



## FORUM 1

### *Ang mga Isyu at Interes sa Pagpangalan sa UP College of Business Administration na Cesar E.A. Virata School of Business*

Miyerkules, 3 Hulyo 2013, 9:00 n.u.-12:00 n.t.  
Pulungang Claro M. Recto (Faculty Center Conference Hall)  
Bulwagang Rizal, Kolehiyo ng Arte at Literatura  
Unibersidad ng Pilipinas (UP) Diliman

**RICARDO T. JOSE** (DIREKTOR, THIRD WORLD STUDIES CENTER AT PROPESOR, DEPARTAMENTO NG KASAYSAYAN, KOLEHIYO NG AGHAM PANLIPUNAN AT PILOSOPHIYA, UP DILIMAN): *Magandang umaga sa inyong lahat at maraming salamat sa inyong pagdating maski masama ang panahon. I would like to acknowledge the presence of Chancellor Caesar A. Saloma, and of course, iyong mga bisita at tagapagsalita natin.*

*Ano ba itong paksa na ito?* The issue of renaming the UP College of Business Administration (CBA) (*basahin ang appendix 1.1, 277-78*). *Marahil ay narinig ninyo na bago na ang pangalan ng CBA at ito ay officially iyong Cesar E.A. Virata School of Business. Kailan ba [ito] nagpalit ng pangalan?* It was actually fairly recently. *Nalaman ng ibang faculty sa UP noong graduation ceremonies noong Abril nang ini-announce na Cesar E.A. Virata School of Business na ang institusyon na iyon. Ngayon, out of this, maraming mga isyu at maraming mga kontrobersiya ang lumabas, maraming nagsulat sa diyaryo, maraming nagsulat din sa mga [online] discussions, pero wala pang opisyal na forum sa UP na tumalakay sa isyu na ito. So, sa Third World Studies Center, we think that it is a good opportunity na puwede nating i-discuss ang isyu na ito from different vantage points. And we try to see from different perspectives kung ano iyong mga issues, ano iyong mga kontrobersiya, ano iyong mga problema na involved dito. Among these, we found out that there were issues relating to [the] naming of institutions.*

*Mayroon tayong patakaran* on naming physical structures, buildings, roads, [and] plazas. *May* republic act relating to this and the rules are very clear.<sup>1</sup> *Kaya lang, kapag sinabing mga institusyon*, it can sound not as clear as that, so *medyo may gray area dito*. But anyway, *ano ba iyong chronology nito?*

The CBA faculty unanimously decided that they would request the formal change of name on 19 July 2012. They wrote a formal letter to the Board of Regents (BOR), which they submitted through channels dated 15 March 2013 (*basahin ang* appendix 1.2, 279–96). It was studied by the chancellor’s office and raised to the BOR on 11 April 2013. The chancellor wrote that he was recommending approval, provided—and this was very clear in his letter—*na magkaroon ng clear guidelines on naming institutions especially after people who are still alive* (*basahin ang* appendix 1.3, 297–300). *Iyon iyong* one of the major issues. Aside from this, there were also issues relating to the role of Virata during the martial law years, which led a lot of the faculty to think *na parang* very short *iyong* memory *ng mga* Filipino, that they have forgotten what happened during the martial law years, and that Virata was the prime minister during the 1980s and was an active player during the Marcos administration. So, there are several issues that were involved here. These will be discussed in fuller detail by the speakers that we have this morning. So, rather than go further into these, I would like to turn over the discussion to our speakers. *Ito iyong* some of the items that we have found. There are some very strong reactions to the renaming of the CBA. It is the only institution I think, at least in UP Diliman, that is named after a living person at this point. So, *may mga iba’t ibang* issues and we hope to take this as an opportunity to discuss these in a more formal way. *Maraming salamat muli sa pagdalo ninyo dito*.

**MARIA LUISA T. CAMAGAY** (PROPESOR, DEPARTAMENTO NG KASAYSAYAN, KOLEHIYO NG AGHAM PANLIPUNAN AT PILOSOPHIYA, UP DILIMAN): *Salamat, Dr. Jose. Ipapakilala ko iyong mga tagapagsalita natin ngayon ayon sa kung paano sila nahahanay sa ating programa at pagkatapos ko silang*

1. *Ito ay ang* Republic Act No. 1059, “An Act Prohibiting the Naming of Sitios, Barrios, Municipalities, Cities, Provinces, Streets, Highways, Avenues, Bridges, and Other Public Thoroughfares, Parks, Plazas, Public Schools, Public Buildings, Piers, Government Crafts and Vessels, and Other Public Institutions after Living Persons.” *Ayon sa* section 1 *ng batas na ito, kung kondisyon ang pagpapangalan sa isang donasyon na magiging pabor sa gobyerno, maaring ipangalan ang mga nabanggit na pampublikong institusyon sa buhay pang tao*.

*ipakilala ay magsasalita na si Dr. [Judy] Taguiwalo, G. Nelson Navarro, Dr. [Eduardo] Tadem, at Dr. Amado Mendoza.*

*Si Dr. Judy Taguiwalo ay propesor sa [Women and Development Program] bago pa ito maging Women and Development Studies sa College of Social Work and Community Development dito sa UP Diliman. Siya ay naging faculty regent [ng UP] at naging political prisoner noong panahon ng diktadura ni Marcos.*

*Si G. Nelson Navarro naman ay kolumnista sa Philippine Star at alumnus ng CBA, UP Diliman. So, [magsasalita siya] tungkol sa bagay na ito na lumabas sa kaniyang column noong Linggo.*

*Si Dr. Eduardo Tadem ay propesor sa Asian Center, UP Diliman at ang kaniyang mga areas of interest ay rural development, agrarian reform and the peasantry, at social movements and civil society organizations. Siya ay nakapagsulat na ng papel hinggil sa paksaang ito na pinamagatang “Technocracy [and the Peasantry: Martial Law Development Paradigms and Philippine Agrarian Reform]” (Tadem 2015).*

*Si Dr. Amado Mendoza ay propesor sa Departamento ng Agham Pampulitika sa College of Social Sciences and Philosophy, dito rin sa UP Diliman. Ang kanyang mga interes ay international studies, policy research and advocacy, at business/economic journalism.*

*Sila po ang ating mga tagapagsalita. Sa palagay ko, marami tayong mapupulot na kaalaman at magiging mayaman ang ating talakayan. So, tawagin po natin muli si Dr. Taguiwalo.*

**JUDY M. TAGUIWALO** (PROFESOR, PROGRAMA SA KABABAIHAN AT PAG-UNLAD, KOLEHIYO NG GAWAING PANLIPUNAN AT PAGPAPAUNLAD NG PAMAYANAN, UP DILIMAN): *Ang gusto kong pokus sana ay ang pag-rename ng UP CBA sa konteksto ng nangyayari sa UP sa kasalukuyan.*

*Para sa akin, tatlo ang sangkot sa mga isyung kaugnay ng pagpapangalan sa UP CBA na Cesar Emilio Aguinaldo Virata School of Business: (1) ang isyu ng pagbibigay-dangal sa mga matapat na naglingkod sa awtoritaryang rehimen ni Marcos; (2) ang isyu ng pagpapangalan ng mga gusali at programang pang-akademiko ng UP sa mga buhay na tao at batay sa donasyon sa konteksto ng neoliberalismo sa ngayon sa Pilipinas at sa buong daigdig; at (3) ang isyu ng demokratikong proseso ng pagdedesisyon sa loob ng unibersidad. Hindi magkakahiwalay ang mga isyung ito dahil nakasalalay ang mga ito sa katangian ng UP bilang isang pampublikong unibersidad, ang naging papel nito sa kasaysayan, at ang kaniyang kasalukuyang tunguhin sa panahon ng neoliberalismo.*

*Ang isyu ng pagbibigay-dangal sa matatapat na naglingkod sa awtoritaryang rehimen ni Marcos.* [Sa] pagtingin ko, marami na tayong nabasa, marami nang naisulat at narito ngayon si Nelson Navarro na maglilinau pa kung bakit hindi katanggap-tanggap, bakit historical revisionism, bakit adding insult to injury, ang pagpapangalan ng isang akademikong yunit ng UP sa isang matapat na naglingkod sa diktadurang Marcos (basahin ang appendix 1.4, 301–10). Marami nang mga usapin tungkol dito. Ang sabi:

Virata was a robotic technocrat, unfeeling of the sorry state of the people, programmed by, and following, his boss' program to a T . . . . He does not deserve the honor UP gave him. Decency dictates that he decline it. Virata is a case study of morality and ethics. What was committed in naming the CBA after him was a violation of moral and ethical standards; it effectively approved his behavior while serving the Marcos regime. (Pulmano 2013)

Galing ito sa isang alumnus ng UP na si Eugenio A. Pulmano na taga-UP College of Medicine.

Nabasa rin natin ang kolum ni Randy David (2013) at ganoon din ang sinabi:

By naming its school of business after a Marcos technocrat, UP is, in effect, signaling that it aims to produce graduates who, even as they excel as problem-solvers in their respective fields, can be trusted to put their political consciences on hold while they do their work.

At ang “Historical Revisionism” [na] editorial ng [Philippine Daily] Inquirer (2013):

Another argument is “we consulted the constituents in the college.” Ignore for now the posts in the social media from alumni and students denying precisely this. Even assuming a bona fide consultation—and we have copies of the signatures of alumni, students, faculty, former deans of the CBA who supported the recommendation of the dean of the CBA—this is one choice where there are stakeholders outside the college, namely, the other members of the UP community who have invested much of their lives fighting the Marcos dictatorship.

If their sacrifices are about to be diluted, surely they are entitled to be heard on this issue.

Yet it is more than just a problem of forgetting. The renaming is just a symptom of a deeper problem: the drastic shift in people's mindsets away from looking at Virata's place in history and toward looking at him as an individual. It is now possible to extol Virata's personal virtues and be oblivious to his lending his sterling reputation to deodorize the Marcos dictatorship. The UP BOR had this to say: "Virata has served UP, the Philippine government and the country for many years and with clear distinction."

So, those are the criticisms from outside the university. *At siyempre*, I am in full agreement with those criticisms. I believe that UP should uphold respect for honor and excellence, that is supposed to be the call of the university. Excellence cannot be separated from honor. We say that again and again. And we say that, "UP *ang galing mo, ialay sa bayan, hindi sa diktadura.*"

***Ang isyu ng pagpapangalan ng mga gusali at programang pang-akademiko ng UP sa mga buhay na tao at batay sa donasyon.*** Sinabi ni Rigoberto ["Bobi"] Tiglao, "Nakakainsulto." Pinangalan na nga sa isang minion ng diktadura, hindi pa humingi ng donasyon. Magkano ba ang donasyon? Limang bilyon? Dalawang bilyon mula sa hidden wealth ng mga Marcoses? Hindi ito ang point, pero ito na nga ang patutunguhan ng unibersidad. "Marcos Pa Rin!" ang isyu sa forum natin ngayon pero kinukonteksto ko ito sa tunguhin ngayon ng UP ng pagbebenta ng naming rights sa university.

Relatibong bagong patakaran ang pagpapangalan ng mga gusali sa UP batay sa donasyon. Ang patakaran noong 1984 sa pagpapangalan sa mga gusali, istruktura, kalsada, at iba pang lugar—take note, places, walang academic programs—ay "after outstanding alumni for their exceptional and exemplary professional, scientific, or artistic achievements." *Galing ito sa [UP] Naming [Rights] Policy ng BOR na inaprubahan noong Agosto 2009 (University of the Philippines Gazette 2009b).*

Ang guidelines ay binago sa panahon ni President Francisco Nemenzo. Ang guidelines sa pagpapangalan ng mga buildings, structures, streets, parks, and other places na may kakabit na donasyon ay inaprubahan ni UP President Nemenzo noong 27 Hulyo 2004 at inihapag sa BOR bilang

Matters for Information of the Board *noong ika-1185* meeting ng Board *noong 26 Agosto 2004*. “Noted” *ang naging [tugon] ng BOR*.

*Ano ang laman ng patakarang iyon? Ang pagpapangalan, “1 . . . may be named after natural (living or deceased) persons, juridical persons and objects. 2. [Naming] . . . shall be allowed only when it is made a condition in a donation in favor of the University and for meritorious considerations,” kapag living persons (University of the Philippines Gazette 2009b, 56)*. So, consistent *siya sa batas na sina-cite ni Rene Saguisag. Pangalanan mo ang building sa buhay na tao kapag kondisyon siya sa donasyon. Pero nakasaad din doon:*

3. In naming a building, a structure, a street, a park or a place in the University after a natural or a juridical person, the person so honored: 3.1.1. must have exceptional or exemplary achievement in his/her field/profession, or significant contribution to the University of the Filipino people; and 3.1.2 must have sterling reputation or could be looked upon as a role model of the youth. (*University of the Philippines Gazette 2009b, 59*)

*May “3.2,” hindi lang sa amount ng donation. Although sinasabi na “the donation should not be less than 50%”—may pera-pera na talaga—“of the construction cost of such building, structures, streets, park or place” (University of the Philippines Gazette 2009b, 57).*

*Lalong na-institutionalize ang guidelines noong 28 Agosto 2009 sa 1248th pulong ng Board. Kabahagi ako ng BOR nang inaprubahan ito—ang Naming [Rights] Policy na inihapag ng noon ay UP President Emerlinda R. Roman na siya ring number one signatory sa endorsement ng recommendation sa renaming ng CBA. At nililinaw niya na mahalaga ito to supplement government funding. So, ang naming ng mga buildings ng UP ay kaugnay ng patuloy na kakulangan sa subsidyo ng gobyerno sa isang public university katulad ng UP. Pero pinalawak ng patakarang ito ang saklaw ng puwedeng pangalanan mula doon sa 2004 guidelines ni President Nemenzo. Nandoon pa rin ang “buildings or parts of buildings (such as wings, pavilions or annexes); theaters, laboratories, classrooms; outdoor areas, which may be gardens, courtyards, ovals and playing fields, roads or walkways; other facilities that may be recommended for naming; chairs, centers, institutes; [and] programs and projects” (University of the Philippines Gazette 2009b, 56).*

*Inihapag ng administrasyong Roman ang patakarang ito pagkatapos ng BOR meeting noong Hulyo 2009 kung saan matindi ang talakayan kaugnay sa pagpapangalan sa bagong tayong mga gusali, [tulad ng] iyong kolehiyo, Dr. [Eduardo] Tadem. Ano ang proposal in the naming of the new Asian Center facilities to be donated by Toyota Motor Philippines to the university:*

(1) That the entire 1-hectare property be officially designated as the GT-Toyota Asian Cultural Center;

GT as in George Ty—

(2) That the Museum-Library Research Institute building be named GT-Toyota Hall of Wisdom; and, (3) that the auditorium retain the name originally proposed GT-Toyota Asian Cultural Center Auditorium. (*University of the Philippines Gazette 2009a, 51*)

*Mahabang talakayan ito na sa minutes sinabi ko na:*

... this is the first time that a building in the university is going to be named after a corporation. In the past, buildings in the university are named after heroes or deceased administrators/academic leaders of UP . . . naming a building after George Ty and Toyota on the account of their donations runs counter to the spirit of the university as state university. Previously, donors were simply honored with plaques of appreciation [located in prominent places on the building].

