

CIVIL SOCIETY AND THE RESPONSE TO GLOBALIZATION

The discourse on globalization among civil society groups goes beyond the identification and analyses of policy issues in the new world order. Perhaps the most interesting and most crucial is how civil society has mapped out strategies and explored avenues for action and change. The diverse nature and dynamics of civil society's relations with the state, as well as collaboration with other nongovernment/nonprofit actors is in itself suggestive of the breadth of strategies and options.

Likewise, the role of civil society in the debate is not limited to the mere recognition of the ills and critique of the present system of globalization. But more significantly, as a transformative unit in society with broad constituency and an actor in governance and democratization, it has played a central function in advancing a people-centered agenda on globalization. It should be recalled that during the deliberations on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade-Uruguay Round (GATT-UR) Agreement for the Philippines' membership in the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 1994, civil society already figured considerably in advocating for its non-ratification to safeguard the interests of the majority.

[1] Civil society organizations (CSOs) utilized different mechanisms of engagement in the debate, which catalyzed and further enhanced its participation in policy-making.

This chapter tries to examine the responses of selected Philippine civil society groups to globalization. Shared and divergent perspectives on globalization have led to a variety of concrete actions employed, reflecting certain dynamics and processes of engaging institutions of global governance, including the Philippine government. What kind of interventions was adopted by civil society to advance their campaigns and issues? What particular advocacies prove to be contentious even among CSOs? Is there a common alternative or response to globalization?

To answer the questions, the chapter was divided into two parts. The first illustrates the modes of action and organization of civil society as it challenges the various instruments of globalization. The latter section of the chapter provides a survey of policy responses to the new world order.

Building an Action Agenda on Globalization

The “Battle in Seattle” in 1999 became a historic landmark for civil society action, battling institutions of economic global governance. Various tactics were employed and new concepts of protests and strategies were adopted. It also propounded a challenge over and above an opportunity for CSOs to rethink and consider changing modes of protest to deliver the message of resistance to globalization clearly. ^[2]—

Table 1 presents the various actions taken by selected Philippine civil society organizations. Emphasis of certain types of actions by some groups does not automatically denote disregard of other tactics. Rather, each organization finds its niche in the whole range of strategies, and coordinates with other groups to complement or supplement other modes of action. It is interesting to note that the strategies are somehow interrelated. For example, pressure politics through mobilizations are almost a function of social movements, while education is undertaken to lay the basis for resistance.

Table 1. Actions Taken by Civil Society on Globalization

Concrete Actions	Left Political Blocs	National Policy Research and/or Network NGOs	Sectoral and/or Issue-Based Research and Advocacy NGOs
------------------	----------------------	--	--

Strengthening Social Movements	Mobilizing and Organizing the Grassroots	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Organize the basic sectors, such as the workers, peasants and the urban poor, who are most vulnerable to the direct impacts of globalization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Stress in local actions which create local movements ○ Engage in community organizing to reflect on what the community can achieve together ○ Establish community trust funds as innovative way of financing sustainable development initiatives by local communities
Expanding National Alliances	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Forge strong links among civil society groups and with other progressive organizations, including the Church to further advance the world's anti-globalization movement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Develop working relations among groups with strong political clout ○ Engage and cooperate with civil society groups based on issues ○ Establish and maintain of national coalitions to monitor the implementation of policies and programs of government related to globalization 	
Creating a Global Civil Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Build a global movement which is multi-cultural, inter- 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Promote closer coordination of research, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Form and build regional alliances

	<p>racial, humanist and culturally-sensitive</p>	<p>analysis and formulation of alternative economic initiatives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Create and maintain organizations, alliances and networks in the regional and international levels to further strengthen the influence of policy research organizations in trade negotiations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ (At the regional level, whether with ASEAN or other regional groupings), expand networking among neighboring countries with the same development framework
<p>Pressure Politics</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Participate in anti-WTO protests, international socio-economic dialogues and fora and other forms of non-violent direct actions ○ Hold rallies, demonstrations, and local and general strike to show strength and pressure ○ Engage in policy and legislative lobbying 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Participate and sponsor meetings, conferences and dialogues at the national, regional and international levels ○ Influence the policy-making processes through research and analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Participate in all dialogues, summits and meeting with governments – national, regional and international ○ Engage all branches of the government in direct lobbying ○ Organize pickets, petitions, rallies and all types of street campaigns ○ Form alliances with party-list and individual members in Congress and the Senate

