



PROCEEDINGS
Third World Studies Center
Fortieth Anniversary: Directors' Forum

9-10 FEBRUARY 2017
GT-TOYOTA ASIAN CENTER AUDITORIUM
UNIVERSITY OF THE PHILIPPINES
DILIMAN, QUEZON CITY

This plenary panel, comprised of former and current Third World Studies Center (TWSC) directors, is an occasion to revisit the research agenda and engagements of TWSC in the past forty years, on how it has contributed to the growth of critical scholarship on the Philippines and the Third World. It is also a discussion on how TWSC can further enrich social science inquiries in the Philippines.

RANDOLF “RANDY” DAVID (FOUNDING DIRECTOR, TWSC, 1977-1992): TWSC has survived these last 40 years. It’s all led by women. First of all, I really want to express my gratitude and appreciation to the Third World Studies Center’s present director, Dr. Ricardo Jose and the center’s tireless team for putting together this incredible gathering of foreign and Filipino scholars to mark another milestone in the life of this institution in which I spent a good part of my academic life—fifteen years to be exact.

The Third World Studies program was formally launched at a small colloquium during the first year of Dr. Francisco “Dodong” Nemenzo Jr.’s deanship of the College of Arts and Sciences. The year was 1977 and the so-called New Society of Ferdinand Marcos was five years old. Life under martial law had just begun to normalize. The regime was feeling somewhat more confident in its grip over the country’s political system. Opposition politicians, critical journalists, activist professors and students who had been arrested at the onset of the dictatorship were being released from prison in trickles to

demonstrate the return to political normalcy. There was also some relaxation in the travel ban and professors were gradually being allowed to attend conferences abroad after undergoing what we used to call ideological inoculation under the President's Center for Advanced Studies, which used to be housed in this center [Asian Center].

Dodong himself, the new dean, had just been released from prison, and to that colloquium, we had invited four principal guests to its auspicious founding event—all of them dead now—namely: former Senator Jose “Pepe” Diokno, Maris’s father, also newly released from prison; the writer Renato Constantino, my father in-law, who had just been freed from extended house arrest; the economist Alejandro “Ding” Lichauco; and the writer-diplomat SP Lopez, the immediate past president of the University of the Philippines, who had been replaced by Dr. Onofre “OD” Corpuz. There were no prepared papers nor lectures. The purpose of that quiet gathering was to get the views of the guests and of the small audience of UP faculty on what they thought should be the main concerns of this new program, and what initiatives it might launch, mindful of the restrictive political atmosphere in which the university was still operating.

We thought that the nomenclature “Third World Studies” sounded safe and broad enough to encompass issues that were important to us but would not directly put us in confrontation with the Marcos regime. The concept also conjured a vision of a world divided between two opposing ideological camps—one capitalist and the other socialist—and a third, residual group of newly sprung nation-states that were being pulled toward one side or the other. The term also enjoyed currency in mainstream media, not least because the number of strongmen from Asia, Africa, and Latin America were vying for leadership of this third camp. From Southeast Asia, for example, there were Singapore’s Lee Kuan Yew, Malaysia’s Mahathir, and of course, our very own Ferdinand Marcos. From Africa—North Africa—the voice of Libya’s strongman, Muammar Gaddafi, resonated everywhere, promising to use his country’s petrodollars to support liberation struggles against Western imperialism.

“Third World” clearly signified many things to many people. For us, the term perfectly summed up everything we thought was worth inquiring into in order to understand the roots of the country’s most persistent problems, namely: mass poverty, gross social inequality, a stagnant economy, and a profoundly corrupt authoritarian political system. At the same time, the concept also sensitized us to the rapidly changing world environment that framed these questions and problems.

I remember how one of the very first research topics that commanded our attention was the concept of the “export processing zone;” a business model that was already being carried out in countries like South Korea, Taiwan, Singapore, and Malaysia—the rising tiger economies—and which the Marcos regime wanted to test in the Philippines through the establishment of the Bataan Export Processing Zone in Mariveles. Here, foreign companies were invited to set up factories, offered the most lavish tax breaks, and guaranteed an army of cheap and docile workers. We looked into this model, its pernicious effects on labor rights and working conditions, on the living conditions of the displaced communities, on the environment, and on the national economy as a whole. And we came to the conclusion that these export processing platforms, which were engaged not in the manufacture of finished products, but rather, in the intermediate processing of components for re-export, could not possibly contribute to the development of an industrial economy. But four years later, to our surprise, the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences in Beijing invited us to a conference on export processing zones. China was obviously fishing for lessons from the experiences of other countries. By 1982, China began building massive export platforms, which became the backbone of its program of rapid economic growth—in effect, really pulling the rug from underneath the radical Maoist movement, which was operating in the Philippines. Export platforms became the key to accelerated technology transfer, access to capital, to markets, and a way of mobilizing a large army of workers who were streaming into China’s cities. The Chinese, obviously, saw something that was happening in the world economy, which we could only catch a glimpse of—a small glimpse of—and they acted with lightning speed to seize the opportunity and on a scale no other country could match.