The chair [Emmanuel Angeles] took note of the observations of the faculty and the student regents. He then called for a division of the house.

Five (Regents [Emerlinda] Roman, [Abraham] Sarmiento, [Nelvia] Gonzales, [Alfredo] Pascual, including Regent [Cynthia] Villar . . .) voted in favor of the proposal. Three (Regents [Judy] Taguiwalo, [Clodualdo] Cabrera, and [Charisse Bernadine] Bañez) voted against the proposal. (*Ibid.*, 51-52)

*Mahalagang matukoy ang pag-apruba sa GT-Toyota building bilang unang break sa tradisyon ng pagpapangalan ng mga gusali sa UP batay sa accomplishments ng binibigyan ng karangalan at hindi batay sa donasyon. We are talking of buildings here. Dati ang mga nagbibigay ng donasyon ay*

kinikilala sa pagpapangalan ng mga professorial chairs or awards or scholarships para sa kanila. Dati nang praktika ito. Ang nagbibigay donasyon sa mga pagtatayo ng mga gusali ay kinikilala sa pamamagitan ng plake na kumikilala sa kanilang kontribusyong pinansyal. Matingkad na halimbawa nito ang “Sentro Optalmolohiko Jose Rizal ng PGH [Philippine General Hospital]” na itinayo sa pamamagitan ng donasyon ng pamahalaan ng Espanya. Hindi ito pinangalanang “Spanish Government Ophthalmological Center,” pero may malaking plake sa bungad ng gusali na kumikilala sa donasyong ito.

Ang praktikal na pagpapangalan ng mga gusali kapalit ng donasyon sa unibersidad at lumilitaw sa debate kaugnay ng pagpapangalan sa CBA na Cesar E. A. Virata School of Business Administration ay bahagi ng patuloy na pribatisasyon ng isang pampublikong unibersidad tulad ng UP. Malinaw na praktika ng mga pribadong unibersidad sa Pilipinas tulad ng Ateneo at La Salle na ipangalan, hindi lamang ang kanilang mga gusali kundi pati na ang kanilang pang-akademikong programa, sa malalaking donors. Sa La Salle, halimbawa, nariyan ang “Ramon V. del Rosario College of Business” at ang “Gokongwei College of Engineering.” Ang Ateneo naman ay mayroon ding “John Gokongwei School of Management.” Talaga namang mayaman-yaman ang mga Gokongwei.

Hindi ako nagtataka na ang unang gumawa ng hakbang na mawasak ang tradisyong ng UP bilang isang pampublikong unibersidad at gayahin ang praktika ng mga pribadong unibersidad ay ang CBA. Hindi lamang sa pagpapangalan ng building sa isang korporasyon na akala ng iba ay pagawaan ng kotse ng Toyota dito sa UP, kundi sa ngayon ay ang pagbabago ng pangalan ng isang akademikong programa na lilitaw sa certificates ng mga estudyante ng UP, kung hindi man sa kanilang diploma.

Sinabi ko noon sa panahon ng administrasyong Roman na bumilis ang kumpas ng pribatisasyon ng UP, at ito iyong presentation ko noon sa 20[10] Alumni Council:

Some of the manifestations of the diminishing public character of the University are the transfer to the students of a larger part of the cost of their education through increased tuition and the imposition of various fees such as higher and/or new laboratory fees, joint ventures with big business, the selling of naming rights, the privatization of former university services such as the University Food Service and the UP Printery, contracting a private entity to set up laboratory, pharmacy, and radiology inside the PGH compound. (Taguiwalo 2010)



Initially named the Daniel Mercado Medical Arts Building, now renamed Faculty Medical Arts Building, because [of] the attempt to downplay the protest [regarding] “the private management of university dorms,” reached approval [of] the BOR but which fortunately has not been implemented in the current administration “are only some examples of the accelerating and diversified ways of privatization of the University of the Philippines” (Taguiwalo 2010).

A UP alumnus, Eric “Cabring” Cabrera, suggested the following renaming of other UP institutions to continue the momentum started with the approval of the Cesar E.A. Virata School of Business. *Kung hindi ninyo pa nabasa sa Facebook, babasahin ko na lang ngayon:*

- The Benigno Simeon Cojuangco Aquino III School of Neoliberal Economics;
- The Ferdinand Edralin Marcos College of Martial Law;
- The Vicente Castelo Sotto III Creative Writing Center;
- The Liwayway Gawgaw Tapia College of Education;
- The Manuel “Lito” Lapid College of Superhuman Kinetics;
- The UP Maroonongs (to replace Maroons; *pampataas* ng confidence levels, especially for the basketball team);
- The Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo National College of Public Administration and Governance;
- The Wilfredo Buendia Revillame College of Mass Hysterical Communications;
- The Lucio Tan School of Contractual Labor and Industrial Relations;
- The Henry Sy Sr. University Shopping Center (pushing for “Mart”);
- The Sixto Serrano Brillantes Jr. Financial Assistance Program (to be known as the Sixto-FAP) with Brackets 60, 30, and 10;
- The Imelda Romualdez Marcos Sunken Garden of Truth, Goodness, and All Things Beautiful; and
- The Zobel de Ayala Public-Private-Partnership University of the Philippines (Cabrera 2013)

***Ang isyu ng demokratikong proseso ng pagdedesisyon sa loob ng unibersidad.*** I think it would be good if we understand the governance processes involved in the decision regarding the renaming of an academic unit. I would just like to note that there are ongoing

donations for buildings in UP Diliman. At least, the donation made by Rep. [Fatima Aliah] Dimaporo to the College of Architecture Auditorium has not been named “Dimaporo Auditorium.” It is called Mindanao Auditorium because she [gave] PHP 50 million. But happily, she did not impose as a condition of the donation that it be called the “Dimaporo Auditorium.”

The College of Arts and Letters has also received donations for the construction of a theater. A simple groundbreaking ceremony was held on June 13 at the site [where the theater,] envisioned to be a three-story building from the design of architect Jason Buensalido, will [be erected]. But who are the donors? Present during the ceremony were UP President Alfredo Pascual, UP Diliman Chancellor [Caesar] Saloma, College of Arts and Letters Dean [Flora Elena] Mirano, officials of the Euro Towers International Inc. led by Ignacio Gimenez, chairman of the board and a UP Diliman alumnus, Edmundo Las, Hotel Sogo chief executive officer, and William Go, the hotel managing director. Does this mean that we are going to have a Sogo theater inside [UP]? We can laugh so much if it does not hurt *kung hindi talaga ang pagpapangalan ng academic unit ay pagbibigay-dangal sa isang masugid at matapat na tagapaglingkod ng diktadurang Marcos. Hindi na rin ako nagulat, kasi noong last graduation, sino ang commencement speaker ng UP? Si Edgardo Angara, na ganoon din naman ang masasabi natin. Ano ba ang naging papel ni former senator Edgardo Angara sa panahon ng diktadurang Marcos? Uulitin ko, ang pagbibigay-dangal sa mga naging bahagi ng diktadurang Marcos ay betrayal ng mga sakripisyo—kabilang ang sakripisyo ng buhay ng marami-raming estudyante, kabataan, guro, at mamamayang Pilipino na lumaban sa diktadurang Marcos. Walang puwang ito sa UP na pamantasan ng bayan. Magandang umaga po sa ating lahat.*

**NELSON A. NAVARRO (KOLUMNISTA, PHILIPPINE STAR):** *Grumadweyt ako sa CBA noong 1968 at si Virata ang pumirma sa aking diploma. Noong 1968, kagalang-galang pa iyang si Virata. I mean you know, [graduate ng The] Wharton [School] at saka talagang technocrat.*

*Itong pagpapangalan kay Virata, as far as I am concerned, is invalid. It is against the law. Hindi lang ito pinoint out ni Rene Saguisag na mayroong republic act na nagbabawal magpangalan sa mga taong buhay pa. Ngayon, nakausap ko rin si [Maria Serena] “Maris” Diokno, na ngayon ay chairperson ng [National Historical Commission of the Philippines] at sabi niya may pamamalakad tayo na ang pagpapangalan ng mga ganito, kailangang [pagkatapos] pa ng fifty years. Patay na sila ng fifty years. Bakit*

*kailangan ng fifty years? Kasi iyong judgment natin is flawed. Kung immediate, madadala sa emotions, madadala sa passion ng times. Kapag pinangalanan mo iyong talagang napakalaking institusyon, kailangan na humupa na iyong mga batikos, humupa na iyong mga sipsip, at ang lalabas ay kung ano talaga ang intrinsic work ng isang tao.*

*Ngayon, ang sabi niya, itong batas na ito ay talagang ibinasura na, binaboy na ng panahon ni Marcos. Kasi pinangalanan na nila lahat na “Imelda this, Imelda that.” Pati iyong tatay nilang patay na, si Don Mariano Marcos, pinangalanan, si Doña Josefa, at lahat na. Talagang binaboy nang husto. Kaya kung ipapangalan kay Cesar Virata, bakit pa? Huli na ang lahat. Isang college lang ang pangalanan mong Cesar Virata, napakalaking kasalanan na. Ipinangalan na nga natin kay Marcos ang lahat, kay Imelda ang lahat ng bagay na ito. Plainly illegal ito.*

*Malapit ako sa pamilyang Diokno at kaibigan ko rin si UP President [Alfredo] Pascual, at naiintidihan ko kung anong klaseng pressure at pagre-railroad ang ginawa para ipasa ito. Remember that iyong petition ng CBA—nag-consultation sila Marso, at Abril inaprubahan, tapos ini-announce na sa graduation na Cesar Virata na pala [ang bagong pangalan ng kolehiyo]—sino ang kinonsulta nila? Hindi ba nagpa-final examinations ang mga bata. You know, ito ay railroad[ed]. There was no attempt to reach alumni like us. Wala akong kilalang graduate ng CBA na kinonsulta nila. Kasali pa rin kami sa kolehiyo na iyan. Feeling ko, kung si Maris Diokno ang naging presidente ng unibersidad na ito, maski iisang boto lang iyon, maninindigan iyong kaibigan ko na iyon. It just goes to show na, kailangan pa ba na magsakripisyo ang isang pamilya para manindigan sa bagay na klarong-klaro naman? Kaya iyong petition ko, appeal to President Pascual and the BOR. There is no excuse for your bad judgment. In spite of the railroading na ginawa ng pangkat ni Angara—and do not kid me about it; I know exactly who railroaded that petition—you should have stood up for the higher interest of the university and the higher interest of the nation.*

*Decency requires Virata to reject this undeserved honor and for UP officials to accept the withdrawal of Virata. Kaya lang, nangangarap tayo. Garapal talaga iyang si Virata. Hindi niya iwi-withdraw. At siguro dahil nasa batas na, pinalitan na, mamaya nakalagay na doon, Virata [and others], ang pangalan. Siguro naghahabol tayo sa tambol mayor. But, maski naghahabol tayo sa tambol mayor, ito lang ang gusto ko [sabihin]: the argument is beyond Virata.*

*Virata is a very nice gentleman. We have always had a good relationship. I will meet him and say, “Kumusta po kayo?” and everything*

like that. *Wala akong masasabi sa pagkamaginoon ni Mr. Virata. Kaya lang, I beg to disagree na kailangang ipangalan at i-honor natin iyong position niya. Kasi talaga namang naglingkod siya at sumisipsip siya sa diktadura ni Marcos hanggang ngayon.*

*Maraming mga taong nagkamali, naglingkod kay Marcos, at nagsisisi na sila. Tinalikuran na nila si Marcos at sumali sa pagbabago. Ehempro: si Juan Ponce Enrile, si Fidel Ramos. Tinalikuran na nila kaya nakaka-move on na sila. Itong si Virata, nunca, nunca. Never, never. Jinustify pa niya ang paglingkod up to the bitter end and up to now. Walang regrets. Ito ba ay pamamalakad ng isang taong matino at taong kagalang-galang? I would dare say na hindi. Kakapalan ito ng mukha at kailangang i-denounce repeatedly.*

*Alam mo ang argument ng mga kaibigan ni Virata: kung hindi si Virata daw ang naglingkod kay Marcos, mas masaklap ang nangyari sa bayang Pilipinas. My God, this is the most self-serving, the most idiotic, the most insulting argument of all. This very reasoning was invoked by the minions of Hitler at the Nuremberg Trial. Ang sabi nila, kung hindi kami nagsipsip, kung hindi kami naglingkod kay Hitler, siguro, hindi lang six million Jews ang na-incinerate, kung hindi pati kayong lahat. Dapat tayong magpasalamat sa kagaguhan na iyon? Buti na lang noong Nuremberg Trial binitay silang lahat.*

