PANEL 3

The Academe and Social Movements: Enriching Theory and Practice

RONALD C. MOLMISA

Various civil-society groups have been urging members of the academe to engage in community problem solving and take the lead in the promotion of social justice. As "think-tanks" and "knowledge reservoirs," they are capable of combining ideological work with political initiative. Gramsci's writings recognize the importance of "organic intellectuals" that provide ideological leadership to a given class and sector. Progressive social scientists can be subsumed under this category. These intellectuals articulate and implement the hegemonic project of that class through state apparatuses and the public sphere (Burke 1999). They are the ones who conquer the "traditional intellectuals" who created and uphold an older hegemonic project. Their careers are founded on the three legs of the academic tripod of teaching, research, and social action, with a view of fixing social ills and transforming the systems that generate them.

There are reasons why academics are central to the effective operations of civil-society organizations (CSOs) (Martin 1984). First, they are more cognizant of social issues and more socially skilled than other groups in society. They can easily recognize public concerns mainly because of their insatiable thirst for knowledge

and unending quest for solutions. Second, they are trained and experienced in social criticism. Hence, they can engage state actors in intelligent debates and discourse with a view of addressing the real roots of social problems. They have immense opportunities to influence public policy by convincing those in power to advocate for and/or act on their proposals. Third, they enjoy the benefits of "academic freedom" that provides a platform for unfettered creative thinking and bold policy experimentation. They are independent of particular commitments that can stall their initiatives. Fourth and last, academics have a self-reflective and self-correcting character. Since they constantly examine their ideas and actions, they can ascertain their effectiveness in achieving social goals.

This integrative essay attempts to describe the involvement of academic activists in the emergence, development, and outcomes of civil-society organizations used as cases studies for the UNRISD-sponsored and Third World Studies Center-led research on local-international dynamics of social movements in the Philippines (international trade rules, fair trade, debt relief, anti-corruption, and the Tobin tax). This essay is organized in three interrelated sections. The first section explores the involvement of academics in the activities and campaigns of local social movements. This is followed by a characterization of the relationship between the two vis-à-vis their engagement with state actors and institutions. The concluding section offers some prospects for strengthening the relationship between them.

WHEN ACADEMICS GET INVOLVED

Along with the business sector, the academic community, and a range of social actors constitute a critical mass of groups opposing neoliberal globalization in the country. The academic community has been instrumental in the formation of three major coalitions in the country: Freedom from Debt Coalition (FDC) (on debt relief), Stop the New Round Coalition (on international trade), and 3) Transparency and Accountability Network (TAN) (on anti-corruption). In addition, professional experts from major universities presented their varied interpretations and recommendations on capital controls when the Asian financial crisis hit the country in 1997. This resulted in the emergence of discourse on the Tobin tax as a viable alternative to discourage short-term capital speculation.

In late 1986, FDC held preliminary meetings to unite the groups and individuals pressuring the government to adopt reforms in its debt policy. A preparatory committee was formed in the process, which included representatives of political blocs, politically non-aligned groups, and academics who provided technical assistance. Among those who participated in the initial meetings were experts from the University of the Philippines (UP) and Ateneo de Manila University. The technical inputs of UP sociology professor Randy David of the then-newly formed Bukluran sa Ikauunlad ng Sosyalistang Isip at Gawa (Union of Filipino Socialists [BISIG]); UP School of Economics professors Emmanuel de Dios, Manuel "Butch" Montes, and Joseph Lim; and Ateneo de Manila University professor Germelino Bautista were sought to elucidate the ramifications of the national debt to the country's economic growth during the Aquino administration. Moreover, UP economics professor Solita Monsod, who favored selective debt repudiation, was appointed director-general of the National Economic and Development Authority.

From 1988 to 1996, FDC was led by UP public administration professor and former national treasurer of the Estrada administration Leonor Briones. During her term, the coalition became a recognized player in economic-policy advocacy, and its positions and proposed alternatives on key economic issues often served as important rallying points for the progressive movement as a whole.

The emergence of the Stop the New Round Coalition can also be attributed to the active involvement of progressive academics. Professors and scientists from the UP Los Baños were part of the first national coalition formed against the the World Trade Organization—the Pambansang Ugnayan ng Mamayan Laban sa GATT (National Citizens' Alliance against GATT), which pushed for the outright rejection of the GATT-WTO. Years later, SNR was formed with the help of UP sociology and public administration professor Walden Bello, who also serves as the executive director of the Focus on the Global South (FOCUS). FOCUS convened a series of meetings among different local social movements doing work on the WTO, which led to the launching of SNR. Several academics joined SNR activities and campaigns in their individual capacities such as Prof. Rene Ofreneo (UP School of Labor and International Relations), Prof. Miriam Coronel Ferrer (UP Department of Political Science), Prof. Perlita Frago (UP Department of Political Science), Verna Dinah Viajar (Third World Studies Center, UP Diliman), and Sharon Quinsaat (Third World Studies Center, UP Diliman). Prof. Rosalinda Pineda-Ofreneo of the UP Center for Women's Studies got involved as an informal member or "endorser" of the coalition.

Campaigns against corruption also necessitate the cooperation of members of the academe because of the technical underpinnings of the problem. Hence, the Transparency and Accountability Network (TAN) rallied the support of various academic and research institutions like the Ateneo Center for Social Policy and Public Affairs, the Ateneo School of Government, the La Salle Institute of Governance, the National Institute for Policy Studies, and the Philippine Center for Policy Studies. Their support to the coalition is focused on two areas: prevention of corruption by conducting academic research on how to make government transactions more transparent through the streamlining of government processes; and the promotion of a corruption-intolerant society by encouraging the public to report corruption cases and inculcating in them the value of honesty, transparency, and accountability.