We saw this unfolding phenomenon, signified by export processing zones in the mid-1970s, and called it by the awkward term “transnationalization.” From this standpoint of our unyielding vision of nationalist industrialization, we could only regard it as a threat, rather than as something to recognize, prepare for, and possibly seize as an opportunity.

In 1974, the Marcos government began to send Filipino workers to the Middle East and teachers to Nigeria as a show of goodwill, and as a way to earn foreign exchange to pay for our oil imports that had, in the meantime, quadrupled in price. Thus was launched the huge labor export program that has sent millions of Filipino workers and

professionals to employment destinations abroad, and which has grown into the Philippines' largest source of foreign exchange until now. Yet at its inception, labor export in the Philippines was supposed to be no more than a stop-gap measure to tide the country over through a difficult period. By sheer accident, therefore, the Philippines found itself at the birthing of a global labor market that had been made possible by advances in modern travel and communication.

At the Third World Studies Center, it took us almost a decade before we could take notice of this global shift and begin publishing seminal studies on the social and economic impact of the Overseas Contract Worker phenomenon. One would be hard pressed to find a comparable development in Philippine society that can equal the overall impact of the Overseas Filipino Worker (OFW) program on our people's way of life. It is difficult to imagine what other kind of economy can support the countless shopping malls that we find today in nearly every corner of our large cities and towns. Or what sources of income would have permitted the exponential growth of the telecom sector, the banking sector, and the construction industry. One would need to only take a look at the rapid expansion of tertiary schools in the provinces, offering courses in nursing and information technology to understand where a large chunk of OFW remittances has been going. These schools have created the gigantic supply of English-speaking young graduates from whose ranks the emerging business process outsourcing industry (BPO) has been drawing its workers. Today, the BPO industry has gone beyond call centers and has become the second largest foreign exchange earner for the country, next only to OFW remittances.

Clearly, what is upon us is a pattern of social and economic development that has come about largely in response to the contingencies of a global economic system that is far more complex than we could figure out through the prisms of Dependency Theory or the Mode of Production Theory—perspectives which had guided our thinking during the first two decades of the center's existence.

Indeed, there was a time when we had felt compelled to revisit the usefulness of the Third World concept itself in light, not only of the collapse of Eastern European socialism, but of the Soviet Union itself. Perhaps something like a "Center for Global Studies" would have quickly appeased our apprehensions. But there was something in the increasingly popular notion of globalization and modernity that we felt did not quite capture the realities that we face at home: mass poverty,

social exclusion, worsening inequality, the growing populist resentment, and the call for strongmen. A “third world” perspective has had the advantage of keeping us thematically focused on what it means to be consigned to the periphery of world society—even as we try to understand the complex dynamics of a world society that is structurally segmented along modern functional lines, rather than along the old, imperialist spheres of influence.

But at the same time, a world systems view has become a necessary antidote to the nationalist nativism that has, of late, shaped the vision of the growing populist backlash against globalization. It has allowed us to see, for example, climate change as an integral part of our own problems, to identify with the suffering of refugees and migrants across the globe who are being brutalized by the war and tyranny; and to march in solidarity with social movements that are fighting bigotry, fascism, extremism, racism, intolerance, and other forms of oppression in various parts of the world.

We, the observers of our societies and of the world that we share, have a common cause in bringing about a kinder, gentler, more prosperous, more equal, and more democratic world society. But we are also mindful of the fact that our discourses are very much shaped by the events that we seek to analyze, and no less, by the heritage of ideals we have received from the cultures that we inhabit. All these could be a source of many intellectual blind spots. We need to bring the lenses of the various disciplines together in creative interaction so we can minimize the dangers of being trapped in sterile, academic echo chambers.

That, to me, has always been the function of the Third World Studies Center—to serve as an incubator of progressive ideas and a refuge to the dwindling number of irreverent scholars, dissident intellectuals, and social activists, wherever they may come from, and whatever cause they may champion. Thank you.

MARIA SERENA I. DIOKNO (DIRECTOR, TWSC, 1995–2000): My appointment as the Director came at a time, which Randy has described, when some colleagues in the College of Social Sciences and Philosophy were questioning the relevance of the term “third world.” Of course, some found it outdated, given the end of the Cold War, during which the term was born, and the emergence of new conceptual frames that challenged the once dominant Dependency Theory and Center-Periphery frameworks, and so on.