*Pasalamat si Virata na ang Filipino talaga masyadong pusong-mamon. Galit na galit tayo pero pinatawad natin. Kaya iyang mga balimbing na iyan nagsamantala at ngayon, iniinsulto pa tayo sa pagmumukha na natin at we are taking it lying down. I beg to disagree. Alam mo iyong ating “bloodless revolution,” walang firing squad. Iyan, buhay pa si Imelda ngayon at congresswoman. Iyong anak niya, governor. Iyong isang anak niya, senator. Ang kakapal talaga ng mukha.*

*Anong nangyari sa Romania, hindi ba? Iyong si [Nicolae] Ceausescu, pagkahuli sa kanila, pok! Binaril sila. Hindi ako nag-a-advocate ng firing squad. Masyadong madugo iyan. Pero itong ganitong klaseng insulto, sinasabi ko, sana nagkaroon nga tayo ng firing squad para wala na itong problema natin na hinaharap ngayon. Na iniinsulto na tayo ay nakabungisngis pa rin tayo. Noong minention ni Judy Taguiwalo iyong mga jokes, talagang nakakatawa. Iyon ang problema ng mga Filipino. Lahat ng mga bagay na seryoso, lahat ng mga bagay na yumuyurak sa dangal ng ating bayan, ginagawa nating joke only. Hindi na ito joke. But as she points out, kung hindi tayo tatawa, ay iiyak, hahagulgol tayo. Mas masama naman iyon, hindi ba?*

*Si Virata, noong ako ay estudyante pa sa CBA, kinuha iyang maging secretary of finance—very good. Kasi noong 1960s, there was such a thing*

as technocracy. *Parang sabihin natin na modern government—Kennedy administration, etc.—bring young, intelligent, bright, idealistic, the best and brightest of a particular country into government because they will cleanse the government and make it run efficiently. They are unlike the *trapos*—the politicians, the governors, the congressmen—na puro patronage na lang at puro pork barrel na lang na paghahatian nila. Ninanakawan lang nila ang bayan. Pero kapag kumuha tayo ng matitinong tao na edukado, may mga degrees, doctorates, mula sa abroad, alam nila kung paano patakbuhan ang gobyerno.*

*Kaya kinuha ang UP kasi si Marcos ang number one alumnus ng university. Alam ba ninyo noong panahon namin, si Marcos maya-maya pumaparada diyari sa ROTC [Reserve Officers' Training Corps], maya-maya nag-a-address ng mga symposium (basahin ang appendix 1.5, 311–14). At si Imelda nakatemo. And the people of the university really loved them (basahin ang appendix 1.6, 315–18). They really loved them as an example of what a UP alumnus should be: serving the country (basahin ang appendix 1.7, 319–22). Kaya noong nag-recruit dito si Marcos, lahat iyan— si Virata, [Jaime] Laya, O. D. Corpuz—the best and the brightest of the university. [Carlos] Romulo himself served Marcos as education secretary and foreign minister, etc. Iyang si Virata, from the beginning to the end, minister of finance at naging prime minister pa siya in the puppet assembly. We were so proud.*

*Ngayon, itatanong ko sa inyo, kung the best and the brightest ng UP, the best and the brightest of this nation, ang sumanib kay Marcos, bakit pumalpak? Bakit sumabit? Bakit naging kalunos-lunos ang kalagayan ng bayan natin?*

*Noong nagsimula si Marcos noong 1966—30 December 1965 he was inaugurated—during his first term, the Philippines could proudly say that we were the best in the whole of Asia, second only to Japan. Alam mo ang Filipino, ang taas ng prestige sa Hong Kong, sa Japan, everywhere in Asia. Filipinos were known as big spenders. Mayaman tayo. Thirty years later, anong nangyari sa Pilipinas? Tayo ang pinakadukha. Tayo ang pinaka-basket case. Walang nangyari sa atin. Basahin ninyo iyong biography ni Lee Kuan Yew. Sabi niya, noong nagsisimula ang Singapore noong 1965, 1966, pagtingin nila sa Pilipinas, “Wow, mayroon silang Ayala Avenue!” “Wow, mayroon silang ganoon, ganito!” Singapore was a very poor country. Tayo, we were not only a rich country; we were a glamorous country. Imelda and Ferdinand Marcos were called the John and Jackie Kennedy of Asia. Talagang hinahangaan tayo. Ano ang nangyari? Kasi ito ngang technocracy, naglingkod sa gobyerno. Itong technocracy ng Pilipinas,*

*naging tuta at nagpagamit sa diktadura.* It became worse under martial law *kasi wala nang restraint.*

I have to focus on two colleges in this university that really were responsible for the damnation of this country: the CBA and the College of Law. These were the twin pillars of the dictatorship (*basahin ang appendix 1.8, 323–26*).

*Si Virata ang unahin natin. Siya ang nag-justify ng lahat ng World Bank loans, etc. Hindi siya mapaalis kasi ang World Bank at that point was pushing a lot of loans, hindi ba? Puro loan—billions and billions of cheap loans. Ginamit ni Marcos ito not to industrialize but to steal; to transfer money out of the country. Ang laki ng inflation, ang laki ng utang ng Pilipinas. Pero hindi naman nag-translate to economic progress kasi kinurakot lang lahat. Sino ang nag-justify ng lahat ng ito? Sino ang point man ng World Bank dito sa Pilipinas? Si Virata.*

*Sa College of Law, ito ang mas kalunos-lunos. Haydee Yorac was a very good friend of mine. Sabi sa akin ni Haydee, there was a time in 1992—kasikatan ni Haydee—may nag-uudyok na mga women lawyers ng UP, Women Lawyers' Circle (WILOCI) na mag-guest speaker siya sa commemoration dito sa UP College of Law. “Bakit?” sabi ni Ms. Yorac. “Kasi kailangang ipakita natin na ang kababaihan ng College of Law ay natatapatan na iyang mga lalaki. We now have so many justices—Supreme Court justices, judges in the Court of First Instance, bar toppers. At iyang College of Law, majority ay babae na. Iyong mga lalaki, nagna-nursing na lang, hindi ba? Iyong mga babae, mas matatalino, mas masipag mag-memorize, etc. Ready-made sila for the College of Law; the kind of culture that they have there.” So, sa kapipilit nina Katrina Legarda, Cecilia Muñoz-Palma, Florida Ruth-Romero, at iyong mga sikat sa College of Law, napilitan din si Ms. Yorac na magsalita sa forum ng UP Women Lawyers' Circle.*

*Tapos sabi niya, “You know,”—iyon ang tono kasi ni Yorac—“I am not really impressed that a lot of our women are bar toppers.” Hindi niya sinabing topper din siya. Sabi niya, “Ang function ba ng talino ay para lang sa ating pansarili? Na nakakuha tayo ng lahat ng mga honors? Ipangangalandakan natin to the whole world that we are so brilliant, we are bar toppers. We are this, we are that? Hindi ba may isang bagay like social responsibility? Hindi ba may mga bagay katulad ng ethics na dapat din nating i-consider? Hindi lang katalinuhan? Papaano mo ginagamit ang iyong katalinuhan at para kanino mo ginagamit ang iyong katalinuhan?” Sabi niya, “I dare say that there is no institution in this whole country that is most responsible for the corruption and degradation of this*

country than the UP College of Law!” *Sabi niya*, “*Sino ba ang gumawa ng presidential decrees ni Marcos? Iyang UP Law Center! Sino ba ang presidente? Si Angara and everything.*” *Pinooint out niya talaga iyong mga katarantaduhan na ginawa ng UP College of Law. “Sino ba ang nag-back [ng] judges? Si Estelito Mendoza.*” She did this whole litany of what the College of Law did.

*At saka noong naga-aral dito si [Maria Imelda Josefa] “Imee” Marcos at si [Ferdinand] “Bongbong” Marcos [Jr.] ng Law, sino ba ang nagbibitbit ng kanilang schoolbag? Hindi ba iyong dean ng UP College of Law? Ang sabi ni Haydee [Yorac], “Alam, mo I am very proud of one thing. Nang mag-enroll iyang magkapatid na Marcos na iyan pagpasok kong propesor sa UP College of Law”—pasista ang UP College of Law—“pagbukas ng pinto na ganyan, tatayo silang lahat, including the Marcoses.” Kapag tumayo lahat ang mga estudyante, tayo rin ang mga Marcos. Sa lesson, “Okay, recite articles 20–30. Ms. Marcos? Okay, singko. Sit down. Mr. Marcos?” After that, marami nang complaints. Sabi nila, “Ang taray-taray ng bruhanng iyon. Sana ikinulong na lang natin para hindi na maging teacher ni Imee.” The long and short of this is that Bongbong quit after a few sessions. Imee also quit. Hindi nila ma-take si Ms. Yorac.*

Later on, *lumabas na si Imee grumadweyt, cum laude pa. At ang kaniyang graduation, sa Malacañang Palace.*<sup>2</sup> *Kasi, dahil kina Haydee, iyong UP College of Law did not approve her kasi she falsified public document. To enter the College of Law, you must hold a bachelor’s degree and she misrepresented that she was a graduate of Princeton University. She did not graduate from Princeton University. I was in Princeton at that time as I was living in Princeton. I was a reporter for the [Trenton] Times and everyday I would see her on campus from a distance. So, they asked Princeton University kung talagang graduate ba*

---

2. *Iba ang pagkakaalala ng iba. Ayon kay Madrileña de la Cerna (2017): “It was a public knowledge during my stay in the campus that Imee could not graduate because she lacked 35 units. Many of her batchmates were my dormmates in the campus. In the first place, we learned that her admission to the college was questionable because she did not finish her undergraduate studies at Princeton but was admitted just the same with intense pressure on the administration (whose admission policies are very strict). Thanks to the very few good men and women at the UP College of Law led by the late Haydee Yorac, the integrity of the college remained intact by not letting her graduate. However, a few days later, I was shocked to watch on TV the ‘graduation’ of Imee Marcos as magna cum laude at the Meralco Theater with Ferdinand and Imelda Marcos putting on the hood and cap on Imee. I could not believe what I saw. The next day, the ‘graduation’ picture was all over the front pages of the national newspapers.”*

itong Marcos na ito. *Hindi siya graduate*. So, *hindi siya graduate pero cum laude pa rin siya*. At *para maging cum laude siya, ginawa lahat na mag-cum laude*. Saan ka nakakita ng UP that would connive with the dictatorship so blatantly? *Paano tayo irerespeto? Anong klaseng unibersidad ito? Ngayon, sabi mo, we are the best. Yes, we are the best, pero saan natin ginamit? Sa kagaguhan.*

*Ang naiisip ko, ngayon itong kay Virata na ito*, this is just the tip of the iceberg, so to speak. It speaks of a very profound dysfunction in the kind of university we have. True, when the university was founded in 1908, it was supposed to be the capstone of the colonial educational system. It was supposed to produce the best colonial minds that will serve the United States (US) imperialist. But you will recall that over time, *nag-assert din iyong na-suppress na struggle ng Filipinos for freedom.*

And UP did not really begin to have a decent education until Rafael Palma. That is why we have Palma Hall. *Iyong Palma Hall, well-deserved iyon kasi si Rafael Palma naglingkod sa bayan. Siya lang ang tumindig against Quezon who was the tuta of the Americans. That is why they sacked Palma: over the pro- and anti- issue.*<sup>3</sup> *Hindi ba, [Maria Luisa] “Malou” [Camagay]? She is a historian. She knows that the people of the university who stood up against Malacañang and they [were] the people who were punished. They were fired. At ang na-promote ay iyong mga tuta, hindi ba?*

During the time of [UP President] Bienvenido Gonzalez—post-war *na—ano ang ginawa ni Bienvenido Gonzalez? Inimbitahan niya si Claro M. Recto, na kalaban ni President Elpidio Quirino, na magsalita*. Here he delivered his very historic speech, “Our Mendicant Foreign Policy.” *Tapos ang gusto pa ni Quirino, bigyan ng PhD [doctor of philosophy] si Sukarno, the dictator of Indonesia.*<sup>4</sup> *Bienvenido Gonzalez at ang UP*

---

3. *Hindi tinanggal kundi napilitang magbitiw si Rafael Palma bilang pangulo ng UP noong 8 Nobyembre 1933 matapos manungkulan nang may isang dekada. Hindi maitatangging malaki ang kinalaman, kung hindi man ito ang tanging dahilan, ng banggaan nila ni Manuel Quezon na noon pangulo ng Senado. Nakasentro ang banggaan nina Palma at Quezon sa Hare-Hawes-Cutting Act. Si Palma pabor dito, kontra naman si Quezon. Sa tingin ni Quezon ginagamit ni Palma ang unibersidad laban sa kanya. Dahil dito, inipit ni Quezon at ng kanyang mga kaalyado sa lehislatura ang budget ng UP, at kahit na ang pasahad kay Palma bilang pangulo ng unibersidad (Churchill 1985, 177–96).*

4. *Para sa detalye sa usaping ito, basahin si Lazaro (1985, 288–89). Kalaunan ring pagkakalooban ng UP ng Doctor of Laws, honoris causa si Sukarno noong 2 Agosto 1963.*



BOR that has Gumersindo Garcia, Jose P. Laurel Sr., and people like that, stood up and said, “No! We will not honor a dictator.”<sup>5</sup>

The last straw was *nagkaroon ng reunion ang UP College of Law. Dito sa UP noon, bawal ang beer. Bawal ang alcohol. Bawal ang alak.* Guest si President Quirino ng UP College of Law anniversary. *Dito [kunwari] nag-iinum tayo, ano ang ginawa ni Presidente Bienvenido Gonzalez? Pumunta siya doon sa university gate at hinarang niya iyong San Miguel.*<sup>6</sup> *Hindi nakalusot.* With this kind of behavior, bow *ako kay* President Gonzalez. *Ito ang dapat paninindigan ng isang president of the university. Maski nga si [Carlos P.] Romulo nagsabi, “This is the independent Republic of Diliman!” Iyong mga nire respeto natin—iyong presidente ng Pilipinas—ay kung siya ay nanunungkulan nang tapat sa bayan niya. Pero kung hindi siya nanunungkulan ng tapat,* it is the responsibility of this republic to stand up to the republic that is being misled by people who are not true to their duties.