At the height of the Asian financial crisis, economists from various streams called for new financial architecture to respond to the volatility of financial and capital markets. Although the Tobin tax movement in the country has yet to be conceived, the measures proposed by professors from the UP School of Economics (UPSE) on managing short-term capital flows are instructive. These issues also showcase the divergent opinions of technical experts in addressing the problem. These diverse opinions account for the difficulty of establishing a Tobin tax movement in the country. Ateneo de Manila University economics professor and former NEDA chief Cielito Habito (2005) admitted that there are no strong advocates of the proposal in the country at present. Several proposals were presented but these did not reach the halls of Congress. These include UP economics professor Raul Fabella's (1998) "time-graduated capital gains tax," which could minimize, if not totally prevent, asset bubble formation; and Nobel Prize laureate and World Bank chief economist Joseph Stiglitz's proposal to limit

the extent of tax deductibility of interest in debt-denominated or foreign-linked currencies to control the country's reliance on foreign borrowings (cited in Reyes-Cantos 1999, 2002).

On the other hand, former Department of Budget and Management secretary and UP economics professor Benjamin Diokno (2005) expressed his reservations on the feasibility of imposing a Tobin tax on capital inflows and outflows in the country. For him, the proposal has "tricky" concepts that must first be addressed. One area of concern is the impact of the Tobin tax on Foreign Currency Deposit Units (FCDUs). FCDUs are the most mobile capital of the country. Diokno believes that should the government tax them, it may trigger capital flight. Furthermore, defining the tax base of the Tobin tax must be carefully studied. It must, first and foremost, be guided by equity considerations. For instance, remittance coming from overseas Filipino workers must not be taxed because it cannot be considered as short-term speculative capital. Another UPSE professor, Mario Lamberte, then chairman of the Philippine Institute for Development Studies (PIDS), expressed his reservations in the setting up of additional capital controls. He argued that the country did not have to reimpose currency controls it had dismantled before the 1997 crisis. Instead, he recommended three major measures to minimize the country's vulnerability to financial shocks: 1) adoption of flexible exchange rate, 2) improving of corporate governance, and 3) strengthening of the banking system by improving prudential regulations (Lamberte 1998).

ACADEME-CIVIL-SOCIETY RELATIONS

The role of academics in the emergence, development, and outcomes of social movements is prominent in the area of knowledge transfer. Knowledge transfer can proceed in four ways: from the academe to civil society (technical assistance), from the academe to the academe and the public (research and publications), from-civil-society group to another civil-society group (information sharing); and from state institutions to academe/civil society (insider's assistance).

First, type of knowledge transfers would be from the academe to civil-society actors through technical assistance and capacity-building initiatives. By elucidating the theoretical and empirical underpinnings of issues, academics assist social movement actors in comprehending complex issues. For instance, during the early years of FDC, UP political science professor Amado Mendoza Jr., then research head of the National Economic Protectionism Association (NEPA), trained coalition members on effective strategies of engaging policymakers on debt issues. NEPA held several seminars and "crash courses" attended by progressive movements and personalities. Apparently, some of the academics who train civil-society actors maintain a "politically neutral" character. Although they are identified with these groups, they veer away from joining mass rallies and demonstrations. They often leave the partisan and oppositional roles to civil-society actors that are more able to accomplish them (Cohn 2005). In another instance, in 2005, TAN cooperated with the Procurement Watch Inc. and the La Salle Institute of Governance (LSIG) in developing "deployment-matching software that addresses the needs of government agencies for third-party procurement monitors and availability of observers in procurement monitoring." The measure provides NGO observers for government agencies needing procurement monitors.

The second type is evident in the efforts of academics to share and disseminate their research findings to fellow academics and the general public. These researches, in one way or the other, have the potential to build up constituencies because they popularize the mass movements' agenda. It must be emphasized that when academics make their research work accessible to policy advisers and policymakers, they improve their chances of influencing public policy. The FDC has been the subject of numerous studies. The earliest of these was written by Rosalinda Pineda-Ofreneo (1991) in her book, *The Philippines: Debt and Poverty,* in which she examined in one chapter the nature of FDC's campaigns and advocacies. Also noteworthy is Grageda's (1994) more focused study on the coalition. He traced the ideological roots of the organization to better understand the crafting of its earlier advocacy positions. Another work by Gershman (1997) presents a systematic analysis of FDC by mapping out the terrain of its advocacy, the opportunities it has to maximize, the challenges it has to contend with, the strategies it employed, and the outcomes of its plans and actions. Similar studies were also made by Melgar (2000), which examined the process through which a movement's discourse is understood, appreciated, and translated into action by its constituency. The most recent literature was Ferrer's (2002) article, which deals with FDC's campaign against oil deregulation in 1996.

Information sharing constitutes the third type of knowledge transmittal. Academic members of different civil-society organizations can learn from each other in different settings. This becomes an easy enterprise since members of the coalitions in the study have had a history of cooperation and alliance building, which greatly facilitates collaboration. Through immersion in and exposure to various international conferences and forums, academics can pass on new forms of knowledge, such as fresh outsourcing and campaign strategies, for the development of civil-society groups. FDC, SNR, and TAN have benefited from the experiences of their international partners. One important link of SNR to the international community was the Our World Is Not For Sale Network. Another venue where academics in the ASEAN region draw fresh ideas is the NGO Forum on the Asian Development Bank (ADB), which was established in 1992. The forum is an Asian-led network of NGOs and community-based groups that support each other to amplify their positions on ADB's policies, programs, and projects.