Globalization was rising as the new scheme of things, and so, alternative names to the Third World Studies Center began to be floating, like the “Global Studies Center,” which Randy mentioned, and at one time, I also heard “International Studies.” I also suspect, although I don’t know this for a fact, but I don’t know if there was some perception, underlying the question of the term, that the center, as a member of the college, maybe was not relating enough to the College, either in its activities, or with regard to its faculty. Anyway, nothing came out of this fairly quiet exchange of views. If you know, the College of Social Sciences and Philosophy, having a subdued exchange of views is quite unusual and the name of the Center remained untouched.

The Third World Studies Center has always had a research mandate directed to the problem of development, undevelopment, underdevelopment, and the accompanying problems of poverty, inequity. But during my time—and I don’t know if things have changed, Rico—the center had no research funds, either from the college or from the Diliman campus, so part of my job as director was to find funds. And since none seemed forthcoming from the university, we took the bold step of bidding for a project, which was offered by, okay, we will admit, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). This project, we rather ambitiously called the *Philippine Democracy Agenda*. Now, to be sure, this was ironic and unprecedented on the part of the center, and we thought long and hard about bidding for the USAID project, checking and re-checking the terms of reference, ascertaining without doubt that we had absolute freedom to design and run the project totally on our own without any interference whatsoever from the donor agency, and there was none. Indeed, as it turned out, our biggest challenge was learning to cope with the accounting requirements of the US government. The financial aspect of the project was the unhappiest for me as it also required that the Social Sciences and Philosophy Foundation, the foundation of the college, as the recipient of the agency, was in solid financial form, and at the time, the foundation of the college was in a fledgling condition, and I had the unhappy task of balancing that with the financial requirements of the project. In any case, our project did not receive a single negative comment by the US accounting agency. Believe it or not, I received a closure letter all the way from Washington, saying that the project was successfully closed.

If I have gone into some detail about the financial aspect of the project, it is only because there is a lesson or two to be learned from it: that the center needed—I suppose Rico still needs—secure research funding, preferably from the university, rather than outside it, and that financial management is, unfortunately, a requirement of project management, which cannot be easily be assigned to another because of the liabilities entailed. We all want to retire in peace and mine is coming up in a couple of years.

Our *Philippine Democracy Agenda* was partly a response to the upcoming celebration of the nation's centennial in 1998 and the recognition that the work of nation-building was not yet complete—of course, might it ever be? If Randy's time was about the dictatorship, mine was the era of national construction or reconstruction, depending on your point of view. While popular empowerment was the main theme a decade earlier, we were seeing that the process of democratization, which we had all hoped would be transformative and liberating after we ousted the dictatorship, was not turning out quite so. Hence, we decided to examine three major themes: 1) perspectives of democracy and citizenship in Filipino political culture; 2) Philippine state-civil society relations in policy-making; and 3) the dynamics of and relations within civil society. This was a massive eighteen-month project that resulted in the three-volume work. The third volume was edited by Miriam Coronel-Ferrer, my deputy director at that time; the second volume was edited by our excellent researchers, who unfortunately, have since left the Third World Studies Center: Marlon Wee and Glenda Lopez—they ended up marrying each other, happily. I worked on the first volume. The books resulted from three major conferences, Baguio, Davao, and Cebu; in which the total of some 140 persons took part. We made every effort to invite participants from different segments of Filipino society, certainly more non-academics than academics took part, and I recall that some of the discussions were quite contentious, exactly the stuff that makes social sciences attractive and worthwhile. Our argument then, which I think remains relevant today, is that civil society is the main arena of our democratic undertaking, both as the author of democratic ideas and approaches, and as the actor in the transformation of these ideas and strategies into action.

Looking back at the action agenda that resulted from the project, much remains to be done, and here's another lesson to be learned: we academics can excel at crafting social agenda, but giving life to the

agenda is not only the province of the university, and perhaps, this is the point I wish to end with this morning. As we review the life of the center, we find ourselves thinking again about our present, dim as it seems, and our future. The historian in me seeks to understand why things happen the way they did and the backstory, the silenced narratives that help us understand the picture better. But understanding isn't enough, not in the times we live in. What the Third World Studies Center has always represented to me is that artful combination of research and advocacy without sacrificing one or the other, and the courage, equally an act of intellect and of citizenship, to state and advance its positions on oftentimes controversial issues. Francisco Nemenzo Jr., the founder of the Third World Studies Center, once said that it was, I quote, "a refuge for radical academics," end quote. I still recall the history modules of the center that we worked on—I was a starting instructor then; Randy was the director—and offered seminars to young people and the numerous talks that the center organized in the height of martial law. The center is no longer a refuge today, but we still need a center that is unafraid to take positions it can defend, not with alternative facts, but with solid evidence, and following the intellectual standards of critical thought. Above all, we need to reach out to the public outside the academic world, a public that is prepared to question our ways and challenge our most basic beliefs in a technologically-driven arena.