I do not want to go on and on about this. *Kung gusto ninyo hanggang magdamagan tayo dito, pero may iba pang speaker. Ayaw ko namang agawin ang kanilang moment sa spotlight.* So, I am very sorry if I extended a little bit and I got carried away. I got carried away because I feel strongly about this issue. As Judy [Taguiwalo] has pointed out, *simula lang ito. Simula lang ito ng rewriting of Philippine history. Nagwagi tayo sa EDSA pero ngayon, unti-until nilang binabawi. Unti-until nilang wina-white wash. Lalabas niyan, magkakaroon kayo ng Presidente Bongbong Marcos.* If we do not watch out, you know, in history, people who do not learn from their mistakes are condemned to repeat [it], and they probably deserve the second trashing. *Ganoon lang ba ang mangyayari sa Filipino? Laban nang laban, panalo nang panalo sa mga dambuhala,* but in the end, we will go back to our normal way of relaxing our vigilance and then allow the same monsters to grow back again. *Alam mo iyong mga corrupt na iyan, para iyang [si] Dracula.* You have to impale them. *Kailangan ipako mo nang husto para hindi na babangon. Kung hindi, babalik ulit iyan. Hanggang dito na lang po at magandang hapon sa inyo.*

---

5. *Hindi pa bahagi ng UP BOR si Jose P. Laurel Sr. nang maging pangulo ng UP si Gonzalez. Magiging miyembro ng BOR si Laurel mula 1952 hanggang 1957. Ang University Committee on Honorary Degrees ang nagpasyang hindi bigyan ng honorary degree si Presidente Sukarno ng Indonesia. Sinasabing kung pinakiusapan ni Presidente Gonzalez ang mga miyembro ng komite, maaaring napaapayag niya ang mga ito na pagkalooban ng honorary degree si Sukarno. Pero walang ganoong hakbang na ginawa si Gonzalez (Lazaro 1985, 288).*

6. *Basahin si Lazaro (1985, 289) para sa detalye.*

**EDUARDO C. TADEM** (PROFESOR, SENTRONG ASYANO, UP DILIMAN): This is what I prepared for today, but it is actually a paper that I did for a research project on martial law technocrats—which is a much bigger project—and my part in this project was to look at the role of the Marcos technocrats in rural development, and specifically in my case, in [the] agrarian reform program. What I would like to look at is the role of the chief technocrat himself in the agrarian reform program. So, this is an aspect of Cesar Virata’s tenure as finance minister and prime minister that is little known: that he actually had a hand in the conceptualization and implementation of the Marcos’s agrarian reform program, which many scholars know was a colossal failure.

During the martial law regime of Ferdinand Marcos, Filipino technocrats played a major role in conceptualizing and implementing a land reform program that was called by Marcos himself [as] the cornerstone of a new society. But for all their expertise, the technocrats failed to [ensure] the success of the program and may have even contributed to [the] dearth of accomplishments after thirteen years of implementation. Now, this failure can be traced to a development paradigm pursued by Marcos and the technocrats because of its bias for elite big business concerns which contradicted the distributive justice and equity-based principles of agrarian reform. Leading technocrats like Cesar Virata—prime minister and concurrent finance minister, and more important, chairman of the Land Bank [of the Philippines], the agrarian reform’s financing institution—originally came from the academe—UP—but honed their skills in the corporate business world, where their mindsets became inexplicably admired.

But let us look at technocracy first as a concept and a practice. Technocracy has been defined as a form of government in which decisions would be based exclusively on technical considerations, a regime in which the government’s actions would be the result of an absolute rationalization of social mechanisms. So, the technocracy thesis holds that human beings are mere cogs in the social machinery, objects of technical control in much the same way as raw materials in their natural environment. Technocrats, therefore, are viewed as a conservative power bloc under the capitalist state apparatus, and they are conscious and unconscious allies of existing economic and social elite.

While generally assumed and respected to be neutral, technocrats in government share the same educational and social background as industrialists and business managers, and are, therefore, likely to share

their ideas, prejudices, and general outlook. Because of this, it cancels the supposedly inherent advantage of a technocratic regime with its avowed emphasis on merit, professionalism, and technical skills rather than birth or political connections. This implies that the very same circumstances that promote technocratic control are inimical to democratic rule. And we have this disjuncture between technocracy, on one hand, and democracy, on the other, because it puts at risk standard democratic features such as accountability, checks and balances, political representation, and transparency. And then the close ties between business and technocrats give rise to what is called a “revolving door,” where government recruits bureaucrats from the business sector while the business sector taps technocrats who have either left public positions or have retired.

Now, this depiction of technocracy is true and clearly relevant in the Philippine case, especially during the martial law period imposed by Marcos from 1972 to 1986.<sup>7</sup> It was a regime that was bannered as one where technocrats had a role to play within a state committed to modernization. It is important to determine what role technocrats played in propping up the dictatorship and providing the justification for the continued martial rule. My paper focuses on Marcos’s acknowledged chief technocrat, Cesar Enrique Aguinaldo Virata—by the way, it is Enrique, not Emilio.<sup>8</sup> It highlights his participation in and his own insights on the agrarian reform program.

Virata, as we all know, earned two bachelor of science degrees: mechanical engineering and business administration in UP, cum laude. He was an instructor at the UP CBA and secured his master of business administration from the prestigious Wharton School in the University of Pennsylvania under a US government fellowship grant. By the way, before I go on, I would like to say that a lot of what is personally ascribed to Virata is a result of a series of interviews done with Virata himself by a team composed of Cayetano Paderanga Jr.,

---

7. *Sa papel, tinapos ni Ferdinand Marcos ang pagkakatuklas ng batas militar noong 17 Enero 1981.*

8. Cesar Enrique Aguinaldo Virata *ang tunay at buong pangalan ng dating primer ministro* (Sicat 2014, 1). *Isinunod ang kanyang pangalawang pangalan sa kanyang ama, si Enrique T. Virata. May ilang sanggunian online, gaya ng Wikipedia, na ang binabanggit na pangalan niya ay Cesar Emilio Aguinaldo Virata. Mali ito. Lolo ni Virata ang dating pangulong Emilio Aguinaldo pero hindi siya ipinangalan dito. Ang ina ni Cesar Virata, si Leonor Aguinaldo, ay anak ni Baldomero Aguinaldo, pinsan ni Emilio Aguinaldo. Noong naninilbihan si Virata kay Marcos, kapansin-pansin ang pagkakahawig niya kay dating pangulong Aguinaldo* (Sicat 2014, 195-96).

Yutaka Katayama, Teresa Encarnacion Tadem, and Temario Rivera under a project of called “The Martial Law Technocrats” (Katayama et al., 2010).

Virata says that it was during his American education that he began to see himself as a technocrat. He later became dean of the UP CBA and in that capacity facilitated the graduate studies in the US of other future Marcos technocrats, like Manuel Alba and Jaime Laya. Other soon-to-be martial law technocrats like [Vicente] Paterno, [Armand] Fabella, and [Placido] Mapa also secured their graduate studies in US universities. When they came back, most of them entered what would be the main training ground for Filipino technocrats in the 1950s. This was the accounting consultancy firm SGV & Co.–SyCip, Gorres and Velayo—which had, among its clients, the country’s largest firms, as well as, multinational corporations. Virata joined SGV in 1956 as a full-time business executive where he was exposed to major industrial sectors and where he established ties with American multinationals such as United Fruit and Castle and Cook, agribusiness giants then exploring plantation ventures in Mindanao. The next logical step for Virata was to join [the] government. And along with Manuel Alba and Jaime Laya, [he] initially did consultancy work for several state agencies such as the Bureau of Customs, the National Waterworks and Sewerage Authority, the Philippine Charity Sweepstakes Office, etc.

In 1967, President Marcos appointed Virata as deputy director general for investments of the presidential economic staff; undersecretary for industry; director and acting chairman of the Philippine National Bank; co-chairman of the Joint United States–Republic of the Philippines Trade and Investments Panel; and chairman of the Board of Investments. In 1971, he was elevated to the Marcos cabinet as secretary of finance. One of his major tasks was to attract foreign capital. As finance secretary, he served concurrently as chairman of the Land Bank of the Philippines, which was organized specifically to support the government’s agrarian reform program.

In September 1972, Virata was in the US, participating in the World Bank meeting when he learned, to his surprise, that Marcos had declared martial law. While initially skeptical of the need for such a draconian measure, he eventually came around to rationalizing it as a way of jump-starting Philippine economic development. He also thought—quite naively, I must say—that it would be no different from what other Asian governments, for example, Indonesia, Taiwan, South

Korea, Singapore, Malaysia, and Thailand, which already had in place an authoritarian and capital-friendly government.

In 1981, as a result of the cosmetic lifting of martial law, Marcos unilaterally inaugurated a French-style parliamentary system of government and designated Virata as prime minister and head of the cabinet, although Marcos retained the presidency and all of his martial law powers. Virata's power and influence were actually limited by the existence of other powerful political-economic factions and personalities in government, but his main source of influence was his closeness and the confidence he enjoyed from the country's foreign multilateral and bilateral donors such the [International Monetary Fund], the World Bank, the [Asian Development Bank], and the American, Japanese, and West European governments.

Marcos's development strategy was basically that of developing a business-oriented foreign capital-friendly economic base. And because of this, Marcos preferred those technocrats who shared his vision of an economy open to foreign investments. Thus, he gave preference to the foreign investment-based plan of Armand Fabella and Cesar Virata himself, against that of the protectionist and nationalist recommendations of, for example, the National Economic Council, which was then headed by Hilarion Henares.

Serious fundamental contradictions surfaced, however, and in the area of socioeconomic development strategies, there was that contradiction—a very basic contradiction—between productivity-oriented initiatives, on one hand, and equity-oriented approaches, on the other. And in the conceptualization and implementation of rural development in general, and agrarian reform program in particular, this paradigmatic conflict would be played out in a typical fashion.

And what is agrarian reform all about, anyway? David Wurfel says that agrarian reform is a complex of policies designed specifically to transform rural society in the direction of greater equality of wealth and power among groups and classes, and of greater equality of opportunity for individuals. To be truly redistributive, agrarian reform must effect on the pre-existing agrarian structure a change of ownership and control over land resources wherein such change flows strictly from the landed to the landless and land-poor classes, and from rich landlord to poor peasants and rural workers.

But what was Marcos's agrarian reform program all about? Upon declaring martial law in 1972, Marcos also declared the whole country a land reform area and ordered the emancipation of tenants from their

bondage and transfer to them the ownership of the land they till (*basahin ang* appendix 1.9, 327-38). Marcos's land reform program, however, retained the limited program scope of previous agrarian laws that covered only tenanted rice and corn lands. Thus, even if totally implemented, such a program would have benefited only 45 percent of tenants, 12 percent of landowners, 56 percent of the area of all rice and corn lands, 5 percent of the rural labor force, 31 percent of all tenanted farmland areas, and 8 percent of all farm lands.

Apart from this basic problem with the program, there were also other inadequacies. One was a conservative vision within the land reform bureaucracy resulting in the pervasive absence of political will, patronage, and corruption, and an implementation that was organized around landowners rather than tenants, with the result of increasing production costs under the Green Revolution program, failure of the small farmer credit program, beneficiaries incurring huge declines in real incomes and losing control over their lands, and, as far as the tenant beneficiaries were concerned, the very high payment default rate that reached 90 percent by the early 1980s.

What was the record of agrarian reform under Marcos even within that very limited scope? Three weeks before he was ousted, only 2.2 percent of land had been distributed, representing a mere 2.2 percent of targeted program area—a pitifully meager outcome despite thirteen years and four months of absolute power resting on the hands of only one man. The failure of Marcos's land reform resulted in the increase of land inequality by the 1990s with Gini coefficient of 57 compared to 53 in the 1960s. The tenurial status of poor farmers also declined. Tenancy increased from 33 percent to 36 percent in the number of farms, and from 26 percent to 27 percent in the percent of farm area. For all crop lands, tenancy actually also grew from 29 percent to 33.4 percent.

And now, Cesar Virata was the highest ranking technocrat with powers over the land reform program, directly by virtue of his chairmanship of the Landbank, and later, indirectly as the prime minister. In a series of interviews, Virata echoed Marcos's view on land reform, and I quote, "We have a long history of resettlement even before the war. Marcos said that this issue of crop-sharing had not solved the problem." I am referring to the 70-30 sharing [scheme] because there was a crop-sharing law that was passed.

Now, my comment on this is that agrarian reform, of course, is not only about resettlement. Marcos's and Virata's view[s] reflect [the]

confusion about what the problem was and the solutions that were offered. The crop-sharing system was not the solution; it was part of the problem. Virata also outlined the justification for a new agrarian reform law. Again, as Marcos explained to him, and I quote Virata, “He, Marcos, explains his reason for the land reform decree. Rather than for the land owners to lose their lands to the New People’s Army, we better have agrarian reform for the farmers so that they would be with us and not with them.” Now this statement only confirms the notion of various scholars that the basic driving motivation of [the] Marcos government’s land reform was indeed counterinsurgency.

For Virata, “Land reform was part of agriculture.” This reflects a framework far removed from the program’s social justice rationale and reducing agrarian reform to its bare technical consideration. From this simple assumption, Virata explains the decision to limit land coverage only to rice and corn lands. He said, and I quote again:

We decided that the agrarian reform should be confined only to rice and corn lands. In the case of sugar, we thought that plantations were more suitable to sugarcane cultivation. With coconut, coconut plantation owners were saying that there were really no large coconut plantations. We did not include coconut and sugar plantations because of efficiency considerations and competitiveness.

This seemingly sacrosanct belief that big farms are more efficient and more competitive than small farms on grounds of economy of scale, was actually made less conclusive by scientific studies done by Hayami, Adriano, and Quisumbing (1990) who pointed out that economies of scale will not exist for most tree crops such as coconuts, coffee, cacao, and rubber. And that although some scale economies may rise due to the need for large tractors in sugarcane production, it is not difficult for small growers to achieve an efficiency equal to that of large plantations so long as a rental market for custom plowing services exists. And they concluded by saying that as a matter of fact, no significant difference in yield per hectare seems to exist between plantations and small growers of banana and pineapple.