The last type of knowledge transfer is made possible when an academic assumes a dual character: as a policy adviser and as a member of a civil-society organization. In this setup, he or she can play an important role in advising the government to frame national policies based on the advocacies of his organization. Access to information becomes an easy task because information can be retrieved from concerned state agencies through help from the so-called friendly insiders.

The mode of knowledge transfer, however, can assume a different direction. Civil-society organizations can also be the spring of information for the academe to appreciate and process. This can be witnessed in the efforts of CSOs to influence academic institutions and rally their constituents to support the former's agenda. One effective means is the holding of advocacy campaigns in academic institutions. SNR's provincial forums in Northern, Southern, Central, and Western Mindanao universities from August to September 2003 endeavored to inform and educate various sectors on the repercussions of trade liberalization. Another example is TAN's initiative to show the play "Anatomiya ng Korapsyon" (Anatomy

of Corruption), produced by the Cultural Center of the Philippines, in five major cities (Naga, Baguio, Manila, Bacolod, and Davao). The UP-Baguio and the Ateneo for Social Policy and Public Affairs hosted the event in Baguio and Manila, respectively. TAN's campaigns were facilitated by presenting the concepts of corruption in a popular form of theater performance, followed by a public forum.

CONCLUSION

One factor that isolates civil-society groups from the academe is the difference between the ideal world of theoretical studies and the needs of social-movement practitioners. On the one hand, academics' interests and priorities can diverge from the concerns of social movements. Social-movement actors, on the other hand, can undermine the value of social-movement theorizing and research. Only when social-movement actors (who have the experience) and academics (who possess the theories) share their knowledge with each other, can the bond between the two be strengthened.

The bond between the academe and social-movement actors can be strengthened in various modes. State actors also stay abreast of the knowledge produced by academic researchers and often incorporate the findings of academic research into their work. Hence, it is imperative that state agencies constantly receive inputs from the academe. Civil-society organizations can ensure this commitment through constant lobbying, advocacies, and engagement with respective agencies. These actions can serve as conduits for academic activists to directly influence public policy.

Since the relationship between the two is often galvanized by their common struggle to effectively engage state agencies and supranational institutions, campaign strategies must always incorporate the expertise of both camps. Institutional partnerships must become the norm in their activities. The academic environment is a good venue where policymakers and civil society can converge and commence a dynamic discourse on issues. Academic institutions must ensure that the perspectives of social movements are incorporated in conferences and forums they organize.

REFERENCES

Burke, Brian. 1999. "Antonio Gramsci and informal education, the encyclopedia of informal education." http://www.infed.org/thinkers/et-gram.htm, accessed on 19 June 2006.

Martin, Brian.1984. "Academics and social action." *Higher Education Review*, Vol. 16, No. 2, Spring 1984, pp. 17-33. http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/sts/bmartin/pubs/84her.html, accessed on 17 June 2006.

Cohn, Daniel. 2005. "Jumping into the political fray: Academics and policy-making. Draft paper for Policy Analysis in Canada: The State of the Art. Simon Fraser University.

Diokno, Benjamin (former Department of Budget and Management secretary and UP School of Economics professor). 2005. Interview by Ronald Molmisa. Tape Recording, 22 November.

Fabella, Raul. 1998. *The Tyranny of Fundamentals: The Crisis*. Paper presented at Philexport Forum, Philexport, Philippines, 4 November.

Ferrer, Carmille Grace S. 2002. "NGOs and policy advocacy: A case study of the Freedom from Debt Coalition's campaign against oil deregulation." *Labour and Management in Development Journal*, Vol. 3, No. 3, pp. 2-20.

Grageda, Jose. 1994. “Freedom from Debt Coalition.” In Cesar P. Cala and Jose Z. Grageda (eds.), *Studies on Coalition Experiences in the Philippines*. Bookmark Inc., Makati.
Gershman, John. 1997. “Battling the debt crisis.” In *Policy Influence: NGO Experiences.* Ateneo Center for Social Policy and Public Affairs, Institute for Development Research, Konrad Adenauer Stiftung, Quezon City.
Habito, Cielito (former NEDA chief and Ateneo de Manila University economics professor). 2005. Interview by Ronald Molmisa. Tape Recording, 15 November.
Lamberte, Mario B. 1998. “Currency crisis: Where do we go from here?” In *Human Development Network, Who’s Afraid of Capital Controls?* Human Development Network, Quezon City.
Reyes-Cantos, Jessica. 1999. *Regulating Short Term Capital Flows*. Action for Economic Reforms, Quezon City.

Reactions

MAUREEN PAGADUAN (Professor, Department of Community Development, College of Social Work and Community Development, University of the Philippines [UP]-Diliman):

It is heartening to hear the works and accomplishments of the academic community. However, I am unsure whether anyone here can actually say that these observations are all true. Maybe we need to first examine the framework in studying the relationship between the academic community and social movements. What are the factors that determine how academics behave? Faculty members can be violent at times—just think of the conflicts arising from professional positions and promotions. What is the history of these conflicts? I think the members of the academe tend to be not very civilized in these instances. Academics embody the Filipino culture when it comes to conflicts and oppositions. These things should be reflected in the framework.

With regard to the role and influence of the academe, I believe that when you talk of influence, the institution has built a certain amount of credibility. Not just any member of the academe is welcome to engage with social movements, especially if one introduces himself or herself as an academic. I think most of us in the academic community who are participating in social movements had been student activists before. We build relationships with these groups by virtue of our experiences on the ground, not so much as researchers. Simply introducing yourself

as an academic or a degree holder does not allow you easy acceptance into the movement.