Building Knowledge and Elevating People's Consciousness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Expose the destructive schemes and negative impacts of programs and policies of globalization in the Philippines and worldwide ○ Build social consciousness through education ○ Popularize the issue of globalization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Broaden policy choices of NGOs and other civil society groups ○ Promote alternative ideas, paradigms, institutions and global and regional arrangements ○ Carry out massive information campaign on globalization through the use of popular and interactive media 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Build awareness through in-depth researches and policy analyses, educational discussions, use of popular media, development education, fact-finding missions and case studies ○ Widen the debate on globalization and make it as inclusive as possible by presenting pragmatic issues in popular format
---	---	--	--

Strengthening Social Movements

Nobel Peace Prize winner and famed anti-apartheid spokesman Archbishop Desmond Tutu once said, “The only way to eat an elephant is piece by piece.” Perhaps the elephant can only be consumed by an organized army of ants, which devours the limbs first and gradually works its way to the head.

Hence, organized civil society can set off with the strengthening of social movements. Basic elements of civil society include political and social movements apart from all other types of groups outside the state – nongovernment organizations (NGOs), people’s organizations (POs), religious institutions, academe, media, business and basic communities. [3] O’Brien et al. typifies social movements as a ‘subset of actors operating in the realm of civil society’ which pursue extensive social change and transformation. [4] Scott further clarifies this characteristic as he stresses the

communal nature of social movements having common interests and, ‘for at least some significant part of their social existence, a common identity.’^[5]

The consolidation and building up of social movements are deemed fundamental to completely utilize modes of intervention, such as pressure politics. Its collective nature necessitates some degree of organization and structure, inclined towards the improvement on the quality of life. Nonetheless, the organization and structure should not constrain flexibility and creativity to adapt to the changing political and economic environment.

To strengthen social movements, the respondent CSOs encourage three parallel types of interventions: (1) *mobilizing and organizing the grassroots*, (2) *expanding national alliances*, and (3) *creating a global civil society*.

A. Mobilizing and Organizing the Grassroots

Basic sectors of society are the first to be hit by the onslaught of globalization. Increased importation of traditional agricultural crops such as rice and corn has jeopardized the livelihood and further exacerbated the poverty of small farmers. As transnational corporations grow in power under the orthodoxy of free trade, labor flexibility schemes and feminization of labor are being implemented in the name of competition. Trade unions are incessantly shrinking with the decrease of regular workers and growth of casual and contractual labor. Moreover, an economic policy with a bias for urban development contributed to the swelling population of itinerant urban dwellers in the metropolis.

- Civil society organizations, particularly those with mass base engage in community organizing at the local (*barangay*, city/municipality, etc.) level. The concept of grassroots organizing in the context of globalization is however on two levels of democratization.

On the one hand, community organizing is still considered important for the traditional purposes of empowerment and participation. Community Organizing of the Philippines Enterprise Foundation (COPE) organizes slum dwellers not just to oppose demolitions and poor housing programs, but also to reflect on what the community can achieve together. The need to organize the urban poor is moreover seen as a complement to other sectoral struggles.

On the other hand, local efforts harmonize national and global actions. Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement (PRRM), for example, promote what they term as ‘international solidarity of locals,’ where local

actions are stressed to create local movements rooted in communities trying to produce desirable outcomes and scenarios. Essentially, a variation of self-governing and self-sufficient communities linked internationally and globally is created.

Realizing however that local movements may be constrained by the lack of resources financial and otherwise, NGOs and POs raise and provide funds for organizing and sustaining actions at the local level. Foundation for the Philippine Environment (FPE) establishes community trust funds as an innovative way of financing sustainable development initiatives by local communities and provides for participation of POs in national sustainable development efforts.

B. Expanding National Alliances

During the deliberations on the GATT-WTO issue in 1994, a large number of anti-GATT national coalitions were formed.^[6] Largely, these were either initiated or headed by major political blocs or NGOs/POs. Although some of the alliances folded up after the country's ratification of the Uruguay Round, several CSOs continued to synchronize their efforts to oppose WTO policies through the expansion of existing national formations and birth to new ones. While the objective of major anti-GATT formations in 1994 was to resist and deter ratification of the agreement, national alliances at present endeavor to monitor and contest, if necessary, the implementation of policies and programs of the government promoted by the WTO, WB and IMF and other institutions of globalization.