Virata’s analysis of ownership of coconut lands being the product of savings of ordinary employees, folds or falls flat in a line of data that land ownership in coconut lands is highly concentrated within 2 percent of coconut farms occupying 1.25 million hectares or 40

percent of total area, while 91 percent of coconut farms occupied only 32 percent of total coconut lands.

Now, what was Virata's role as Landbank chairman? It must be clear that Landbank was established specifically with the mandate to support the land reform program and manage the purchase of lands covered by its land acquisition component. Now, when he took over as Landbank chairman, Virata amended the bank's charter to convert it into a universal bank.

Sixto Roxas Jr., who drew up the original concept of the Landbank and was its first governor, told Virata that this conversion was a mistake. Sixto explained that what would happen was that those involved in the universal bank component of Landbank would now become what he called senior citizens, while those involved in the land reform component of the Landbank would become junior citizens.

Now, Landbank under Virata's leadership bore a large amount of responsibility for the land reform's colossal failure. Among the six stages of the implementation of operation land transfer, it was in the fourth stage, land evaluation—and this stage was the responsibility of Landbank—that the process bogged down continually [with the highest number] of backlogs registered. Of the many problems and inadequacies of Marcos's land reform program, majority of them could be traced to the workings of Landbank under Cesar Virata's chairmanship. I have here a number of problems but I will not go into that. So, for all the vaunted expertise and modernized methods that it was able to mobilize behind it, including a state apparatus unencumbered by countervailing institutional restraints and checks on its political power, the Marcos-Virata martial law regime failed miserably to carry out its land reform program even within its extremely limited program scope. Where then and for what purpose were the extraordinary authority of martial law and technocratic know-how eventually utilized and successfully exercised in the socioeconomic initiatives in the Philippine countryside?

The answer to this question was evident in the early years of martial law. In 1974, the dictator inaugurated the Corporate Farming Program, which turned out to be the direct opposite of . . . the land reform program. The most glaring feature of this productivity-based Corporate Farming Program was its conflict with the regime's equity-oriented land reform as it concentrated land in the hands of big corporate players, where the average farm reached 402 hectares, in contrast to the land reform's objectives of breaking up large estates into family farms of not more than five hectares each. A bigger irony here is that the total



farm area acquired by big corporations under the Corporate Farming Program was 445 percent greater than the measly 15,000 hectares that had been transferred to land reform beneficiaries in the thirteen years and four months of martial law land reform.

Corporate incursions [in] the Philippine countryside have exacerbated the unequal social and economic relations between the rural rich and the rural poor. These are even more disruptive for poor peasants when multinational corporations are involved. It is clear that in the rural development strategy of the Marcos-Virata regime, corporate and plantation-style farming easily superseded and took the upper hand over the agrarian reform program and its land redistribution component as the principal means for countryside development. As prime minister, finance minister, and chief technocrat, Cesar Virata presided over this strategy and consistently back-staffed his principal, Ferdinand Marcos, in prioritizing and favoring a productivity-oriented and [economically] efficient path of rural development over an equity-oriented and redistributive justice model.

This is what happened after fourteen years of martial law to the rural areas in the Philippines. In the Philippine and Southeast Asian experiences during the 1960s and the 1970s, the technocratic approach has been identified with developmental authoritarianism and as a response and alternative to movements for social change—in other words, revolutionary movements. This developmentalist approach was launched with the education and training of local experts in American universities who would think the same way as the American experts themselves. Returning home, these Western-educated locals entered government service and established bureaucratic strongholds, thus, building American intellectual hegemony into the economic policy-making of their countries. Joseph Stiglitz says, however, that economic policies are not neutral but illogical. Many of the technocratic proposals that may have worked in developed societies may encounter different socioeconomic contexts in developing countries and, therefore, are bound to fail.

After Marcos was deposed and went into exile after the 1986 popular uprising, Cesar Virata and other martial law technocrats were effectively sidelined by the new government and initially ostracized by many in the business community. But this estrangement, however, did not last long. Virata returned to the private sector and established a management consultancy firm and later joined the Yuchengco business conglomerate where he became director and corporate vice-chairman

of the Rizal Commercial Banking Corporation (RCBC); chairman and director of the RCBC Realty Corporation, RCBC Forex Traders, RCBC Land, Pacific Fund, and Coastal Road Corporation; and director of the RCBC Savings Bank, RCBC Capital Corporation, Great Life Financial Insurance Corporation, Malayan Insurance Company, and the YGC [Yuchengco Group of Companies] Corporate Services—a lot of corporate titles. But other than these, he also became director of the Manila Electric Company, the Luisita Industrial Park Corporation, Business World Publishing Corporation, AY [Alfonso T. Yuchengco] Foundation, and Bank Card Incorporated. He also served as adviser to the Japan Bank for International Cooperation, Investment and Capital Corporation of the Philippines, Cityland, and Steel Corporation of the Philippines. Now, this typically characterizes what I mentioned earlier about the “revolving door” practiced in the capitalist business firms and government, and it appears to be working well to the advantage of Cesar Virata. In skillfully utilizing this practice, he has apparently succeeded in overcoming the stigma of his unremarkable service during the Marcos years and the martial law period, or has he?

The Philippine martial law experience with the distributive justice program like agrarian reform reveals the severe limitations of the technocratic approach in dealing with real problems of real people. For Mahar Mangahas, the heart of the problem lies in the discomfort that technocrats schooled in traditional economics undergo when faced with equity and social justice concerns. On the other hand, Joseph Stiglitz offers a more direct and succinct prescription, and I quote, “Don’t trust technocrats.”

**AMADO MENDOZA JR.** (PROPESOR, DEPARTAMENTO NG AGHAM PAMPULITIKA, KOLEHIYONG AGHAM PANLIPUNAN AT PILOSOPIYA, UP DILIMAN): I was a political prisoner during the dictatorship, and I helped Judy [Taguiwalo] escape in 1974. It is unfortunate that we do not have speakers from the CBA and [that] Mr. Virata himself declined the invitation to appear in this forum. So, you will have to content yourself with a one-sided panel.

This is not about Mr. Virata alone. Taken in isolation, Mr. Virata’s deeds would seem to be regular and innocent. We have rejected the dictatorship in 1986, and the dictator was not at all powerful. He was not the only power—he needed to go to sleep, for instance. He needed minions, like Mr. Virata. In that sense, Mr. Virata was the chief minion.

And he, in fact, represented the soft side of the dictatorship. Some have forwarded the observation that Mr. Virata was the technocratic “deodorant” of the martial law regime.

I have interviewed Mr. Virata in various occasions as a business reporter covering the finance beat, and I can testify to his *pagiging maginoo*. *Maginoo siya*. He did not mind my favorite tactic for getting a scoop: I would ambush him in the men’s room and ask questions while he was peeing, and he could not escape. But still, he would answer the question. Therefore, I got the scoop because my competitor was female and she could not do what I was doing.

So, what was his role that I remember at that time? This was the phenomenon called “jumbo loans.” Jumbo loans were loans taken out in the name of the republic through the Central Bank for loan lending to local users. Local users did not have the standing to borrow in the international money market and, therefore, the credit of the republic was substituted and put in the international market. And what sweetened the deal was that the republic offered a guarantee. So, if the private, the end user, defaulted on the loan, then the Philippine government would make good [on] the obligation. *Malaki ang naging papel ni Virata bilang minister of finance at eventually, prime minister, para dito sa mga jumbo loans na ito. At ang mga jumbo loans na ito iyong ginamit to finance the Bataan Nuclear Power Plant, which has not yet generated a single megawatt of electricity up to this time.*

One of the advantages of being the last speaker is you just cherry-pick from previous speakers and try to see [what] they have not covered. So, I will raise these points.

Why was the decision made? Why did not we stick to the uncontroversial generic name “College of Business Administration”? Why generate controversy? *Halimbawa, nag-uumpisa nang mag-print ng stationery, etc., pagkatapos dahil sa kontrobersiya, babawiin. Sayang iyong pera.* So, all of these additional transactions costs are, in my opinion, unnecessary and not welcome.

However, as I have told you earlier, it is not just Virata. It is a question of a larger project of revisionism, a larger project of political rehabilitation. And this could be just a trial balloon, so to speak. If Virata is rehabilitated, if Virata becomes honorable, then who else can be dragged up from the cesspool of ignominy, so to speak? And who else but Mr. Marcos himself? I have already heard the BOR’s decision and they were saying: “We are going to honor Mr. Virata because of his service to the country.”

Why stop there? Why not Mr. Marcos? He served the country. He was a war hero. He was a bar topnotcher. Why not name the College of Law, “The Ferdinand Edralin [Marcos] School of Law?” *Huwag nang martial law kasi masyadong specific iyon*. So, indeed, one can put forward the notion that history is opinion. History is a class of opinions. In this case, apparently, one side was not heard. The side which extolled Mr. Virata was the only side that was given fair reading. And it creates a problem because it is a done deal. The BOR [has] already named it as the Virata School of Business. *Naghahabol lang tayo. Ano ngayon ang gagawin natin?* What are we to do? Should we now petition the BOR to reconsider their decision? The other is, can we reach out to the stakeholders, including students, including alumni, regarding the decision? How do we do so?

We have the classic collective action problem *kasi si dean, mayroon na siyang captive audience, samantalang tayo*, we have to reach out to a dispersed audience to come up with some critical mass that will offer a contrary opinion. I think, as a political scientist, I am interested not only in the history but in the question: “*Ano ang gagawin natin?*” *Kasi nandiyan na iyong desisyon*. Shall we just accept it because it is already a done deal? Or shall we continue to oppose it? What kind of opposition is going to be necessary so that it is going to be meaningful and it will result in what we want to happen?

Let me get back to this project of historical revisionism and political rehabilitation. I am focusing on the political fortunes of the Marcos family. Up until 2010, none of the Marcoses had ever been rehabilitated on a national basis. What had happened before 2010 [was that] they would be elected in their bailiwicks. So, they have become governors or representatives in Ilocos or in Leyte. But in 1992, for instance, Imelda [Marcos] made the fatal mistake of dividing the pro-Marcos group, because she competed against [Eduardo] “Danding” Cojuangco [Jr.]. If you combined their votes—if one supported the other—then they would have won. So, with Bongbong Marcos as senator in 2010, this was the first instance of rehabilitation of a Marcos on a national scale, and [Bongbong] Marcos is not shy about his intention of running for president in 2016.

Now, in support of this bid for [the] presidency, they have all kinds of efforts, especially in social media, to rewrite history. And the history is being framed as Marcos versus Aquino. It is that narrative which is being framed. So, the narrative is feeding on the dissatisfaction on the sitting Aquino government but it stretches to [former president

Corazon] “Cory” Aquino. For instance, the [Hacienda] Luisita issue. Narratives would say that the Cojuangcos cheated on Luisita because they borrowed money from government on condition that they were supposed to give to the farm workers. They first raised that in 1985 but it did not fly. Those who want to revise history never give up because—I am being presumptuous here; there are so many historians here—I look at history as a continuous offering of opinions. You offer opinions and you see which opinion will be accepted.

What was the narrative in 1986? It was bloodless because Mr. Marcos persuaded his generals not to fire at the crowd. So, he was the hero. He was responsible for the bloodless character of 1986. And then in answer to Nelson [Navarro], what happened to us? Why did we retrogress? The response is, we retrogressed because we removed Marcos. Everything was going fine, but then when Marcos was removed, [we] went down all the way. There is a subtext: democracy is bad. Democracy is messy. Democracy is inefficient. When democracy was restored, we did not have discipline! That is the continuous message. I monitor social media and that is a recurring complaint. They will say: “During the first two years of martial law, we queued to ride in jeepneys and all that stuff. Sidewalks were clean, etc.” And the battle of narratives seems to go on, and it will intensify until 2016 because it is my view that all of this are related to the grand political contest in 2016.

UP is a major battleground for capturing the public imagination, for swaying public opinion. Now, let us assume it is a done deal. Do not look at me with hostility. What I am saying is, we have to be on the lookout for similar attempts to rename programs, rename buildings, etc.

## MALAYANG TALAKAYAN

**CAMAGAY:** [Judy] Taguiwalo showed that] there has been a very clear policy of the university on naming buildings, streets, but not curricular programs. However, she did show that this policy of naming has changed over time that it has reached this point of renaming the CBA [after] a living person, because she did bring out the point that we have a law which prohibits the naming of streets and places, buildings after a living person. I mean, Cesar Virata is very much alive. He is 80 plus years.

Then, we did move on to Nelson Navarro whom I enjoyed listening to also because he is an alumnus of the CBA and he said he did not want to be introduced as [an] alumnus of Cesar Virata School of Business Administration. And I think it was very informative because he talked about UP in the 1960s. So, for the students here, it is interesting to have those nuggets of information about what the university was like at that time.

Then, he was followed by Dr. Tadem who clearly showed to us how Cesar Virata rose as a technocrat and finally becoming the chairman of the Landbank and finance minister of the Marcos administration, proceeding to implement the agrarian reform. And we see the failure of the agrarian reform program of the Marcos administration can be attributed to Cesar Virata.

And lastly, we had Dr. Mendoza asking us to dwell on the issue: Is this step leading us to political revisionism or political rehabilitation? He articulated what the next step [could be] because it has [already] reached the BOR and it was decided that the CBA from now on will be called the Cesar Virata School of Business Administration.

It is really very unfortunate that we do not have anyone representing the CBA to shed light on what inspired them to name the college after this person. It is really very unfortunate but just for your information, from the kit that we got, there seems to have been a process [that was] followed. And it really emanated from the CBA. The dean wrote a letter to the chancellor. [And the dean was very happy that the chancellor approved the request.] But at the end of the letter, [the chancellor] was very clear that there are certain policies involved in the naming of places, buildings, [and] roads in UP, but he had some reservations about naming a program like business administration after a living person. So, I was happy to see that though he transmitted that letter, he also gave his opinion on the matter. So, the floor is now open . . . .