The presentation treats the academe as a homogeneous community. I do not think that is very enlightening. I agree with Dr. Nicanor Tiongson who said in his speech delivered to graduating students in UP Mindanao that the contribution of the University of the Philippines to development problems and solutions has been rather patchy. If he were referring to academics, I would suppose they are more likely to be instigators than problem solvers. Therefore, I think it is important to distinguish and differentiate members of the academe and not to take them as a whole. For one, academics come from different disciplines, and there are differences in perspectives even within disciplines.

I do not think that members of the academe involved in social movements identify themselves in terms of their academic affiliations; rather, they carry their organizational membership. So how is it possible that their identity is fully recognized as members of the academe among social-movement circles?

Social movements need writers and people who have the luxury to read books, theorize, and study. Are there academics involved in social movements who theorize? I think there are. I believe that the academe continues to play a significant role in terms of providing instruments, mechanisms, and theoretical insights. Before the academic can play that role though, he or she needs to embrace the movement first. He or she cannot view himself or herself as a separate entity, as an academic alone.

In looking at the relationship between the academe and social movements, it is important to factor in the academic culture in the discourse. Our uniqueness as an intellectual community that places a high value on objectivity, with the tendency not to align with any particular group, has to be abandoned if we enter the movement. If the academic does not have a specific standpoint or commitment to particular causes, how can he or she be credible as a consultant?

Where does the academe find the inspiration to be involved in social movements? It is my opinion that members of the academe look for facilitation funds as an incentive for involvement. As you may notice, most researches conducted by academics are institutionally funded. There is always an honorarium for involvement in research-dissemination activities. How can we then say that academics are inspired by commitment alone? Where is the sincere desire and motivation to help social movements in building a better society? This is because, as I have suggested earlier, the values of unity and community are not quite embedded in the academe. In social movements though, those values inspire action and commitment to change.

I will now move on to discuss the relationship of the academe, specifically with grassroots movements. First, I will comment on the movements that were discussed in the paper. The three case studies that were cited by Mr. Molmisa involved groups with economic and trade issues. There are other varieties of social movements, such as the women's movements, that were not represented. Next, I shall illustrate a specific case to show the contentious reality of the academe-social movement relationship.

The College of Social Work and Community Development, where I teach, prides itself of maintaining close linkages with grassroots communities and cause-oriented groups. The admission of students from the military is a big issue in the

college. We now have around twenty military students in the graduate program—captains, majors, colonels, and honor graduates of the Philippine Military Academy. We also have students who are military chaplains working in the different branches of the military. What would our students from nongovernment organizations think? They might say the college is bringing the military to the communities. One aspect of the problem is the belief in the academic community that education means freedom. I believe the college has to draw the line, so to speak, as far as the issue is concerned.

My final point has to do with the basic link that seems to have been forgotten in the framework: the student body. Academics who teach have to inspire their students to be committed to social change, to be critical of the path toward attaining a better life for majority of the Filipinos so that they do not have to be nurses struggling to work abroad. If we inspire them to join social movements, not the corporate world and call centers—though the financial rewards are tempting—and if we expose our students to the movement, then teaching becomes an inspiration. Those are indicators of our achievement as teachers.

JOSE MAGADIA, S.J.
(Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Ateneo de Manila University):

I am thankful to be part of the forum because I believe this is an important venue in which the academe and social movements can be carefully examined. Data on the subject are abundant, but the relationship of the academe and social movements has not been formally studied and discussed. The points I will raise are essentially from an academic's perspective.

I was asking Prof. Francisco Magno earlier if this paper is the beginning of something more extensive. I hope it is, because a length of six pages is too short to capture the richness of the experience of the academe and social movements. There is a lot to be told and a lot to be learned. It is important that these experiences be studied, documented, and disseminated in detail.

First, I will discuss the different levels of involvement between the academe and social movements. Social movements cover a wide area that a typology needs to be worked out. Thus, research on the subject matter has to cover the different experiences at different levels: the national, the regional, and the local. Within these levels, involvements are varied and substantive. One example would be the sharing or transfer of knowledge from academe to civil society or from academe to

social movements. Within this type of involvement, experiences are also varied; they can be in the form of technical skills, attitude, and orientation. Furthermore, what is transferred in the process can still differentiated and categorized.

There is a whole gamut of experience from social movements to civil society to academe, some of which have already been documented. I think more academics have to touch base and explore these experiences. How are we supposed to give substance to academic exercise without linking the experience of movements on the ground to theory? The area of knowledge transfer is quite vast. This is yet another type of involvement that has to be examined.

Earlier, the link between government and civil-society organizations, and links among civil-society organizations were mentioned. The government is not the only link to social movements. Social movements engage the academe as a venue for coming together. In this respect, academic institutions may act as liaison. Social movements involve a complex web of networks which, I suggest, the paper should further unravel.

My third point concerns the issue of accountability. How do you audit civil society? Who is supposed to be accountable? Are organizations only accountable to its funding institutions? To some extent, academics have a role to play in checking the practices of social movements and civil-society organizations. We talk about transparency in the academe, but the question is: are NGOs transparent? Do they account for all the funds obtained from their donors and sources?

The fourth point has to do with another significant role of the academe. The translation and rearticulation of movements' causes into a language that is acceptable to other sectors is a service provided by the academe. It moves from the language of cause to the language of legalities, and that kind of linguistic venture is initiated by the academe.

Another point has to do with objectivity and ideological commitment, values that are important to the work of academics. Objectivity by itself already poses a dilemma. How do you define objectivity? What you define as objective may not hold true for others.