Last September 2001, the Kilusang Magbubukid ng Pilipinas (KMP) and Pambansang Lakas ng Kilusang Mamalakaya ng Pilipinas (PAMALAKAYA) resuscitated the *Pambansang Ugnayan ng mga Mamamayan Laban sa Liberalisasyon ng Agrikultura* (PUMALAG). PUMALAG I was the multi-sectoral alliance against GATT of national democratic organizations in 1994. The resurrected PUMALAG II is now composed solely of peasant and fisherfolk organizations and employees' associations of the National Food Authority and the Department of Agriculture,^[7] working to take agriculture out of the WTO and to protect the interests of small fisherfolks in bilateral trade agreements.

Carrying the slogan, "Fair Trade, not Free Trade," a coming together of representatives from various industries, businessmen, labor unions and non-government organizations laid the foundations of the Fair Trade Alliance (FTA).^[8] With the vision of ensuring a "strong, vibrant, and

sustainable economy capable of providing decent jobs to all Filipinos,”^[9] FTA’s foremost task is to review and reverse, if necessary, the country’s trade policies and commitments in order to provide better protection for local industries.

Meanwhile, a campaign coalition called STOP THE NEW ROUND! Philippines^[10], focused on making the Philippine Government break the consensus in the upcoming WTO Fifth Ministerial Meeting set to take place in Cancun, Mexico on September 2003, was formally launched last February 20, 2003. It aims to put forward a strategy for Cancun, which highlights three key points: opposition to a new round of WTO negotiations, opposition to further WTO trade and trade-related liberalization, and opposition to the incorporation of the “new issues” of investment, competition policy, government procurement, and trade facilitation into the WTO agenda.^[11]

Whereas civil society established coalitions along political lines in 1994, CSOs at present recognize the fundamental need to work together despite ideological differences. For example, Kilusang Mayo Uno (KMU) networks with NGOs in one aspect of advocacy, but finds itself dissenting with the same NGOs on other issues. Action for Economic Reforms (AER) engages other organizations in sustained dialogue as well as healthy debate on various issues, albeit differences in the analyses and positions. Trade Union Congress of the Philippines (TUCP) also supports the engagement and cooperation of trade unions with civil society groups based on issues.

Furthermore, left political blocs try to forge strong solidarity links with other non-state actors, including the Church and progressive nonprofit organizations, to further advance the national anti-globalization movement.

However, groups such as PRRM and Alliance of Progressive Labor (APL) still caution against the loose definition of civil society cooperation. The present dynamics of civil society is still, they assert, ideological. In the end, collaboration may be constrained by irreconcilable divergences in strategies and approaches. The key organizational node is merely the opposition to the negative impact on globalization.

C. Creating a Global Civil Society

It is probably a mere coincidence that the technology, which fuels the engines of globalization, has also made transborder citizen activity possible. Indeed, not only has advancement in information technology laid the infrastructure for capital mobility and internationalized the operations

of transnational corporations, but created an arena where groups, once isolated and confined to their own national causes, communicate and share information on common concerns.

Aside from technology, the emergence of ‘new centers of authority,’^[12] such as regional regulatory bodies, has necessitated citizen activity to transcend territorial geography. In the present world order, states do not have monopoly of governance. Thus, it seems most likely that civil society will take advantage of this dispersal of authority. After all, engaging the state alone, which has already been undermined, prove to be futile when not complemented with a direct lobby on global institutions.

Philippine civil society has encouraged international solidarity in any global issue. The common contention is that civil society can argue better in the WTO as a group. A critical mass at the global level cannot be easily discounted.

Left political blocs stress on building a global movement that is multi-cultural, inter-racial, and culturally sensitive. The emphasis probably comes from the sentiments on the North-South divide among NGOs. Bello explains that Northern NGOs are focused on single issues, while their Southern counterparts are more comprehensive in their concerns.^[13] Moreover, in addition to having greater resources for international action and policy engagements, the prominence of Northern NGOs may cloud and weaken the prospects of Southern NGOs to influence global institutions.^[14] Consequently, CSOs call for a global civil society with a common identity and a unified position. They, however, warn Philippine CSOs from adopting a Northern agenda and allowing their advocacies to be filtered by the Northern NGOs in the name of solidarity.