Today's new themes, like populist authoritarianism, are concerns we share not only with developing countries, but interestingly enough, with the most developed ones, so we have now reached the stage where we can welcome the almighty West to the Third World. Thank you.

MIRIAM CORONEL-FERRER (DIRECTOR, TWSC, 2000–2004): When I joined the Third World Studies Center, by the time of 2000, Maris left. Some of the achievements under Maris's leadership were in the domains of social movements, cause-oriented groups, the language of democratization, civil society, etc. But the discourses were already shifting by that time. These shifts included from socialism and capitalism to social capital, but not yet social media; from anti-imperialism to globalization; and many of our works at that time tried to weave together these things. We came up with books that looked at globalization and civil society discourses at the local level. We had summer courses and certificate courses on globalization, human security, and a joint ASEAN university network and Korean Association

of Southeast Asian Studies conference on regional cooperation and identity-building in East Asia and the age of post-Cold War globalization. Was this shift in language a de-radicalization, or, you know, from very tough social movement/civil society anti-imperialism discourse to globalization? Did it signify a de-radicalization or a sign of the changing times that reflect the weaknesses or the incompleteness of the previous languages of discourse? I think Randy alluded a little bit to the latter in his speech. So that's why, at that time, we already knew we needed to come up with a new edition of the Third World Studies language book. It's a 1990 book called the *Political Dictionary for Community Organizers*. It's a dictionary where all the current terms at that time were defined, but the terms were, indeed, changing. However, we never managed to do that, and it's not too late to produce one now.

So from there, our *Kasarinlan* themes also addressed the key themes of that time. We had a theme devoted to economies influx, indigenous peoples, gender and sexuality, arms and militaries, environment, information technology—IT was a big, new thing—and the world after 9/11. Of course, 9/11, at the turn of the century, was one major event. Terrorism was the all-new discourse, the global war on terrorism. It marked the new epoch in ways different from the guerrilla-based insurgencies that marked the cold war period too. In new methodologies, dichotomies were highlighted. So what did we do in the light of these developments? We organized several conferences. There was a conference co-organized with the Iraq Solidarity Campaign Philippines. Even a sit-in conference at the Palma Hall lobby to protest the war that was going on at that time that followed 9/11, just like in the old days, you know, discussing the new international developments that were taking place. *Our Policy Dialogue Series* or *Academe Meets the Government* also reflected key current issues in Philippine politics. In 2001, 2002, we had forums like *Bayan Ko* after 9/11 with then Vice-President Teofisto Guingona speaking. Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo's program for the poor, EDSA 3 and beyond, remember? We had EDSA 2 and then we had EDSA 3; crime and punishment on the plunder of Joseph Estrada. We had Ruben Carranza, then with the PCGG, Department of Justice officials, and several other members of the UP faculty. So we can see that these were the themes, and beyond forums, we also staged our protests.

The Third World Studies Center at that time became some kind of a hub for mobilizing the university or what eventually became EDSA 2. We even did a paid ad and we had a very important paragraph in our

paid ad. I can't remember the acronym now, but it was a nice acronym that we used to bring closer UP in the developments to oust Estrada. One paragraph in that paid ad said, "To Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo, in a sense, we are recognizing you as the successor because constitutionally, you are the one allowed to assume the presidency, but you must make sure that you will take good care of this," and we know what happened afterwards. But at least, we warned everyone in our paid ad. We were not blind to the possible consequence at that time.

Other issues were issues of foreign peace to the country, then and now, still on top of the national agenda. Remember after 9/11, the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP) and Jose Maria Sison were listed in the US list of terrorists; and the late Angelo Reyes, then defense secretary of Macapagal-Arroyo, waged a war on the Moro Islamic Liberation Front, breaking the ceasefire. So we did participate in the all-out peace campaign at that time, together with the peace networks that I was also linked with outside and protesting some of these policies.