**CAESAR SALOMA** (TSANSELOR, UP DILIMAN): So, *noong nag-request ang CBA dean na i-rename ang kanilang kolehiyo into the Virata School of Business, true challenge po iyon kasi nga po ang mga ganyang bagay—renaming—ay BOR power po iyan.* So, I think, *March iyon dumating sa opisina natin. Marami ring decisions tayong gagawin araw-araw.* It took me a while. So, *ang sulat na nanggaling sa chancellor na nag-accompany—parang normally kasi ina-accompany ko lalo na kung mga bagong desisyon.* It took me a while. *April 11 iyong date ng letter ko kasi bago ito wala tayong precedence dito.* So, *tingnan ko. Una,* I was concerned that, *oo nga, totoo*

*naman na may mga schools and colleges na [ipinangalan sa] famous individuals. Ang concern ko is while mayroon na tayong BOR-approved rules on the naming of buildings, wala pa po tayong set of rules o minimum criteria para magpangalan ng mga kolehiyo. Iba ito sa buildings kasi po ang kolehiyo po ay may mga programs. Ang buildings po kasi puwede namang after twenty-five to thirty years ay mawala. Pero ang kolehiyo, it [stays]; kahit ilipat ang isang kolehiyo from UP Diliman to UP Mindanao. There are issues. So, wala po tayong set of rules doon. Mayroon din pong isyu na may proseso po ang mag-transform tayo ng academic unit from department to college, from department to school. Mayroon na po iyang rules. So, interesting po na issue iyan. Puwede ba na ang isang kolehiyo na i-request niya na i-transform siya back into a department? So, may mga proseso na kailangang sundin. Kasi po ang aking principle ay hindi ko [pa]patagalin ang isang sulat lalo na kung hindi naman po addressed sa akin. Kasi hindi po tama na ilagay mo sa pinakailaliman ng file ng papers dahil ayaw mo. So, from my perspective, mayroon namang services si Mr. Virata ngunit ang aking recommendation is, bago pagdesisyon ng university ang isyung ito ay mag-formulate muna tayo ng set of minimum criteria para mapag-usapan. Kasi nga concern ko, living person is one. But I was also more concerned with the other aspects. Well, nagdesisyon ang board. In-approve na but I would also like—kasi wala namang representative din dito si President Pascual—noong tinanong ko siya, ano po bang nangyari sa recommendation ng Office of the Chancellor? Actually, binanggit niya na dapat din na gumawa tayo ng set of minimum criteria. Paano po ba tayo mag-administrate dito sa UP Diliman? Sa Office of the Chancellor, at least? Naniwala po tayo na rules and processes govern the way we administrate and manage and operate UP Diliman. Because, I think, with the diversity of opinions that we have, it is one of the effective ways that we could ensure, that is, transparency, fairness, and predictability in the way we manage our university.*

**TAGUIWALO:** The staff regent has written that she is a new staff regent. *Iyong nag-approve nito ay outgoing staff regent. They were just surprised bakit biglang bumagsak. No time for consultations. No time to ask questions noong 12 April 2013 [sa] BOR meeting. Ang naging fundamental issue for the students was the question of provisions which are considered anti-poor. Kung hindi ka makabayad ng tuition, [dropped] ka from the roll. Simple as leave of absence. So, iyong naka-agenda ay hindi alam. Usually, the sectoral regents share the agenda with the community and then they ask for opinions. Ito wala sa agenda. Pero*

in the June 20 BOR meeting, the new staff regent, [on] the basis of, you know, the criticisms coming from the public outside the university, raised the point again. And the BOR said, “Okay, prepare your arguments and present them in the next BOR meeting.” So, she is asking for our help in terms of petition signing. The endorsement of the CBA *ay nakakasindak kung titingnan mo. Kung sa usapin ng proseso, na may consultations, well, we should know sixteen years in power si [former] president Roman. So, talagang narito lahat. Who signed? Mahar Mangahas signed, you know (basahin ang appendix 1.2, 286). UP alumni signed including [Romulo] Neri, the infamous Neri of Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo (basahin ang appendix 1.2, 286). But they signed (para sa mga nag-endorso sa pagpapalit ng pangalan, basahin ang appendix 1.2, 279-96). They even had a meeting of the administrative staff and REPS [research, extension, and professional staff] early 2012. So, dumaan sila sa proseso. The problem is, ang point ko, we can still do something about it. At the very least mag-petition tayo that has support from our sectoral regents who are opposed to this kind of historical revisionism.*

My second point is the atomization of the university *na inumpisahan din nila sa panahon nila. What do we mean by atomization? Kanya-kanya na lang tayong buhay. Kanya-kanyang graduation. Iyong College of Law, may graduation ito, which we should also oppose because it is destroying the sense of community that UP Diliman has. We only have two university-wide activities: the Lantern Parade and the graduation. During the time of President Roman and Chancellor [Sergio] Cao, they wanted to have graduation at the unit level, which was strongly opposed happily by majority of the deans. What is this atomization? Buhay namin ito e. Taga-[Business Administration] kami e. So, kami dapat ang makakaalam kung ano dapat ipangalan. Are we like that now in UP? Wala tayong pakialam kung bigla na lang may Sogo Theater dito because the faculty of the College of Arts and Letters has recommended that name? Ganoon na ba tayo? Are we going to be like Ateneo in exchange for money? Iyon ang sinasabi natin. Ateneo and La Salle, okay. Chancellor Saloma, while I appreciate [that] they have a copy of that letter shared by the Office of the Secretary of the University, it was very clear that there should be one requirement. At the very least, sana ho naitanong din na may proseso ba na paano ito, hindi ba? The same questions being raised now. Kasi initially kung titingnan mo ay endorsed [ang] CBA request at pinirmahan ni President Pascual. So, kung BOR ka, biglang*



*binagsak sa iyo itong ganito. Endorsed naman pala ni Chancellor Saloma. Endorsed naman ni President Pascual. So, what is the hassle?*

*Pero the main questions being raised [are]: Ano ang naging papel ni Virata sa panahon ng martial law? Pangalawa, ganito na ba tayo? Kung gusto ng majority ng CBA na magkaroon sila ng sarili nilang school, wala nang pakialam ang ibang mga units? This was not even raised at the university council, not even sa university—2012 pa iyong mga meetings-meetings nila. We never knew about this. Nalaman na lang natin, I think, noong university council meeting to approve graduates na may bago nang pangalan at sa actual graduation.*

So, I think the governance of the university cannot be detached from the political context of the decisions that we are making . . . UP as a constituent university should oppose all kinds of moves to atomize the different academic units and to oppose all moves to commercialize, you know, the naming of buildings, the naming of academic units, which are traditional purview of private universities but not of a public university. Unless we agree now that UP is soon going to be the Ayala-UP.

**NAVARRO:** *Diyan na nga nag-start iyan. I mean, it has ramifications and there are implications. Kung ikaw si Fred Pascual, hindi ka naman mangmang, alam mo naman na isang faction lang ang nag-promote niyan. So, bakit ka magte-take refuge na pinirmahan ng college, pinirmahan ng university council? What it is is a railroad. Ngayon, itong mga taong mga tiwali, gumagamit sila ng proseso. Pahabaan ng pasensya. You know, ganyan ang ginawa ng mga Marcos. Ang gagawin nila is over time, makakalimutan lahat natin iyong ipinaglalaman natin. And I think there is no excuse for them. Iyan, tama iyang sinabi niya na, okay, nandito na ito e. And that is forever. It is already cast in cement. No, there is an appeals process. So, naisahan tayo. Kailangan hindi tayo magpapatuloy na palaging naiisahan tayo. We should manifest our own objection and tell them, “You cannot get away with murder. You cannot get away with railroading and hoodwinking and making sure na mapapagod na lang kami ng kapoprotesta.”*

The spirit of UP is eternal vigilance against people who are the enemies of good, who are enemies of justice, and the enemies of freedom. I mean, *alam mo, kung gusto ninyo, pumunta kayo sa ibang pamahalaan, private, gusto ninyo based on your religion, based on your whatever. But UP is a university of the Philippines. Kaya nga, tinatawag kayong mga isko, iskolar kayo ng bayan. Ang taong bayan is the blood, sweat,*

and tears of this country that enables you to study here. *Hindi lang dahil sa kayo ang pinakamatalino*, you are the best and brightest of your generation but because the best and brightest of this nation have a responsibility. *Tayo ang responsable* to make sure our country will live up to its ideals. *Sino pa? Binigyan tayo ng privilege, unang-una ng panginoon, ng utak. Matalino tayo. Para [sa] ano gagamitin natin itong talino?* And take note, you are heavily subsidized by the Filipino people. So, very obvious *ang inyong responsibilidad*. Okay, *maging magna cum laude kayo, maging bar topnotcher kayo, maging Miss Philippines second runner-up kayo*, I do not really care. But over all, *ang katanungan pa rin: para ano ang lahat na ka-ekekan na ito, ano*, in the end? You know, we all want to measure our lives in relation to, *hindi ba sa bayan natin? At ang bayan natin, hindi isang monumento. Hindi isang mythical creation. Tunay na tao iyan. Iyong si Kristel [Tejada],<sup>9</sup> isang mahirap na nagsisikap dahil sa hindi siya makabayad ng tuition, magli-leave of absence siya*. You know, when you are eighteen years old—I know a lot of you here are seventeen, eighteen—you are very confused, you know, your value system is all under attack, *hindi ba. Maraming nangyayari sa iyo*, like, *may personal ka-iyong hormones mo [are] rampaging all over the place*. And that, on the other hand, *may mga responsibilidad ka, may bayan ka, mayroon kang obligasyon sa mga magulang mo. Sundin mo ang mga magulang mo kasi sila ang nagtutustos sa inyo. Isang bagay iyon. Pero may responsibilidad ka sa university na mag-aral ka, sumunod ka sa academic program*. And then, on top of that, *mayroon ka pang pananagutan sa bayan. Dapat maglingkod ka sa bayan*. And it may look like a pie in the sky, *napakalaki*, pero as you grow older, you will realize that there is a purpose for this. You are privileged. You are very bright people. That is why you have an obligation to make sure that the society is put on the right track and that every Filipino must have a chance in life. This is a basic question of truth. It is a basic question of justice, you know? *Huwag na tayong magpaikot-ikot sa mga proseso kasi alam natin*, the road to hell is paved with good intentions. *Si Satanas, hindi ba? Si Lucifer, magandang, poring lalaki si Lucifer. Inakala niya na siya na ang Diyos. Kasi napakapogi niya at napakatalino niya, akala niya kayang-kaya niya na siya na ang magiging Diyos. Dito kasi napakatalino natin dito sa UP. Tayo na lang ang marunong para sa bayan na ito. Kasi in*

---

9. *Nasa unang taon ng Bachelor of Arts in Behavioral Science sa UP Manila si Kristel Tejada nang kitlin niya ang kanyang buhay noong 15 Marso 2013. Pinaniniwalaang ang pangunahing nagbunsod sa kanya sa trahedyang ito ay ang kawalan ng kakayahan ng kanyang pamilya na tustusan ang kanyang pag-aaral sa UP.*

the end, *iyong karunungan natin mayroong responsibilidad. Iyon ang gusto kong sabihin.*

**GALO GLINO III:** *Tanong ko lang po, hindi po kasi natin nabanggit iyong isang side ng isyu regarding iyong renaming ng CBA. Ito po iyong naging justification ni Dean [Ben Paul] Gutierrez. Ang sabi niya kasi, ang renaming daw po ng mga academic units ay isang tradisyon na ginagawa sa US. Tapos ang naging example po niya, ang Harvard daw po mismo, ipinangalan kay George Baker iyong School of Business. At mabuti din po na nabanggit ni Chancellor Saloma na naga-agree po siya. Sabi niya, naga-agree naman po siya na tradisyon nga daw po sa US iyong pagpapangalan ng academic units or academic institutions sa mga tao. Pero po kung may nakabasa sa atin, may panibagong article si Bobi Tiglao (2013) na inilabas kagabi and illuminating on the particular issue. Ang sabi niya, in-email niya iyong Harvard School of Business to clarify and to confirm kung totoo nga po bang George Baker School of Business ang Harvard School of Business. At ang sinabi daw po ng dean ng Harvard School of Business, hindi totoo. Hindi totooong George Baker School of Business iyong sa Harvard. So, Chancellor Saloma, ang tanong ko po, hindi ninyo po ba na-check nang maigi iyong ganitong issue?*

**SALOMA:** *Ang sinabi ko rin, mayroon din namang walang pangalan at kasama doon sa walang pangalan, at kagaya niyan nakasulat, Harvard Business School. Even Stanford yata, wala ring pangalan. So, binanggit ko lang po iyon, ano? So, ang purpose ko po doon is para makita ng presidente at ng BOR natin po na mayroong sumusunod, mayroong hindi. At nasabi ko lang po: “Finally, I also point out that while many business schools are partly named after individuals, donors, organizations, a number have not adopted the said practice such as the Harvard Business School, Yale School of Management, Columbia Business School, [and] Stanford Graduate School of Business.” Binanggit ko po . . . for guidance.*