Sectoral groups share the same view. But some NGOs and POs still believe that it is to their advantage to develop working relations with international NGOs that have strong political influence in the global field.

On the contrary, national policy research NGOs form and build regional and international alliances to promote closer coordination of research, analysis and formulation of alternative economic initiatives, and to further strengthen the influence of policy research organizations in trade negotiations.

Pressure Politics

The burden of civil society as service/welfare provider, guardian and change-agent in a political and economic environment increasingly transcending state borders has further enhanced its capacity to utilize all mechanisms of coercion, inclusion and influence. The nature of its being outside state and market control has enabled civil society to tap creative and popular forms of participation. As such, irrespective of whether the goal is to change or defend society or a social order, social movements depend on protests and participation to pursue their goals. Its reliance on popular mobilizations to contest political and economic power is due in large to its lack of direct control on the holders of formal power, such as the state, multilateral economic institutions (MEIs) or transnational corporations.

However, for civil society to perform its guardian and advocate role, it must learn to permeate, access and engage the state.^[15] The constitutional and legal/policy milieu has mandated the creation of venues and mechanisms for consultation and active involvement of civil society in governance and policy-making. With globalization, though, civil society is not limited to the state. Globalization has, indeed opened up different arenas, although inadequate, for civil society engagement, such as the three multilateral economic institutions (WTO, WB and IMF) and the United Nations.

Civil society employs all legitimate tools and tactics, which range from dialogue and coalition-building on specific projects and policies, through non-violent confrontations and protests, when indispensable. The study found two ways civil society shape and intervene in official decision-making processes nationally and globally. One is the use of direct action and street campaigns as vehicles for social change. The other is through maximizing the use of formal venues such as engaging institutions of political and economic power.

All of the groups included in the study still adhere to the conventional forms of protests. Mass actions are held in the streets. CSOs hold rallies, demonstrations and local and general strikes to show strength and pressure. The usual 'parliament in the streets' is still observed as the real dome where power should be dissolved.

The 'Battle in Seattle' however ushered in and proved the viability of new concepts of campaign protest strategies. Almost all of the organizations in the study participated in Seattle, in which they used direct action and civil disobedience to disrupt the proceedings and influence the agenda of the WTO. Direct action as a tool of a campaign is strongly advocated by Greenpeace, which protests under the credo of active non-violence.

Aside from anti-WTO protests, social movements have challenged the global agenda-setting conferences by organizing parallel or alternative conferences alongside the official event. This is seen, for instance, in the annual gathering of social movements and anti-globalization activists in the World Social Forum (WSF), which incidentally takes place alongside the meeting of leading adherents and thinkers of corporate globalization, the World Economic Forum. Apart from representing a space for movements to meet, network, discuss and flesh out alternatives to the dominant model, WSF is also an occasion to launch protest demonstrations on pressing issues.

Utilizing the formal means of lobbying, civil society participates in all dialogues, summits and consultations with government and international organizations on WTO agreements. Civil society, particularly trade unions, peasants and fisherfolks, and indigenous peoples, for example, engage all branches of the government, but in critical cooperation in its bid to ensure that the basic sectors' perspectives and concerns are always integrated in the administration's decision-making processes. Moreover, the decentralization of power and authority has given broader opportunities for CSOs to engage the government.

Philippine Association for Intercultural Development (PAFID) and Tebtebba Foundation, Inc. discuss with the National Commission on Indigenous Peoples and local government units on development projects in ancestral lands. Philippine Peasant Institute (PPI) and Pambansang Kilusan ng mga Samahang Magsasaka (PAKISAMA) sit in the Task Force on WTO Agreement on Agriculture Renegotiations (TF-WAAR) of the Department of Agriculture. The task force is composed of representatives from government and various agricultural stakeholders' groups, including the agro-industry, and is mandated to formulate and recommend the Philippine's position in the agricultural agreement renegotiations in the GATT-WTO. At the global level, Greenpeace International has observer or consultative status in approximately 100 intergovernmental fora. It has had Consultative Category II with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations since 1988. Tebtebba is also NGO in Special Consultative Status with the same council in the UN.