Okay, so in the region, our guest lecturers from around the world included people who represented key events of that period. We had Emilia Pires of East Timor. Remember, the violence that happened in East Timor, eventually East Timor becoming independent and we did do something on Burma's role in democracy with exiled Burmese scholars coming in to speak at the university. But let me move now to some of the other themes, we held roundtable discussions with our international fellows. Yes, of course, let's not forget, because I saw some of them today. At that time, we had a lot of Japanese fellows, but again, at the turn of the century, we were already transiting to having more Koreans and some Europeans and North Americans, but maybe very soon, we'll have a lot of Chinese, let's see. Yeah, why not? But let me acknowledge some of them. One of our fellows who did very good work. Actually, she lived in a Muslim community in Tandang Sora. Her very strict professor required her to live and stay with a professor to do work on the diaspora, the Muslim communities in different parts of Manila, at that time, a very, very new and pioneering study.

Now, a lot of these issues at the turn of the 20th century are still with us, perhaps for the worse, as the data on armed conflict, for instance, show, the second decade of the 21st century has actually brought on more wars. As the rise of state and non-state, to quote Alfred McCoy earlier, "demagogues in their violent rhetoric" have risen, have come to the fore, but I added non-state because demagogues

are also found outside the sphere of the state. The language of organizing, of course, we find newer terms, like “fake news,” “alternative facts,” “drug wars,” new protest forms, like the mannequin challenge, post-it, instead of *Operation Pinta* or *Operation Dikit*. You know, post-it, you post your slogan on the toilet, just using a post-it, go around, very innovative. Nevertheless, the key tools remain the same for us: critical analysis; vibrant discourse; cohesive and comprehensive synthesis; good, thorough research. Do we need to change our name? What’s in a name? Anyway, three’s a good number.

The work with students among intellectuals remain our key arena. Mobilizations in key moments, I think, the Third World Studies Center was there. In all of these key moments. And, in any case, they do come quite often here in the Philippines because as we know, Philippine politics is forever a period of interesting times. So I think I will end here and thank you all for this opportunity to see you all again.

TERESA S. ENCARNACION TADEM (DIRECTOR, TWSC, 2004–2010): Good morning to everyone. First of all, I would like to congratulate Third World Studies Center director Dr. Rico Jose in organizing this conference to celebrate TWSC’s 40th anniversary. There is, indeed, a cause for celebration because through its four decades of existence, the center has served as a research hub, not only locally, but also internationally. It is, therefore, of relevance to revisit the research agenda and engagements of the center as the members of this plenary panel were requested to do by Dr. Jose, and to examine how the TWSC has contributed to the growth of critical scholarship in the Philippines and the third world. More importantly, how it can further enrich social science inquiries in the country. My comments will come mainly from my experience and my involvement in the TWSC as a research assistant when I joined it in 1982 when Randy was the director, and its deputy director from 1987 to 1990, and later on, as its director from 2003 to 2012—fourteen years, one year short of Randy’s.

In the 1980s, the TWSC was the pioneer in pursuing research in several social science arenas, among which were the following: one was on political economy studies. Foremost of this was the center’s cutting-edge research on the political economy of Mindanao, with focus on multinational corporations and their local counterparts’ involvement in agri-business. The TWSC also embarked on a three-year Southeast

Asian regional project on transnationalization, the state, and the people, the first part of which was in 1984, and the second part in 1985. Funded by the United Nations' University or UNU, it was a regional undertaking, which included academic activists from other progressive institutions in Malaysia, Indonesia, Thailand, and Singapore. I would consider this as a precursor to studies on globalization, as it examines the country's integration into the world capitalist system and what has been its impact, not only economically, but also politically and socio-culturally.

There was always the search for alternative development and political strategies for social transformation. The UNU research project was also a study of authoritarianism in the Southeast Asian region. For the Philippine case study, it examined the Ferdinand Marcos regime, the role of the military, Philippine technocracy, among others. It looked into the people's movements, and the problems of the struggle against the dictator and the end of foreign domination.

A third important area of study, which the TWSC embarked on, was the Philippine Left movement, primarily the CPP-New People's Army-National Democratic Front (CPP-NPA-NDF), as well as independent Left formations. The center was at the forefront of publishing debates, which were going on in the Left movement, producing two trailblazing volumes on Marxism in the Philippines. The first came out in 1984 and looked into the relevance of Marxist theory in examining the Philippine political economy and the various stages of the Philippine revolution. The second one, which came out in 1988, touched on the debates, which emerged in the Left movement at the crossroads with the end of authoritarian rule.