**NAVARRO:** *Kung ang pangalan ng Harvard whoever, baka sundin din ng Pilipinas. Dapat tinimbang. Kanino ba ipinapangalan itong ating college? Which is more important? You have to hear both sides of the question. Now, I would urge all of you to read the columns of Bobi Tiglao about this particular issue kasi, you know, very few people read Manila Times. Iyan ang pabor kay Virata kasi hindi maririnig iyong-. Naba-blanket nila. By knowing this issue, they get away with it, at magsasawa na lang tayo. Bobi Tiglao was the best business writer of his generation and during martial*

law he really covered Virata. *Alam niya ang lahat ng katarantaduhan ni Virata at kung ano ang ginawa niya para paglingkuran si Marcos hand and foot.* Si Virata was responsible for falsifying the financial position of the Philippines after the [Benigno Simeon] “Ninoy” Aquino [Jr.] [assassination]. *Kasi siyempre, nagtakbuhan lahat iyong mga foreign investors. Bangkarote na iyong gobyerno. Pabagsak na si Marcos. Si Virata—they misrepresented that the Philippines had USD 600 million in its financial reserve.*<sup>10</sup> *Silang dalawa ni [Jaime] Laya. They were found out. That is a very criminal behavior more than anything. Gilting-guilty. Jina-justify niya iyon talagang si Marcos. At alam ninyo ba, basahin ninyo kay Bobi Tiglao, iyong mga naglingkod kay Marcos katulad ni Enrile, ni Ramos, ni Paterno, nagsisi na sila. Tumalikod si Virata up to the very last minute kasi daw, “I owe it to my constituency.” Ay, tuta ka na nga ni Marcos, sino pang constituency mo kung hindi si Marcos? Ang hindi niya alam, iyong exact moment na naninindigan siya para kay Marcos, nage-EDSA na, ini-offer ni Marcos kay Enrile na “You can be the prime minister.”<sup>11</sup> *Pinagtawanan ni Enrile. “Ha? Magiging tuta mo lang? Katulad ni Virata.”* He did not exactly say these words but that was the implication of it. I mean, *itong si Virata, pinindeho na siya nang husto ni Marcos—pasalamat siya ni-reject ni Enrile—hanggang ngayon ba naman!* It was pointed out by Judy [Taguiwalo] *kanina. Isang point pa about Virata, hindi daw siya nagpayaman under Marcos. Wrong! Nagpayaman siya under Marcos.**

---

10. Oktubre 1983 nang maisapubliko ang hindi magtugmang mga numero ng international reserves ng bansa at ang mga maniobra para palobohin ang totooong halaga. Ayon kay Sicut (2014, 505), “. . . the integrity of the Philippine data on international reserves . . . was blown out of proportion, probably unintentionally.” Sa pagtalakay ni Sicut, pinalabas niyang hindi ideya ni Virata ang ganitong maniobra at ang may pangunahing responsibilidad ay ang noon gobernador ng Central Bank na si Jaime Laya (Sicut 2014, 500–08). Para mapanauli ang tiwala ng mga pinagkakautangan noon ng gobyerno ni Marcos sa pangunguna ng International Monetary Fund pinagbitiw si Laya bilang gobernador ng Central Bank. Pero iba ang basa ng kapwa ekonomista ni Sicut na si Emmanuel de Dios (1988, 109–11): “Perhaps the most ambitious and spectacular effort at deception—successfully and only belatedly discovered—was the overstatement of the country’s international reserves though manipulated transactions . . . which existed at least as early as 1982, involved a relatively simple maneuver which Virata termed ‘window dressing.’”

11. Sa pagkakasalaysay ni Enrile (2012, 627) sa talambuhay niya na inedit ni Navarro, ito ang sinabi diumano ni Marcos sa kanya noong 25 Pebrero 1986: “Johnny, I am looking for a graceful way to end the problem. I am thinking of canceling the election and continue with my term until 1987. I intend to serve as honorary president. You will be the head of the government, and you can run it the way you want it. What do you think of that?”

*Alam ninyo ba, kung nanilbihan ka sa gobyerno at tumatanggap ka ng salary, kakaunti lang. Virata had twenty-four directorships in different garment operations, more than Imelda Marcos. He was getting more than PHP 1.5 million every month in 1980 prices. I mean, you know, siyempre yumaman siya. At saka, iyong mga directorship, mga [consultancies], ang [daming] benefits . . . Ikaw ang chief tuta ni Marcos, ikaw ang naga-approve ng lahat ng financial policy, siyempre lahat ng big multinational formations, nagko-consult sa iyo.*

**ESTUDYANTE:** *Gusto ko sanang itanong—kasi sa lahat ng nakakaalam ng doon sa proseso—kaso paalis na yata si sir [Tsanselor Saloma], kung may student representative po na present doon sa pagpro-process noong pagpapangalan sa CBA? At kung wala po, bakit po wala?*

**MARIA ANGELA MANABAT:** *Mula po sa secretariat of the Office of the Student Regent, Krista Melgarejo. Humihingi po siya ng paumanhin at hindi po siya makaka-attend dito dahil mayroon po siyang naka-set na meeting pero nagpadala po siya ng message:*

*Nananawagan tayo sa iba't ibang sektor ng UP lalo na sa mga nasa CBA, na i-register ang hindi pagsang-ayon sa renaming na naganap. Huwag po tayong pumayag na i-rename ang isang disiplina ng UP sa isang taong naging crucial ang papel sa martial law dahil alam nating mabigat ang political implications nito at asahan po ninyong ire-raise ko ang matter na ito sa susunod na BOR meeting.*

**ESTUDYANTE:** *Iyong tanong ko medyo related doon sa kakatanong lang kanina . . . This has something to do with the rich taking over. I mean, I agree with you that we should do something about this but then what will be the implications of this whole issue? Will it stop at just renaming? I mean, is it possible [to change] the name back to something more neutral? Or will it lead to something deeper? Because the chancellor said [there] is no precedent. This is a new problem. So, will there be other things that can happen after this?*

**MENDOZA:** *We thought it is over. This is the struggle with the dictatorship. And to the extent that the struggle continues in the writing and rewriting of history, then it would not have an end. Because the struggle with the dictatorship is a very important part of our life, our contemporary life. Hindi lumilitaw iyong class character ng struggle*

*kasi* multiclass *ang mundo*. Unlike the classic labor versus capital model of struggle, okay?

**TAGUIWALO:** I go beyond the question of the continuance of the anti-dictatorship struggle. It is also a struggle for the soul of the university. Where is this university heading? *Ito na ba ang papupuntahan natin?* Memorializing those who served the dictatorship? *Magkibit-balikat* because it is the CBA [that] just ruled the university for sixteen years? We count that sixteen years. It is a struggle against the continuing attack on UP as a public university adapting practices of corporations and private universities in running and naming the university . . . So, *tagalang tama ka*. In a sense, it is a class struggle because it is a contention between UP in the service of the Filipino people and UP in the service of corporate interests. *At saan tayo tatayo? [Sa] henerasyon namin, ang linaw e. Pero ang henerasyon ngayon, sa panahon ng ideological offensive ng postmodernism, kanya-kanyahan, polusyon na sky-high. Ang general tendency ng mga students ay magkibit-balikat. Hindi naman ako sangkot diyang e.* And that works for [C]BA. *Iyong apathy ng general public ng unibersidad.* And I think that has to be stopped. That has to be stopped. Otherwise, *huwag na tayong magpanggap pa. Pare-pareho na tayo ng iba pang mga unibersidad na pribado. Pera-pera lang ito. Walang paglingkod-lingkod.*

**ESTUDYANTE:** *Masasabi ba natin na hindi tayo magri-reach sa point na ito kung pakikinggan lang natin at pahahalagahan natin ang konsensya ng bayan, ang mga social sciences?*

**CAMAGAY:** Just last sem[ester] *tinatalakay namin iyong Philippine presidents.* There was one student—I was reading the violations of the Marcoses—*nagalit siya sa akin. Sinabi ko, ang point ko kasi, si Imelda ang nagpatayo ng mga bopis centers—iyong Lung [Center of the Philippines], iyong [Philippine] Heart [Center], iyong [National] Kidney [and Transplant Institute]. And sabi niya sa akin, “Ma’am kung ganyan pala ang inyong pananaw, e bakit pa rin ginagamit?” E sabi ko, “Pera ng bayan ang ginamit diyang, hindi pera ni Imelda.”* But it was so indicative that there’s still this generation of students who found nothing wrong [with Marcos]. And I think it is also because their parents, *iyon ang itinuturo. Iyan nabanggit nila, maganda ang palakad noong martial law. Noon may disiplina, may kaayusan. Pero sabi ko, “Naku, this is a generation na ang layo na pero ganoon pa rin ang pananaw.”* So, *medyo naalarna rin ako na bagamat*

*kaming mga nagtuturo ng kasaysayan ay ibig iwasto iyong ganong pananaw ay mayroon pa ring impluwensya ng magulang na umiiral. At malamang mas matimbang iyong ideya ng magulang kesa sa mga propesor nila sa UP. I found that very alarming. I mean, for me, na ganito pa rin pala ang pananaw ng mga bata. So, siguro ang leksiyon diyan ay dapat imulat sa mga estudyante iyong tunay na kalagayan noong martial law kasi naggo-gloss over. Pero kailangan ipagbilin at imulat nga sa mga bata.*

**TADEM:** I think one of the reasons why *mayroon pa ring* historical revisionism *na nangyayari ngayon at saka* the Marcoses have been rehabilitated not just on the local level but also [on] the national level . . . is that the leaderships that came after Marcos did not really perform that well either. And, you know, as pointed out, after Marcos, it was still the same old elite game that took over. And many of those elite families that were sidelined during the martial law period came back with a vengeance and also imposed their own brand of elite governance and leadership both economically as well as politically on the country. So, *parang* it was just exchanging one elite-based leadership for another elite type of leaders. And especially during the ten years of Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo, she made Marcos look good. And many people thought she was even more corrupt than Marcos. Maybe Bobi Tiglao has more explaining to do because he served the Macapagal-Arroyo regime right up to the very end—and even up to now.

**KERBY ALVAREZ:** *Siguro po susundan ko lang iyong usapin ng historical revisionism kasi po kanina nababanggit na pinalilinis ang pangalan ng mga Marcos bilang paghahanda sa bakbakan sa 2016. Siguro, i-bring up din po nating issue na ngayong taon ay pagdiriwang ng ika-150 kaarawan ni Andres Bonifacio. Sa tingin ko po isa itong sampal sa pagdiriwang na ito, isang pagsupalpal sa isang pambansang pagdiriwang na kung saan ang UP pa mismo ay kinilala ang isa sa mga pangunahing sumusuporta sa pagsusulat ng kasaysayang kontra-Bonifacio, which is the Cavite Study Center. Alam po nila iyan. Huwag po nilang itago. So, siguro po magandang ipakita sa mga mag-aaral, lalo na mga freshies, na karamihan sa mga friends ko sa Facebook ay nagsasabing, kung hindi nawala si Marcos, siguro kasing-yaman tayo ng Singapore. Utang na loob! Iyong mga ganoong bagay, huwag tayong magbitaw ng mga ganoong hasty generalizations. Alamin natin. Nandito iyong mga eksperto. Tanungin natin sila. Panahon nila iyon, ka-contemporary sila, bahagi sila noong panahon na ito. Iwasan natin iyong ganoong issue. So, siguro po para sa mas technical at relevant na tanong, regarding po doon sa*

appeal, available *po ba iyan sa mga faculty?* Dr. Taguiwalo, *iyong petition po na ipaiikot sa mga faculty ay ano po iyong magiging proseso?*

**TAGUIWALO:** Actually, *puwede pa nating pagtulongan.* It does not have to be one template, you know. If the Department of History can start their own petition, then well and good. *Kasama ang mga estudyante, gawin natin itong effort ng buong community.* So, I hope *ma-start.* *Wala pa akong nakitang petition na naumpisahan e.* But I think it is important. *Kung magawa ninyo,* the next BOR meeting is on July 25 or 26. So, *puwede po bang asahan mula sa inyo na makagawa ng petition?* We have to submit this before the BOR meeting *sa July 25 or 26.* *Pero mas maganda kung sabay, may online tapos may hard copy.*

**PHOEBE TOLETE:** Reaction *lang po sana doon sa sinabi ni Chancellor Saloma kanina.* *Kasi base ho sa mga narinig ko at sa kanyang mga action tungkol sa isyung ito,* open *po iyong UP administration na mag-rename ng academic program [after] persons pero hindi po ini-specify kung living or dead.* *Ngayon po, kung sakali pong i-uphold po ng BOR ang desisyon tungkol sa isyu na ito, para po sa inyo, ano po iyong magiging acceptable na . . .* Dahil *po ang sabi ng chancellor “minimum set of criteria” sa pag-rename sa isang academic program dito sa loob po ng university?*

**NAVARRO:** You cannot assume that the BOR would just be deaf to the arguments. *Kung tinatanggap ko na iyon e bakit pa tayo nakikipagdaddakan dito? Magpakitang-gilas kayong mga estudyante dito sa Pamantasan ng Pilipinas na nakikita ninyo iyong isyu at klaro sa inyo kung ano ang isyu.* *Kasi kung ipapahayag ninyo iyan ay hindi sila maaaring magbingi-bingihan.* *Puwede lang silang magbingi-bingihan kasi time always favors the oppressors.* *Dedemahin lang kayo hanggang magsawa kayo.* *Ngayon kung hindi mo naiintidihan iyong katotohanan na iyon, talagang palagi silang makakalusot.*