The party-list system has also offered a gateway for CSOs to take part in the legislative process. Two of the left political blocs in the study, Akbayan and Bayan Muna, have seats in Philippine Congress. Further, both parties are members of the House Special Committee on Globalization. As representatives of marginalized sectors, they ensure that the interests of the people whom they uphold penetrate the legislature. They hold regular talks

and joint efforts with NGOs and POs in their attempt to guarantee that the Congress supports the people's agenda on globalization.

Informal means of intervention is also a possible option for CSOs at the national level. Aside from the gains obtained from formal lobbying, the use of 'back-door' tactics ^[16] can be an entry point for POs and NGOs to raise concerns and influence policies, especially when consultation and representations are severely lacking. Most CSOs, for instance, establish good working relations with party-list representatives like Akbayan and Bayan Muna. Furthermore, PAMALAKAYA also encourages forming alliances with individual members of Congress and Senate who show interest and raise concerns on the different policies of the government on globalization. ^[17]

In contrast, national policy research and/or network NGOs influence the policy-making processes through research and analysis conveyed in books and other published works. They participate and sponsor meetings, conferences and dialogues at the national, regional and international levels in which they shape the processes and policies through research, analysis and formulation of alternative economic paradigms. Ibon Foundation, Inc., for instance, has had experience with lobbying through research. "Senators and congressmen come to us and ask for justification of certain bills," says Guzman. "Recently, we are being asked to present our rationale for our proposal to reverse the trend of liberalization of rice importation."

We see that civil society's relations with the institutions of political and economic power are in different levels, a clear indicator that governance in the new order has become multi-layered. CSOs who are grassroots or community-based in their approach may find it more practical and effective to engage local government units, while organizations with the resources, capacity and political clout to intervene with the policy-making and implementing bodies may take advantage of opportunities, such as representation, debate and active advocacy work.

Alternatively, CSOs, especially national policy research and/or network NGOs and issue-based/sectoral groups, may have more room for engagement and influence in institutions beyond the state. Some of these are the regional regulation bodies such as Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) or the multilateral organizations themselves.

The political landscape for each level may vary, but the democratic space for participation and involvement in the globalization processes is widening. Although NGOs and POs do not come up with a unified political

action on globalization, the employment of various tactics, from mass actions to lobbying and representation, make them a critical mass to reckon with. Mobilizations show organization, strength and concrete manifestation of opposition, while formal and informal engagements of the state and MEIs demonstrate critical collaboration, and willingness to make use of the processes of consultation and representation. In practice, both options are usually pursued.

Building Knowledge and Elevating People's Consciousness

Civil society is known to improve and increase understanding of different issues, such as globalization, by being an instrument for civic education. Numerous studies by independent think-tank organizations have influenced public opinion and have shaped government policies and programs. Campaigns cannot be effectively realized without proper research while advocacies are half-baked or at the least empty without a firm grasp by affected sectors.

In the case of globalization, civil society has done more than its share of informing the majority of the population of the debates surrounding the issue. However, the objectives and methods of building knowledge and social consciousness vary among the types of organizations in the study.

Left political blocs utilize education to expose the destructive schemes and negative impact of programs and policies of globalization in the Philippines and worldwide. They aim to mainstream the issue of globalization through 'alternative classrooms' and 'teach-ins' during mass actions in the streets and organized multi-sectoral assemblies.

National policy research and/or network organizations, in contrast, attempt to broaden policy choices of NGOs and other civil society groups by presenting a different direction of looking at the issues. By doing research on key aspects of globalization, such as trade liberalization and its impact on the Philippine economy, new perspectives are made available not just for civic education but as a legitimization of certain positions and analyses taken by the critics of globalization. Also, impact studies serve as a 'wake-up call' and substantiation of claims made by certain groups, whether advocates or detractors of globalization. As such, research/network NGOs draw heavily on the academe as a venue to spread their research. In addition, think-tank organizations carry out massive information campaign on globalization through the use of popular and interactive media. Through exploiting the technological advancements made available by globalization

itself, civil society under this category, can coordinate and popularize local studies on globalization with their counterparts all over the globe.