As for TWSC's contribution to the growth of critical research, Ricardo Reyes, former secretary-general of the CPP executive committee, in an interview I had with him last year, expressed that the TWSC played a crucial role in providing a venue through its lecture discussions, forums, and publications, among others, of the debates, which were going on in the party, as this could not be expressed within the CPP. The significance of the studies of the TWSC can also be attested by the following: one, the very well-attended Marxism lecture series, which fed into these two book volumes; second, TWSC publications attracted a vast number of progressive scholars, both local and foreign, who either formally affiliated with the center, or unofficially took part in its activities; thirdly, it developed a community of scholar activists from UP Diliman, UP Manila, Ateneo, other academic institutions,

and research NGOs, who proudly bore the title of TWSC fellows, and whose works were also published by the center; fourthly, the TWSC established a pioneering library that became an important resource for progressive and Left-wing works, and utilized extensively by faculty, students, and NGOs; and fifthly, the center's materials are being used in courses taught in the social sciences and in training programs by NGO practitioners.

TWSC's contribution to the growth of critical research can also be attributed to its engagement with government officials, an example of this was the center's *Academe Meets Government* series, which was launched in the advent of the 1986 People Power Revolution. The series, which was the first of its kind, invited cabinet secretaries of the Corazon Aquino administration to dialogue with academics and key players in civil society. The proceedings of these forums were published in *Kasarinlan: The Philippine Journal of Third World Studies*. The series provided the template, which the university pursued with the succeeding administrations. These major concerns of the TWSC, when I joined, continued to be primary issues, which are now problematized under the context of the challenges to the democratization process under oligarchical rule. More than a decade later, as the center's director, we continued to see the importance of political economy research as exemplified in globalization and social movement studies. The center has come out with a UN Development Programme-funded project, "People, Profit, and Politics: State, Civil Society, Religious in the Context of Globalization" and the UN Research Institute for Social Development-funded "Localizing and Transnationalizing Contentious Politics, Global Civil Society Movements in the Philippines," a joint project with counterparts in Senegal, Argentina, and Bolivia, and this came out as an international publication of the TWSC staff. Thanks to a grant from the Southeast Asian Studies Regional Exchange Program (SEASREP), the center embarked on its research on the impact of globalization on local communities, comparing the Philippine entire experiences, the case studies of which were published in the *Philippine Political Science Journal*.

Democratization studies, in general, and the part of social movements in this process remain to be of importance, particularly in problematizing the role during the post-martial law period. New dimensions have emerged on the research project on the peace process between the Philippine government with the CPP-NPA-NDF and the Moro National Liberation Front or the MNLF, which were started by

TWSC directors Maris Diokno and Miriam Coronel-Ferrer. The center also came out with *Marxism in the Philippines, Continuing Engagements*, and we issued the two volumes of *Marxism in the Philippines* into one volume, as it continued to examine the concerns and dilemmas confronting the Philippine Left under a new political dispensation. Other new research concerns were on human security and reviving memories of the martial law regime, as in the “Mendiola Narratives,” and the research project on an oral history of the Marcos technocrats, a collaborative project with Japanese colleagues.

Much of the relevance of the writings of the TWSC, as well as its publications it has come out with, I believe, has much to do with the center’s role as an activist, and how it provided a place for progressive scholars coming from a wide-depth ideological spectrum a venue where their views and ideas could be articulated and debated. This, for me, spelled the relevance of social science research in the center. These views and ideas are not just for research’s sake, but towards providing solutions and alternatives to address current and present problems in Philippine society. When I came in to the center in the 1980s, I noted that its vibrancy and relevance was drawn from the comradeship of scholars, public intellectuals, social movement activists, among others, as well as the local and foreign academic activist networks, like the Asian Regional Exchange for New Alternatives or ARENA. During the latter part of the martial law period, the TWSC provided a nursing ground for the formation of various important political formations, like Jose W. Diokno’s *Kaakbay* or the Movement for National Independence and Sovereignty; the Independent Caucus, which later evolved into a socialist formation, *BISIG (Bukhuran sa Ikaunlad ng Sosyalistang Isip at Gawa)*, as well as progressive student organizations as earlier on mentioned by Vice Chancellor Fidel Nemenzo, the Third World Students’ Circle, and the Concerned Students of UP.

After the 1986 People Power Revolution, although there emerged other Left research centers, such as the Institute for Popular Democracy (IPD)—IPD’s previous director Joel Rocamora is here—and Focus on the Global South, the TWSC continues to have the unique role of being a progressive center, which is based in the academe. Furthermore, it is not identified with a particular Left bloc. Much of this can be attributed to its founder, Francisco “Dodong” Nemenzo Jr., when he was dean of the UP College of Arts and Sciences, and its first director, Randy David. Because of this, the TWSC plays the distinctive role of a Left research center, which continues to attract progressive scholars

and networks from all sides of the Left ideological spectrum. It is this community of progressive scholars and activists, of which the TWSC has been part of, which it has developed and continues to be involved with, that make for relevant social science research. Such an engagement has always been and should remain to be critical, and should continually reflect in the center's pursuit of research projects and other engagements. Thank you.