The question of objectivity and ideological commitment are paradoxical values that are quite difficult to balance. The academe stresses the value of objectivity, but academics involved in civil society and social movements are compelled to commit to particular causes. Hence the necessity to strike a balance.

Striking a balance is also necessary to maneuver through the *palakasan* system, which is almost endemic in Philippine organizational culture. We tend to think that palakasan, or the use of personal ties with influential persons to gain a position in the organization, is only true for politicians. But this practice is as prevalent in civil-society organizations or social movements, as in the government or the private sector. If this goes unchecked, then it would be difficult to move forward. Persons more capable of doing excellent work but who are not *malakas* with the boss would be sidetracked. Given this reality, academics can possibly study the cultural aspect of social movements, and maybe find some useful interventions too.

Diversity is a striking feature in the academe. There are academics working in a multisectoral environment. What kind of relationship do they forge with social

movements? What are the nuances of such a relationship? This is one interesting area in the academe-social movements engagement that I feel is worth looking into.

The academe is quite a small world. There is an even smaller world within the academe because you still have to distinguish between those who simply teach and those who teach as well as do funded research, for example. In many universities and colleges, teaching is mainly the academic's bread and butter, but you cannot blame the academic who chose to live that way. How can you then bring the best professors from the academe to work with social movements? That is one question that was unanswered by the research. Perhaps Mr. Molmisa can expand the research by addressing this and other points I have raised.

FRANCISCO MAGNO (Associate Professor, Institute of Governance, De La Salle University):

My comments are divided into four parts. The first would be the critique of the theoretical assumption. The second would be some of the empirical material on the Transparency and Accountability Network (TAN). The third would be on the academe-civil-society relations, focusing on the new tools being developed in this age of globalization and the use of information and communications technology (ICT). The fourth and final part would be my comments on the conclusions of the paper.

Allow me to comment first on the theoretical framework. The first paragraph quoted Gramsci on organic intellectuals providing ideological leadership to a given class or sector. I am doubtful whether Gramsci's concept of organic intellectual is applicable because the paper talks about academics. Gramsci was talking about workers as organic intellectuals. Perhaps the research should start with Lenin because Lenin dealt with the role of intellectuals in social change. There is also literature saying that Lenin's work is also related to Rousseau's argument on the general will, which says that society, dominated by partisan interests, needs the intervention of intellectuals. In addition, perhaps C. Wright Mills's *Sociological Imagination* can also contribute to the fleshing out of some of the paper's theoretical positions.

Yet still, there is also the argument about knowledge as the locus of power, for which Foucault and Habermas are progenitors. Perhaps Mr. Molmisa can do some kind of a survey on these theories insofar as the value of intellectuals and academics is concerned.

I am not sure whether the researcher wishes to use the term "academe" or "academics." These two terms have different connotations. When you talk of the academe, you refer to the institution; academics, on the other hand, are specific members of the institution. To further complicate matters, the academe as Professor Pagaduan mentioned, is not a homogeneous entity and so are academics. So in relation to that, and going back to Gramsci, I would like to ask whether the social movements under study—assuming they are, indeed, heterogeneous—are representatives of a class or sector.

I would like to comment on the assertion of the paper that "academics … are more socially skilled than other groups." I know many who do not have "social" skills, and technical skills too, if I may add. But, as Marx said, the point is not just to interpret the world but to change it. If academics want change, they need alternatives. Hence, they need to analyze society first to determine the appropriate alternatives.

The paper mentions that academics are able to recognize public concerns. That means we need to look into the interests of academics. Perhaps you are referring to academics who favor participation vis-à-vis academics who choose not to fully engage in the movement. Perhaps, on a lesser note, by arguing that academics are "more socially skilled than other groups," does the paper imply that state actors are not capable of engaging in intelligent debates?

Even though academics work with ideas, what is important to consider is the type of ideas they espouse. Following Voltaire, ideas are useless without force. Social critique is, therefore, more relevant because academics cannot solve problems just by going to the library. Marx did that but he also engaged in social activism for a certain period of time. To some extent the study that he did was based on evidence. Academics, I should say, have relevance mainly because of their adherence to argumentation based on evidence. I think the issue is really about academics being relevant because they participate in framing the public discourse. That is what academics can contribute. I do not agree that they have more social skills than non-academics.

I was looking at the faces that were flashed in the multimedia presentation—Solita Monsod, Leonor Briones, etc. I think Karina David, too, should be included. These are people who crossed the academe-government-civil society divides. Presumably, there is a sort of "revolving door" that enables these border crossings.

This leads me to my next suggestion for the paper: to look at policy networks. Are there policy networks that exist between and across the academe-civil society-state divide? Within the three-sector model the boundaries are very porous. For instance, we have academics in the UP who are also advisers of the state or of social movements. The Political Science Department of UP is an example. I therefore suggest that network analysis be employed in this paper to map the process of knowledge production for social and policy reform.

Still on the discussion of policy networks, I would like to share some "insider" details on some members of TAN. I shall cite some members who have charted a multisectoral trajectory in their respective professional careers. Teresita Baltazar used to be with an NGO group, Konsensyang Pilipino, before becoming commissioner of the Presidential Anti-Graft Commission. Another is Dina Abad who was with the Ateneo School of Government before becoming congresswoman.

The United Nations Development Programme, one of the partners of TAN, is a donor agency that has reached out to civil society. Emmanuel Buendia, who is the manager of the UNDP Governance Portfolio, is himself an academic, having been professorial lecturer of UP and De La Salle University. Country representative to the Philippines Steve Rood of the Asia Foundation, another TAN partner, is a former UP-Baguio professor.