Focus on the Global South, for instance, promotes alternative ideas, paradigms, institutions and global and regional arrangements based on expanded equality, sustainability and democracy at the national, regional and international levels. It undertakes regular research and monitoring of trade agreements entered in by the government, poverty reduction strategies of the IMF-WB in the Philippines and privatization of basic services and critical industries. To reach a large number of CSOs and individuals, it electronically publishes an e-newsletter, *Focus on the Philippines*. Network NGOs like Philippine Development NGOs for International Concerns (PHILINK) also exchange information among its members and other networks where it is involved (such as Asia Caucus) to help member organizations determine or refine their own positions and analyses of globalization from which they will base their own agenda for action.

Like left political blocs, sectoral organizations endeavor to educate their constituency and major stakeholders on the real meaning of globalization as observed through the eyes of peasants, fisherfolks, workers, women, indigenous peoples and other groups affected by the present system of globalization. Their approach is not to develop an alternative model or to contribute to the theoretical discourse on globalization. On the contrary, their focus is confined to the impact of globalization on their own sectors. With the intention of raising greater consciousness, sectoral groups build awareness on the trade accord – its decision-making processes and implementation – through in-depth researches and policy analyses, educational discussions, use of popular media, and fact-finding missions and case studies. Additionally, they make use of development education through hosting of study/exposure visits, international exchanges and sponsoring lectures, or film showing on urgent issues of globalization.

NGOs and POs under this type have raised concerns on the growing perplexity of affected sectors on the issue. Within sector, while NGOs and POs continue to argue on what position and actions to take, their constituents remain indifferent because of uncertainty, or at the worst sheer ignorance, of the effects of globalization on their lives.

According to Kilusan para sa Pambansang Demokrasya (KPD), *“Tingin namin mababa ang awareness ng mamamayan sa globalisasyon. Hindi nila maidugtong ang kahirapan nila sa globalisasyon. Siyempre para sa mulat o progresibo, walang problema dahil may pinag-aralan at naiintindihan. Ang problema ay paano mauunawaan ng ordinaryong mamamayan na ang kanyang kagutuman at kahirapan ay sanhi ng mga programang pang-ekonomiya ng gobyerno na may kinalaman sa*

globalisasyon.” (We think that the awareness of ordinary people on globalization is low. They cannot relate their poverty to globalization. Of course, for those who are more aware and progressive, they know because they are educated. The problem is on how we can make an ordinary person understand that his or her poverty is due in large to the economic programs and policies of the government, which are anchored to globalization.)

PAFID also shares this view, “*Ano ang link ng globalisasyon sa kanilang kabuhayan? Naiintindihan ba nila na kaya sila naghihirap ay dahil may WTO na nagpapahirap sa kanila...* They would rather point to bad management and at the worst, they say that it is their fate to be poor.” (What is the link of globalization to their livelihood? Do they understand that the reason for their poverty is WTO?)

Hence, CSOs have taken initiatives to widen the debate on globalization and make it as inclusive as possible by presenting pragmatic issues in popular format to reach the grassroots. The common medium used by sectoral groups is still print, where debates on globalization issues are presented in comics and primers using the Filipino language or local vernacular. Sectoral groups also conduct regular educational discussions and seminars on thematic issues.

Building knowledge and consciousness on the issue of globalization is complementary to the first two actions discussed. Whether the intention is to fuel debate (as the case left political blocs), to explore and give birth to new paradigms (which national policy research and/or network NGOs embark on) or to educate constituents (as advocated by sectoral groups), education remains a crucial strategy of civil society to deal with the different issues posed by the global environment.

Civil Society and the Alternative to Globalization

Civil society organizations, especially social movements around the globe, have an echoing call that ‘another world is possible’ amidst an order that is threatening to propagate the ideals of neo-liberal globalization. The plea of world social movements has resonated from the streets of Porto Alegre to Doha, Florence, Johannesburg, Hyderabad and Washington DC.

Critics have been maligning the actions of many of these civil society organizations, saying that their views spring from ignorance and over-interpretation of isolated cases where neo-liberal paradigm has failed. Moreover, staunch disciples of globalization have been begging civil society for an alternative.

The resistance of critical segments of civil society to corporate globalization is not merely manifested in the emancipation of marginalized sectors from the local to global. Pieterse emphasized the need for civil society to go beyond the politics of resistance and protest and move from critique to construction, from struggle to transformation, and from opposition to proposition.^[18] He further stressed the need for civil society to take a proactive stance and make global reform proposals part of its agenda.