MARIA ELA L. ATIENZA (DIRECTOR, TWSC, 2010–2013): Good morning to all of you. I know I'm standing between your lunch and the end of this plenary panel, but allow me to share some of my ideas and experiences with the Third World Studies Center and I'm very glad to be part of this very important activity of the center.

I can say that my formal engagement with the TWSC started as the deputy director of Tesa in 2007 and when I became the director in 2010. But actually, in 1988, during the semester break of my freshman year, I was convinced by my PolSc 11 instructor by the name of Ms. Teresa Encarnacion, to join the Third World Studies Students' Circle, so I spent my semester break attending a one-week seminar. So, I got oriented with the activities of the Third World Studies Center very early in my UP career, and I have participated in a lot of its activities in different capacities.

Now, let me say something about the period from 2010 to mid-2013, when I was the director of the Third World Studies Center. I was fortunate to arrive at the center at a time when the themes of the center have expanded. At that time, we were already dealing with political economy and globalization, social movements, authoritarianism and democratic governance, peace and human security, culture and identity, and new media and technology, so you can see how the themes of the center have expanded.

Now, for the first major question of the description of this plenary panel, "Has TWSC made contributions to the growth of critical scholarship in the Philippines?" At that time, TWSC, of course, has been driven by the research agenda of the center, as well as the individual research interests of its core team, representing different backgrounds. Earlier, we credited the administrative team of TWSC. I can also say that while directors and deputy directors come and go, what is crucial with the TWSC is the core of the research staff, and I'm very fortunate also that during my time as director, I had a very energetic and young team of researchers, and I think most of them are still here. It's still the core team supporting Dr. Rico Jose.

TWSC has also produced some groundbreaking research in different areas catering to the different groups in the country and elsewhere, and it has also engaged with a diverse set of groups within and outside the country. Research has been guided by different research methodologies. Training, advocacy, and exchanges have linked TWSC with different institutions locally and internationally. We were also reacting to the mood of the times: the growth of social media and advances in ICT; greater opportunities for research dissemination and collaboration here and abroad; more support within UP and outside for research—there were more research funding also from within UP—and worldwide experiments with advocacy and uprisings, such as the Occupy movement and the Arab Spring. There was also growing prominence of new social movements for the environment and combating climate change, LGBT movements, and other identity movements.

During my term as director, you will see diversity in terms of our research interests. We had the “Mendiola: Memory and History of Contested Space,” “Narratives of the Revolution: An Oral History of the Communist Party of the Philippines,” and “Plaza Miranda: History of Violence, Memories, and Pursuits of Truth, Focusing on Narratives and History.” We also ventured into textbook and readings production. We had two volumes of the *Third World Perspectives on Politics*, a series of selected and annotated readings for a number of Political Science courses. We are still working on three other volumes. And, of course, Tesa already mentioned the project “Examining the Impact and Responses to Globalization of Local Communities in the Philippines and Thailand.” We worked with researchers from Chulalongkorn University, and this was also funded by SEASREP, headed by Dr. Maris Diokno. We continued the study on human security by focusing on developing a human security index, so we ventured into index development. We produced a draft and pilot tested it first with five municipalities in Luzon and the Visayas, and then we got a UP Diliman grant to do one pilot testing in one municipality in Mindanao. This was our engagement, not only with UNDP, but also with the Office of the Presidential Adviser on the Peace Process. It also enabled us to work with a number of province-based colleges, universities, and CSOs (Civil Society Organizations), and it was a learning experience for us because on the one hand, we were training them to do research, such as doing surveys, fieldwork, and focus group discussions; but in the process, they brought in a lot of their talents and expertise. Even now, we receive inquiries if certain universities, CSOs, and students can

actually use our questionnaire for their own research. One particular university, PUP in Mulanay, was also successful in mainstreaming human security as a result of our engagement with them, and they have contributed in developing a municipal plan, focusing on human security and involving the contingent of the Philippine Army in Quezon Province. So we looked at that project as an important engagement with local actors.

We also ventured into more research-based projects using UP funds. We have two research projects here: the “UP Diliman Handbook on Academic and Authorial Integrity” and “Dishonesty and Disgrace: A History of the University of the Philippines’ Responses to Alleged Acts of Plagiarism Committed by its Faculty Members.” So it’s a growing interest that we think, as a research center, we also have to address, and we feel that we can help the university actually address this particular problem.