*Itong mga sabi na magaling pa noong panahon ni Marcos, iyan din ang nagsasabi na mas magaling pa noong panahon ng mga pharaohs.* *May kaibigan na nagsabi sa akin, noong panahon ng mga pharaohs, hindi ba, maganda iyong Egypt, everything.* *Kumakanta lang sila.* And then I told him, okay, *maganda kung pharaoh ka, kung pamilya ka ng pharaoh, pero . . . kung slave ka, hindi magaling iyon.* At *karamihan noong panahon ng pharaoh, slaves.* *Nagbubungkal ng bato para gumawa ng pyramid.* *Kapag hindi na kaya, itutulak na lang at lalatiguhin.* *Kapag namatay itutulak na lang sa bangin.* *Ganoon ang mangyayari sa inyo.* *Siyempre oppressive regimes like Mussolini’s, the trains always run on time daw, hindi ba? Iyong mga*



inconveniences *na nakikita na iyan*—. Democracy is really messy. There is a lot of negotiations. There is a lot of consideration for the rights of others. But you have no other choice because they already gave all the brilliance to only one. He distributed intelligence to all of us and we have to negotiate [that] among ourselves. Meaning, that my rights only go so far as I do not infringe on the rights of others, *hindi ba?* It is always more efficient if somebody would just dictate *kasi siya lang ang marunong*. But *si Mussolini ha, hindi totoo* that his trains ran on time. *Pineke nila, pineke nila iyong mga historical records. Maski huli sasabihin nila, sasabihin nila* it ran on time. *E, kapag sinabi mong* it does not run on time you are just like a little boy who said that the emperor has no clothes. *Iyon, ganoon lang iyong nangyayari*. It is the attitude that you have. You have to challenge such [bullshit], you know. The kind of argument that people always resort to when they have ran out of real arguments or they want to evade the real issues. Like, *itong mga [taga-] [C]BA na ito, hindi sila makakasipot dito dahil wala silang masasabi. Ano ang sasabihin nila? Paano nila ipagtatanggol iyong mga polisiyang baluktot? Hindi nila kayang i-defend. Hindi ba sabi ni Ramon Magsaysay, “Can you defend this in Plaza Miranda?”* In other words, *sa harap ng demokrasya. Huwag mong sasabihin na lahat ng mga taong [babatikos] sa iyo, mga komunista iyan, mga gago iyan, mga walang pinag-araan, walang PhD iyan, hindi nag-aral sa Wharton, that is why we can ignore them. No! Can you defend this in Plaza Miranda? Iyan ang attitude ng CBA—elitista. Ang feeling nila, sila lang ang nakakaalam. And it is our responsibility to remind them, “Hoy, hindi lang kayo ang nakakaalam kasi pare-pareho tayong tao. Isa tayong boto, hindi ba? Hindi lang tayo isang boto, isang buhay lang tayong lahat.”*

**TADEM:** *Unang-una, dapat dumaan ito sa university council, go through the process of anything na change, anything na regarding curriculum and other academic matter should go to the university council. Mahabang proseso iyan. Papalitan mo ng pangalan ang isang course, dadaan ka ng ano e—.* It will take several months before it can finally reach the BOR. *Ito, dalawang buwan lang. Kasi iyon nga, they sidestepped the BOR. Iyong pangalawa, dapat magkaroon ng extensive consultation na university-wide. Iyong sinabi ni Dr. Taguiwalo, ang kinonsulta lang nila ay sila-sila. They consulted themselves. Naturally, ang lalabas diyan ay oo, papayag sila. Pero hindi nila kinonsulta the greater UP community. Pangatlo, kung walang mangyayari dito at they will retain the ridiculous name Cesar Virata School of Business, dapat siguro magtayo na lang tayo ng ibang*

School of Business, aside from the School of Business, that will be [the] real School of Business that will be dedicated to the service of the Filipino people. I say this because other universities have such situation. Kyoto University has two Schools of Economics. *Sabay-sabay iyan. Dalawa ang Faculty of Economics ng Kyoto University.* One is devoted to classical neoliberal economics, *iyong isa naman* is more socially and Marxist-oriented, and they sit side by side. They compete with each other. We can do the same here.

**NAVARRO:** For the [C]BA mafia *dito: dedmahin na lang. Kasi kapag dinedma, magsasawa din ang mga aktibista na iyan. Kasi ang pagtingin nila, aktibista lang ang nago-oppose ng ganitong kabalbalan. Hindi po iyon totoo.* You do not have to be an activist. You do not have to be very political. You do not have to be ideological. You just have to have common sense to know that something is very, very wrong and very, very hypocritical about it. *Ngayon*, in one of my blogs about Cesar Virata, *sabi ko*, you should have the decency to refuse an undeserved honor. And the UP officials must oblige [you] on that. But on the other hand, I do not think he has the decency. *Siya nga ang nagpasimuno. Siya nga ang gusto na koronahan siya e. Bakit naman niya babawiin ngayong nakalusot na siya. Hindi ba?* So, I think we have to continue. There is the appeal process. *Mayroong staff regent, mayroong at least isa tayong student regent who will make sure na hindi nila puwedeng dedmahin ito sa susunod na BOR meeting. You should go there, maski doon sa labas, to remind the BOR and other members, “Hoy, huwag ninyong ilibing, huwag ninyong ibaon sa mga ibang extra business o processes, etc., itong isyu na ito kasi importante.” At sabi ko rin, sige, mas gusto ko pa nga na Virata and the College of Business. They dig their hell into this because it will be a perpetual reminder to us na iniinsulto tayo araw-araw at pinababayaan natin na duraan ang ating pagmumukha, ang karangalan ng ating bayan. Hindi ito maaari.* It is a kind of struggle. It sticks out like a sore thumb, *hindi ba? Maaaring ngayon, sige, nakalimutan na natin kasi we have let off steam already. Naka-blah-blah na tayo nang husto. Pero bukas paggising mo, nandiyan pa rin e. Next month, nandiyan pa rin iyan.* It is a perpetual reminder *na bakit ba ang pangalan niyan Cesar Virata? Kasi tuta iyan ni Marcos na hanggang ngayong nag-survive at pinayagan nating mag-survive. Ganito na lang ba tayo? I think the onus is on us. Sila, wala silang dapat gawin. Dededmahin lang nila kasi na-railroad na nila. Nagawa na nila lahat. Sila na ang nakaluklok. Why fix it? It is not broke. Why fix it? Nandoon ang attitude nila. Kaya ang iniisip ko talaga, pahabaaan ito ng pasensya e.*

**ESTUDYANTE:** *Ang tanong ko po dito ay may pag-asa pa po ba ang Pilipinas para magbago? Kung mayroon pa po ba tayong natitirang pag-asa, paano natin ito makakamit? Kailan, saan, at sino iyong gagawa ng pagbabago sa bansang ito?*

**NAVARRO:** I think it is the attitude. If your attitude is *palaging may pag-asa pa ba?* Of course, the answer should be *palaging may pag-asa*. *Kasi kung wala tayong pag-asa, bakit hindi pa tayo magpatiwakal lahat?* End it all. End the suffering. If the whole purpose of life is just to suffer all these stupidities and all these injustices, what is the point of living, *hindi ba?* The attitude that there is always hope because you will always fight for what is right, what is the good for our people. *Iyan ang sinabi ni Jesus Christ, hindi ba? May pag-asa ang mundo, ang mundong makasalanan. Si Kristo, for forty days and forty nights talagang binola-bola siya ng demonyo. Bumigay ba siya? Hindi siya bumigay. Ganoon din tayo. Kung bibigay tayo, well, talagang wala nang pag-asa. Pero habang hindi tayo bumibigay at hindi tayo sumu-surrender, may laban pa.* I do not want to make it so bleak but it is an attitude. If your attitude is defeatist, there is nothing that would save you. But if your attitude is [optimistic], you will discover the strength day by day to fight for it. *Hindi ba in the days of the Marcos dictatorship, sino bang maga-aakalang hindi forever iyang mga Marcos na iyan? Pagkatapos ni Marcos, nandiyan si Imelda. Pagkatapos ni Imelda, nandiyan si Bongbong. Pagkatapos ni Bongbong, nandiyan si Borgy! Lahat natatapos. Lahat may katapusan. Dapat iyon ang ating itanim sa sarili. Kasi sinong magsisimula? E di ikaw! Bakit hindi ikaw?* It should start with you. *Alam mo iyong optimism in the struggle is infectious. Kapag nakikita mong hindi ka nag-iisa or naniniwala kang hindi ka nag-iisa, may laban ka. Pero kapag naniniwala ka na ako lang yata, then it is a reason already, botaks na tayong lahat, hindi ba?*

**ESTUDYANTE:** I am Eldrin and I am an alumnus of CBA. First, I appreciate this. This is an information dissemination venue for us. I myself, I am torn between graduating from the college and at the same time, I am not really from the Marcos era. So, at least we are informed about this kind of renaming. Actually, we [came to] know this *na lang* after we graduated. So, as to my question, as an alumnus, what is in it for us? First, the renaming of the edifice. The second one, what can we do? And the third one is how can I leverage this? For example, a

movement. How can I convince my co-alumni [who were not even born yet] during the Marcos era?

**CAMAGAY:** *May mga nabanggit na puwedeng mag-petition. Siguro iyong mga ka-[batch] mo ay puwede mo silang i-[mobilize] at mag-petition na iurong, kung maaari, ng BOR ang kanyang desisyon hinggil sa pagpapangalan ng iyong kolehiyo. Kasi hindi lang edifice, ito ay programa ng college. Talagang bagong-bago ito. It is a school. Biruin mo, Virata School of Business Administration. So, malaki ang repercussion nito sa inyong kolehiyo. So, siguro ay puwede mo silang kalampagin, magpetisyon na kung puwede ngang iurong itong desisyon na ito. Medyo napi-pick-up na rin sa mga kolumnista na gaya ni G. Navarro—nabanggit niya ito. So, I think if there is a ground swell na talagang nakikita na medyo may pagkakamali dito sa desisyon ng BOR ay pakikinggan. So, talagang dapat ay lahat ng sektor—alumni, kasalukuyan na students—kasi palagay ko, itong estudyante nga they have to sign. Kasi, you know, they were approached by the dean. Their hands were tied. But if this information about the real persona of Virata and iyong proseso also—kasi hindi lang iyong persona, pati proseso na dinaanan ay may pagkakamali o flawed—then, all these things can be a basis for, you know, a change of heart on the part of the BOR.*

So, I think on that note, I would really like to thank the students who have stayed on up to this time. And I would like also [to take] the opportunity to thank our panel, Mr. Nelson Navarro, alumnus mismo ng kolehiyo, si Dr. Mendoza, si Dr. Taguiwalo, naging biktima ng rehimeng Marcos, at si Dr. [Tadem], nakulong din—the survivors. So, nagpapasalamat kami. Ikinalulungkot namin na [walang kinatawan] ang kolehiyo ng Business Ad[ministrat]ion. Iyong mga lumagda, iyong dean mismo, si President Roman na faculty ay hindi rin napaunlakan ang Third World Studies Center na dumalo sa forum na ito. So, sa puntong ito ay ibig kong pasalamat kayong lahat na dumalo. Sana namulat kayo sa tunay na pagkatao ni Cesar Virata at namulat din kayo doon sa proseso—na maling proseso—na dinaanan ng pagpapangalan ng kolehiyong ito. So, sa puntong ito, maraming salamat at magandang tanghali sa ating lahat. ❀

## MGA SANGGUNIAN

- Cabrera, Eric. 2013. "What's in a Name?" *God Knows Huday Not Payola* (blog). June 18. <https://lupitnicabring.wordpress.com/2013/06/18/whats-in-a-name/#more-1072>.
- Churchill, Bernardita Reyes. 1985. "Palma's Momentous Decade (1923-1933)." In *University of the Philippines: The First 75 Years (1908-1983)*, edited by Oscar M. Alfonso, 157-200. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.

- David, Randolph. 2013. "What's in a name?" Public Lives, *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, June 19. <http://opinion.inquirer.net/54917/whats-in-a-name#ixzz3mXjvhH5F>.
- de Dios, Emmanuel S. 1988. "The Erosion of the Dictatorship." In *Dictatorship and Revolution: Roots of People's Power*, edited by Aurora Javate-de Dios, Petronilo Bn. Daroy, and Lorna Kalaw-Tirol, 70-131. Metro Manila: Conspectus.
- de la Cerna, Madrileña. 2017. "A Taste of Fake News." *Cebu Daily News*, 17 September. <http://cebudailynews.inquirer.net/147322/taste-fake-news>.
- Enrile, Juan Ponce. 2012. *A Memoir*. Edited by Nelson A. Navarro. Quezon City: ABS-CBN Publishing, Inc.
- Hayami, Yujiro, Maria Agnes R. Quisumbing, and Lourdes S. Adriano. 1990. *Toward an Alternative Land Reform Paradigm: A Philippine Perspective*. Quezon City: Ateneo University Press.
- Katayama, Yutaka, Cayetano W. Paderanga Jr., Teresa S. Encarnacion Tadem, and Temario C. Rivera, eds. 2010. "Edited Proceedings of the Workshop on Economic Policymaking and the Philippine Development Experience, 1960-1985." In *Kasarinlan: Philippine Journal of Third World Studies*, supplement, 25 (1-2): 1-35.
- Lazaro, Guillermo R. 1985. "Gonzalez as an Adamant Visionary (1939-1943, 1945-51): The University Resurrected from the Ashes of War." In *University of the Philippines: The First 75 Years (1908-1983)*, edited by Oscar M. Alfonso, 261-93. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- Philippine Daily Inquirer*. 2013. "Historical Revisionism," Editorial. June 14. <http://opinion.inquirer.net/54599/historical-revisionism#ixzz3n0AMzyoK>.
- Pulmano, Eugenio. 2013. "UP, CBA, and Cesar Virata." *Philippine Daily Inquirer*, June 25. <http://opinion.inquirer.net/55299/up-cba-and-cesar-virata#ixzz3mXgIcLvW>.
- Sicat, Gerardo P. 2014. *Cesar Virata: Life and Times; Through Four Decades of Philippine Economic History*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- Tadem, Eduardo C. 2015. "Technocracy and the Peasantry: Martial Law Development Paradigms and Philippine Agrarian Reform." *Journal of Contemporary Asia* 45 (3): 394-418. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00472336.2014.983538>.
- Taguiwalo, Judy. 2010. "The Diminishing Public Character of the University of the Philippines: Some Thoughts of an Alumna of Class 1970 on UP as the National University." Speech delivered at the 2010 UP Alumni Council Meeting, Bahay ng Alumni, University of the Philippines Diliman, June 25.
- Tiglaio, Rigoberto D. 2013. "UP Dean Lies to Honor Virata." *The Manila Times*, June 06. <http://www.manilatimes.net/up-dean-lies-to-honor-virata/7568/>.
- University of the Philippines Gazette*. 2009a. "Proposals on the Naming of the New Asian Center Facilities to be Donated by Toyota Motor Philippines to the University." 40, 3 (July-September 2009): 51-52. <http://osu.up.edu.ph/2009/08/1248>.
- . 2009b. "UP Naming Rights Policy." 40, 3 (July-September 2009): 56-59. <http://osu.up.edu.ph/2009/08/1248>.

