

what could give justice to both Palestinians and Israelis.—ERWIN S. FERNANDEZ, *ABUNG NA PANAGBASAY PANGASINAN*.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Teresa S. Encarnacion Tadem, ed. 2011. *Global Civil Society Movements in the Philippines*. Mandaluyong City: Anvil Publishing, Inc. 302 pp.**

The research program on which this book is based had an ambitious objective: to examine the transnational nature of civil society movements in the Philippines. The book therefore appropriately focuses on (1) issues raised by local social movements that are international in character, (2) the interactions between domestic and international opportunity structures for social movements, and (3) the strategies and linkages adopted by local social movements that transcend the country's territorial boundaries. These the five case studies do and more. While the book aims to examine the transnational nature of Philippine social movements, it also offers rich historical detail on the genesis of these movements.

The book's editor wrote an excellent chapter that synthesizes the various case studies. An edited volume is always difficult to synthesize—contributors may adopt different organizing frames as a project proceeds—but the synthesis chapters in this book provide a well-developed articulation of the theoretical insights drawn from the cases that illustrate the varying degrees Philippine social movements acquire a transnational character.

Though the book is well-structured, there are still ways for this research agenda to fruitfully move forward. I am proceeding from my own lingering interest in international political economy (IPE), so I shall focus my remaining remarks on issues of international trade, a topic covered by two of the five case studies in the book.

Looking at transnational trade movements (whether pro- or anti-free trade, or in between) in the Philippines offers a fruitful way of linking two literatures that often talk past each other: social movement theory and international trade theory, particularly that which examines the distribution effects of international trade.

Among IPE scholars, there has been a long debate about who wins and who loses in a domestic economy under free trade (whether the

impacts of international trade are felt according to ownership of a factor of production or according to association with a specific sector or industry of the economy). For instance, according to the much-used Stolper-Samuelson theorem, international trade benefits owners of abundant factors while it harms owners of scarce factors.

Political economists, such as Ron Rogowski and Mike Hiscox, have used this insight to examine various historical episodes—in the United States and elsewhere—in which owners of capital, farmers, and labor form shifting alliances that seek to either promote or hinder fair trade. Looking back at the 1999 World Trade Organization Ministerial in Seattle, it is therefore no wonder that the successful protest was spearheaded by organized labor in the United States, since labor security is at the losing end of free trade.

However, a look at the Philippine case presents a puzzle. If the Stolper-Samuelson theorem were correct, then domestic capitalists should be anti-free trade since capital is scarce in the Philippines, while the labor movement should actually promote free trade. What explains this inconsistency between theoretical expectations derived from the Stolper-Samuelson theorem and empirical realities?

This is where, in my view, rich, detailed contextual case studies that look into the dynamics of local social movements can play an important role. Much of the trade literature assume that the collective action problem has been addressed. Those among us who have been working on social movements for some time know that making this assumption is a mistake. A corrective measure would be in examining social movements for the purpose of trade theory.

I hope that this can be taken up by one or perhaps a number of the contributors to this volume. I believe that doing so will contribute to developing critical insights on the nature of Philippine political and economic institutions, the dynamics of the alliance between industry and land that Dr. Temario C. Rivera first studied systematically, the ideological persuasions and predispositions of social movement organizations themselves, and the contentious dynamics in the history of these organizations.—ANTONIO C. PEDRO JR., *DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE, DE LA SALLE UNIVERSITY.*

\* \* \* \* \*