From a comparative perspective, during my term, we were also successful in starting, and it is still an on-going project, the “The Asian Democracy Index.” Through the initiatives of Sungkonghoe University in South Korea, we became part of the Asian Democracy Consortium. The project has since grown to include not just Southeast Asian and Korean examples or case studies, but we have expanded to include South Asia.

And then, of course, you will also see the interest of our research staff with new, innovative projects, such as “Cybersex in the Anti-Development State: Life Histories and Labor Politics” and “Toxic Biopolitics: Tracing Risk Discourses in the Philippine Cosmetics Industry.”

You will also see that in our training and advocacy, we were able to bring in a lot of scholars through the South-South Exchange Programme for Research on the History of Development (SEPHIS) Social Movements in the South Lecture Series. We have speakers from South Africa and also from Egypt.

We were also trying to develop a draft TWSC charter, where I asked every former director to give their inputs to clarify the relationship of the TWSC with the college, and we also want to establish a council of fellows. But I heard that the college has a different appreciation of this, and to this day, the draft TWSC Charter is in limbo.

Let me briefly focus on the question “What can TWSC do to enrich social science inquiries in the Philippines?”.

First, I believe that we should continue contributing to public discourse through our many activities by addressing a lot of pressing issues. These include, of course, remembering the lessons of martial law to counter the authoritarian nostalgia, understanding populism and strongmen, conducting public policy debates on a lot of policy issues, like climate change, the death penalty, fake news, charter change, the war on drugs, etc.

Second, TWSC can do comparative research on the following issues: social movements during populist periods, developing countries' experiences with institutional and constitutional reform, peace processes, human security and disaster issues, and other issues that are relevant not only for the Philippines but other countries as well.

Third, TWSC should continue doing research in local and everyday politics as well as engaging and empowering the local, meaning partner institutes, CSOs, and even local governments.

Fourth, TWSC must continue developing a culture of research and writing in UP, and also spreading the research ethics and knowledge to all our fellow researchers and teachers in the Philippines.

Fifth, engaging government, both at the national and local agencies, and possibly developing policy briefs and situationers based on our research are important extension activities for TWSC.

Sixth, with the implementation of K-12, it's important to engage Grades 11 and 12 teachers with our research outputs, which we have produced in different formats that can be used as study and teaching materials.

And seventh, going back to the failed—should I call it a failed—TWSC charter?, I think in whatever form, it is important to solidify the role of TWSC within the College of Social Sciences and Philosophy and UP as one of the premier social science centers of the university and in the Philippines as a whole where we can provide a space for multidisciplinary, innovative, and groundbreaking research and advocacies for marginalized and alternative perspectives confronting the Philippines and other countries, in search for greater justice, equity, and equality. Thank you very much.

RICARDO T. JOSE (Director, TWSC, 2013–present): Thank you very much, Ela, for that presentation. That brings us up to date. Now, I'd just like to close this session, perhaps, by saying I took over in 2013. Ela just dropped by my room and asked if I could take over, and I had not been very active with the Third World Studies Center up to that

point. I had attended a lot of the lectures, I was also familiar with some of the guests, and all of this, and I think I met Al McCoy in one of the fora in the basement of Palma Hall; but after she saw me, I asked for some time to think about it and then, Tesa also saw me, and then Tesa's husband, too. So all of a sudden, there was a lot of people who were asking me to take over the Third World Studies Center.

I will not summarize what I've done. I have finished one term, three years, and I'm onto my second term now. We've continued many of the programs that they've started. We organized the public lecture series and one of them focused on martial law, because we recognized that the commemorations of martial law were fading fast, and the newer generation—millennials—hardly knew anything about it, and so that is where we started this public lecture series on martial law. And we were surprised at how little the younger generation really knew, and that it was our responsibility to do something about it. That started because of the move of the College of Business Administration to rename themselves into the Virata School of Business Administration. We were the only organization within UP to actually try to question that.

Recently, with the burial of Marcos in the Libingan ng mga Bayani (Heroes Cemetery), we also held a forum on that. Again, one of the only organizations to actually do that. We received a lot of flak from the trolls and it's then that we realized also what trolls were. Our page was taken down within a few hours of our putting the notices out and we realized that this still needs further study: the Internet, social media, and how it is actually being used. People are now talking about the propaganda war being waged in the Internet. That's something we still have to explore, but anyway, as a result of the presentations this morning, I suddenly missed the Faculty Center conference hall, with images of all those conferences that were held there. Intimate discussions, students and faculty meeting each other, and what I observed is that that was an intimate gathering, so I hope we have something like that in the near future. Again, thank you very much for coming. ❀