The third part of my critique deals with the discussion on the new tools of civil-society mobilization. Mr. Molmisa noted earlier how ICTs have been instrumental in, for instance, the campaigns of the Black-and-White Movement, which were waged not in the streets of Mendiola but on the Internet superhighway. That also reminded me of the Zapatistas of Mexico under Subcomandante Marcos fighting the revolution not only in the mountains of Chiapas but also in the worldwide web. Indeed, the times are different and there are more avenues for protest action.

I mentioned a while ago the use of computer software because the paper mentions that academics veer away from joining mass rallies and demonstrations. Of course, our image of mass demonstration is personified by Prof. Randolph David, so I am not sure whether the paper talks about academics who do not join rallies. Many academics use other tools because most anti-corruption struggles, for example in the work of TAN, are fought in the boardroom, not in the streets. We are talking here of people's needs and committee decisions. So if you are not able to track down the prices of public goods, you lose the battle. It is, therefore, necessary to have "social" skills to fight corruption, not only theories and ideas.

The last portion of this critique concerns the conclusions of paper. Let us consider the reforms in the Bureau of Internal Revenue (BIR), which were advocated by then-Commissioner Rene Bañez. During his term, one of the major controversies involved the battle between the government and the employee's union. The BIR union members staged a protest that they even took to the Senate. In effect, they successfully ousted Commissioner Bañez.

The struggle for change may involve both opposition and engagement with the state. However, the heart of the matter is the capacity to present alternatives. As I have said, philosophers interpret the world but the point is to change it. There was mention of state agencies constantly receiving input from the academe. Again, the question is, are these inputs value-neutral? There can be academic inputs that support, versus those that question, the status quo.

We have discussed political reforms but not political parties. Parties have a huge task of aggregating interests but do they have the capacity to perform their job? More to the point: are parties capable of playing a role in policy formulation? In many cases they do not, because many of the proposed policies really come from the executive branch. Of course, they can be instrumental in terms of consensus formation. Having said so, academics can also play a role in building the capacity of parties and politicians to pursue policy-reform work and integrate inputs from social movements.

I agree with Fr. Magadia that we also have to look at the role of the academics at the local level. We tend to focus too much on academics here in Manila but a lot of academics in the provinces, with minimum resources, are doing a lot of work in supporting, for example, reform efforts at the local level. Many of these undertakings are undocumented.

I guess my comments boil down to one thing: the paper should look at advocacy networks where academics participate and cross the civil society/state/private sector divides. That would make for a more textured analysis and a more dynamic framework for looking at the relationship between academics and social movements.

Open Forum

DAGGY COPRADO

(KALIPUNAN NG MGA SAMAHANG MARALITA SA PILIPINAS [ASSOCIATION OF URBAN POOR IN THE PHILIPPINES]):

Allow me to give some personal background before I give my comments. When I was a student at Polytechnic University of the Philippines, I was recruited into the League of Filipino Students. At the time, the assassination of Ninoy Aquino gave impetus to anti-Marcos mass actions and protests. I, along with Professors Pagaduan and Tadem, formed an independent corpus that called for the ouster of then-president Marcos and the restoration of democracy. In 1987, I was one of the founding members of BISIG, a socialist group composed of the urban poor. Prof. Randolf David was among the founders, too, but the organization was mainly under the leadership of Prof. Francisco Nemenzo.

My main criticism of the paper is about the role of academics. We should not take their word as gospel truth simply because they are academics. I come from the urban poor community, but my education does not prevent me from actively participating in the struggle of people who are also impoverished as I am.

BISIG is currently waging a protest at the North Triangle. We are protesting against the World Bank, which is forcibly driving away the squatters there. We cannot allow the World Bank to take sole control of the situation. We believe that participatory mechanisms and democratic dialogue should be employed, but the World Bank is dismissive and insists that the urban poor should simply go back to the province. Obviously the institution is not cognizant of the real problem—poverty and the necessity to seek employment here in Manila.

Academics, whether private- or university-based, have the data to support our cause. But we do not easily believe the Social Weather Stations because the urban poor sector has actually grown bigger in number compared to the labor unions. That is why we are focusing our work on the urban poor. The Arroyo government insists on resurrecting the social housing project, which in reality does not really serve the interests of the urban poor.

We ask academics to give us not only theoretical discussions, but more important, concrete alternatives. What alternatives do we really need as a nation? That is something that we should seek answers for.

ARTURO NUERA (NGO FORUM ON THE ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK):

My suggestion for improving this paper is to expand the concept of "academic." It is important to delineate the difference between the academe's definition and the more popular notion of academic.

Based on my experience, I believe only a small portion of the academic world is working with social movements. Most of these academics come from the social sciences. These are academics who have a solid background in social research and who spend their time engaging communities as part of their work. Using concrete, lived experiences on the ground they formulate ideas in a theoretical manner, following the practice in the academe.

Perhaps it is also worth noting the class background of members of the academe who are engaged in social movements. Class orientation more or less has a bearing upon one's work despite deep involvement in the organization. We know that most of these academics come from the middle class, because the middle class can afford to complete college, masteral or doctoral degrees.

Some academics do consultancy work for both civil society and people's organizations, and for the government. Maybe class background has to do with their ability to cross channels. Nevertheless, my main point is that we must expand our definition about academics.

MILLET MORANTE (KILUSAN PARA SA PAMBANSANG DEMOKRASYA [MOVEMENT FOR NATIONAL DEMOCRACY]):

I am trying to understand and appreciate the discussion from the point of view of someone from the grassroots because that is where I come from. First, I believe that academics are thinkers and articulators, but for whom? I think that at present most academics are speaking or articulating the status quo; they are not very keen on social change.

When we speak of social change, we mean changing the oppressive structures of society. But this definition is often labeled "communist" or associated with communism and the Left. Maybe that is why many academics are not wont to embrace this work. Hence, the relationship between the academe and social movements, or with the people's struggle in general, is quite sketchy. The academe is not neutral or objective in that sense. The academe remains an ideological tool of the ruling class and it will remain so unless, I think, it will also get inspiration from the mass movement—even though we know the movement is very fragmented right now.

The academe is supposed to be the articulator or the voice of society, especially of the marginalized sector. Why is the academe not voicing out their views on extrajudicial killings now? Or charter change? Or widespread poverty? Obviously, we cannot define the academe in a monolithic sense. I think the so-called objectivity needs to be clearly mapped out so mass movements can understand the position, or positions, of the academe.

Finally, the academe should revive the discourse of nationalism. Whether we like it or not, we have a rotten social system. We need everybody, especially the articulators, to help create effective alternatives in society.

RONALD MOLMISA:

I would like to clarify that my presentation is based on the case studies that are part of the Philippine study on global civil-society movements under the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development research project. Thus, I have only discussed the social movements covered by the project. I would like to emphasize that this is not a full-scale, independent study on the relationship of the academe and social movements.

My view as to why some members of the academe do consultancy work with different sectors in society follows Marx's contention on economic

determinism. Sometimes the economic status of professors influences the decision of an academic to work with social movements. My interpretation of Gramsci's organic intellectuals includes the academe. I believe so because within the academe there are members who oppose traditional intellectuals. Certainly in my paper there are differences between the concept of academic and the concept of public intellectual. I used the concept of public intellectual to refer to someone who expresses his view or position even if he does not belong to the academe. I defined the academic as part of institutions of higher learning who are involved in research and teaching.

I do agree that the academe is not a monolithic bloc. If you are looking for professors or educators who would rally behind your cause, you will need to carefully study the interests and political leanings of the departments and colleges here in UP. For example, when the issue of then-president Joseph Estrada's resignation came about, some colleges wanted his resignation, while some were comfortable with the status quo.

There are different views in the academe as there are in the social movements. You need to know which faculty members can support your cause, those who engage in advocacy work and consultancy, and those who are fully engaged in civil society or people's organizations.

MAUREEN PAGADUAN:

I do not want to put too much value on the idea of intellectuals in the academe as articulators. That role is not central to academic life; in fact, it has been acknowledged that many academics choose not to be involved with social movements. We do not have to rely on the academe to articulate issues and craft alternatives. Indeed, the search for alternatives is not the task of only one community. We should not privilege only one community for the job, unless there are clear indicators of credibility or standpoint.

What I would like to see in Mr. Molmisa's paper is how the academe performs its responsibilities to the students, and how students contribute to the dynamism of the academe-civil society engagement. Many faculty members are committed to engaging students in contributing to society by being involved in public issues and working with marginalized groups. The studentry is a potential resource that can also significantly contribute to advancing the causes of social movements.

The question for us in the academe is how committed and open we are to be criticized for our interests and motivations. Academics need to earn a living, but whether we engage social movements or not, it is important to exercise transparency. Faculty members need to be accountable to the stakeholders from the social movements whom they work with.

That is why I raised the issue on the admission of students from the military at the College of Social Work and Community Development. We are not strictly objective in that sense. Further, the decision to take in students from the military places the college in a rather dangerous position. Some of our students and colleagues are concerned about their security. Academic freedom in this case has to be exercised with caution. Policies have to be installed so that the security of our students, as well as members of the college, will not be jeopardized even while academic freedom is upheld.

Faculty members, including myself, are to be held accountable for what could happen to people in the college or to the members of the communities we work with. It is difficult for us because we cannot simply bring our military students to the communities, especially those communities beleaguered with insurgency, even though students in our college are required to go on field as part of their education and training. That is a huge risk.

One point of convergence that should be pursued is the incorporation of insights and practices of social movements. It is difficult to change the curriculum each time there are new developments on the ground. But the academe has to be cognizant of change, and that change should be part of planning the curriculum so we can provide rich and relevant inputs to our students. I hope that social movements can come into the academe to discuss curricular possibilities and thereby strengthen the engagement.

My suggestion is to improve the framework of the paper by opening up spaces for dialogue or talking points. Without some kind of leveling, the technicalities of the academe-social movement relationship would be impossible to thresh out.

Finally, I wish to make a clarification. In my opinion, TAN, Freedom from Debt Coalition and Stop the New Round Coalition are not social movements per se, but institutions within larger movements. TAN belongs to the anti-corruption movement, FDC is part of the movement for debt relief, and SNR belongs to the fair trade movement. The paper should explore the linkages of these institutions to other organizations within their respective networks.

AMADO MENDOZA JR. (Department of Political Science, College of Social Sciences and Philosophy, UP-Diliman):

I started as an activist when I was fifteen, and now I am working as an independent political scientist. As an independent analyst, I believe in an unattached, critical view of everything and everyone including myself. I tend to be critical because insofar as work is concerned, all intellectuals are flawed, or at least always have some gaps or oversights in their views. If we are to develop as academics, it is important to have room for critique by participating in dialogues and in the exchange of opinion.

I do not agree with Professor Pagaduan's claim that academics no longer have value in society. Maybe I understood it differently, but allow me to express my view anyway. To say that one is critical is not tantamount to being uncommitted. Quite the contrary: to be critical is, for me, to be of service to the society.

Academics in public universities *should* be public intellectuals here in the Philippines. An academic who derives income from the state should be a public intellectual. An academic intellectual should also choose between being politically correct or being honest. Personally, I choose honesty over political correctness, so allow me to voice out an honest opinion. The principal component of social movements—the "reaffirmist" bloc of the Philippine Left—is not here now. Does that mean they do not wish to engage in a dialogue with us? Whether we like it or not, they are a political force, and until such time they join us in a dialogue our so-called search for alternatives will remain futile.

There are opportunistic academics who do consultation work left and right, but let us not judge them outright. Maybe we should look at their track records first. These academics have different motivations that may vary through time.

Consultancy work may be a necessity, a means of livelihood to some of these academics, but that does not mean they have lost sight of the greater task ahead, which is to be involved in social change.

ROMEO ROYANDOYAN (CENTRO SAKA INC.):

One of the issues raised in bridging the gap between academics and social movements is the question of accountability. How should the academic be accountable? In relation to this question, in what direction is social change being pursued? The academic cannot theorize unless he is clear about the emancipatory agenda and all struggles toward that end. He must have an emancipatory agenda; otherwise, he is just pursuing a livelihood, earning a living in UP. My observation is that the social change that the academe aims to instigate lacks a very clear declaration of a particular emancipatory agenda. The academic needs to ask himself toward what end he is struggling for.

MARY LUZ FERANIL (ALTERNATE FORUM FOR RESEARCH IN MINDANAO):

I would like to take off from the point of view of Professor Pagaduan regarding the involvement of the civil society or NGOs in developing the university curriculum. Allow me to cite my organization as a case in point.

Among the advocacies of our organization is the issue of peace. In Mindanao, we worked with a research organization in building six pilot private and public high schools. We also worked with the Department of Education in conducting workshops for teachers on how to integrate the issue of peace in the curriculum in the context of the Mindanao situation. Furthermore, we engaged other schools in integrating the peace issue in their school curricula.

The initiatives I have mentioned are collective efforts of different stakeholders. These are the result of initiatives from different groups from the government, civil society, and the education sector. Here are examples of concerted efforts of stakeholders to develop and inculcate in the minds of high school students the culture of peace.

RONALD MOLMISA:

I thank Professor Pagaduan for providing an instructive recommendation. As they say, if you want to change the structure of society, change the minds of the people. So the approach of the academe that we can probably look at is this: while you do the "dirty" work, you also do the nice or "neat" work. You renew the minds of the people while you do rallies, demonstrations. Perhaps this is the only way that the academe and social movements can collaborate, for the academe to really level with social movements. As previously noted, theorizing is futile without grounded experience. The problem with many academics, I have observed, is that they tend to theorize based on books, but these theories are not really rooted in actual experiences on the ground.

MARIA ELA ATIENZA (DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE, COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND PHILOSOPHY, UP-DILIMAN):

I will now give a comprehensive summary of the major points that were raised by the main presenter, the reactors in our panel, and members of the audience.

The paper highlighted the role that some academics play in the engaging social movements. The role of academics in the emergence, development, and outcomes of social movements is focused on knowledge transfer. Knowledge transfer proceeds in four ways: from the academe to the civil society; from academe to academe and the public; from one civil-society group to another; and finally, from state institutions to the academic and civil society.

Some suggestions on strengthening the role of academics in engaging social movements were raised. While most academics are engaged in theorizing, they should be more deeply involved in the issues and causes of the social movements. Second, academics have to note learning points based on their experiences with social movements. Finally, academics must contribute in framing the issues and offering alternatives.

Professor Pagaduan mentioned that academics have to be credible first to be able to link with social movements. Second, academics must focus on linking with grassroots movements. Academics should also keep in mind that their primary focus is to inspire students to be committed to social change and social involvement. Fr. Jose Magadia added more specific roles that academics can play in relation to social movements, including liaison work, networking, provision of secretariat services for social movements, and auditing of civil-society

organizations. He also mentioned academics who organize, translate, and articulate the causes of social movements in a language that is understandable to different sectors. In particular, they work to assist legislators in crafting policies that would push for the causes of different social movements.

A large part of the discussion focused on comments and recommendations for the paper. There was a comment that the paper has a very positive or glaring description of the academe which, it is hoped, should spur more realistic assessments of the academe's involvement with social movements and the dynamics of such relationship. A comment was raised that the paper tends to treat the academe as a homogeneous entity. Members of the academe have different contributions and relationships with social movements. In response, Mr. Molmisa agreed that the academe should not be treated as a homogeneous bloc. He cited UP as an example, where every department or college has its own political leanings.

Other comments from the floor include looking more into the typologies of social movements. Discussions should include the fact that social movements operate at different levels—international, national and local—and that experiences vary at each level. Another suggestion for the paper is to look into dilemmas of academics who are involved with different social movements. How do academics strike a balance between ideology and objectivity and ideological commitment? How do they maneuver within Philippine organizational culture?

Prof. Francisco Magno gave some comments on the framework of the study, particularly theories used in the paper. He questioned the use of Gramsci's concept of organic intellectual and suggested looking into the works of Lenin, Rousseau, C. Wright Mills, Foucault, and Habermas to refine the theoretical underpinnings of the paper. He also commented on the appropriate use of terms. He suggested using "academics" instead of "academe". Another important comment was to look at other means and tools for academics and social movements as they engage the state and other institutions. Finally, Professor Magno suggested that the paper try to get away from the very neat demarcation of the three-sector model of society.

Participants from the audience commented that there should be focus on other social movements; for instance, the anti-poverty and women's movement. A major suggestion was a careful analysis of the orientation, or class background, of academics working with social movements.