The collapse of the Seattle Ministerial and the annual gathering of social and political movements in Porto Alegre can be carelessly construed as a show of force and clamor. But the old saying that “empty cans produce a lot of noise” does not hold true for civil society, for it has continuously stimulated debate, debunked the myths of neo-liberalism, and laid out a people-centered alternative to corporate globalization. But what have been the policy directions taken by civil society in its pursuit of a more humane global order?

On top of disagreeing about definitions, policy areas and actions, CSOs have also taken different courses to a more equitable future. The theoretical and conceptual foundations of globalization point to several policy proposals which anti-globalization activists have long been promoting. Scholte explains two types of proposition: *reformism*, which posits that capitalism does bring forth economic prosperity but requires properly drafted and implemented public policies; and, *radicalism*, which seeks to address deeper structural causes of the ills of globalization.^[19]

The recommendations of Philippine civil society, though, cannot be reduced and categorically labeled according to the above-mentioned policy courses. Also, the advocacies of civil society do not necessarily make a Medium Term Philippine Development Plan style of economic agenda. The basis of their proposals, after all, stems from their understanding of globalization and what they perceive as problem areas that need to be addressed. This part of the chapter merely surveys the different advocacies, alternatives and visions of civil society in the Philippines. Whether the respondents are reformist or radical in their approaches, their proposals cannot be simply isolated and branded as such. But rather, their framework of analysis of key policy areas according to their own comprehension (ideological or pragmatic), as discussed in the previous chapters, has more to do with the advocacies which follow. While the responses were multi-faceted, the study was able to classify them in relation to the level of policy reforms and to the functions of governing institutions.

One is on advocacies to modify the present *national policies* of the government related to globalization. This typology is further categorized into: fiscal and monetary, industry, trade, food production, labor, culture and environment. In connection with these, the *role of the Philippine government* is gravely being questioned. Thus, there have been efforts to alter the governance function of the state, urging for reforms not just on its policies, but also, on its responsibility to its people.

Moving up to another tier, there is an overarching demand to examine the *role of regional blocs and groupings*. Do they still matter in the world politics now being redefined and practiced by the WTO or the IMF-WB? As a venue for economic cooperation, how can they be further exploited?

Furthermore, CSOs have also made recommendations to address *policies of the multilateral economic institutions*, specifically to contest the power of the three instruments of globalization in shaping policies of nation-states.

Reviewing and/or Transforming National Policies

The Philippines has not been able to reap the benefits of globalization due to its lack of domestic economic capacity. Compounded with a weak social infrastructure and economic mismanagement, it was in a weak position to take on the challenges of globalization to begin with. It is therefore not surprising that civil society has put the transformation of national policies on top of their list. Table 2 summarizes the policy choices promoted by CSOs.

Table 2. Proposals of Civil Society on National Policies

National Policies	Left Political Blocs	National Policy Research and/or Network NGOs	Sectoral and/or Issue-Based Research and Advocacy NGOs
Fiscal and Monetary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Advocate for tax reform ○ Keep interest rates down ○ Institute capital controls 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Encourage investment in infrastructure and productive capacity ○ Establish a nationalized banking system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide investment alternatives such as micro-financing and micro-based marketing system
Industrial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Pursue national industrialization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Force companies and businesses to 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Protect infant industries until they are able to compete both in the domestic and world markets ○ Stop privatizing industries needed for national industrialization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ have corporate social responsibility 	
Trade	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Propose selective liberalization with protected industries ○ Re-introduce and use responsibly all range of protectionist controls 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Break the perennial trade imbalance due to dependence on imported inputs and low value-added exports ○ Regulate the export of extractive raw materials ○ Work out mutually beneficial trade and exchange of technology and information ○ Implement a program that develops global competitiveness of high value-added products ○ Oppose unbridled and aggressive liberalization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Investigate the smuggling of meat products and increase tariff of poultry and livestock ○ Establish an alternative local trading system ○ Oppose Executive Order 254 or the Early Voluntary Sector Liberalization
Food Production	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Pursue genuine land reform ○ Take agriculture out of the WTO ○ Lay out a workable, strategic plan to address food security 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Develop own agriculture along subsistence level ○ Institute safety nets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Farm according to capacity of nature with less external inputs ○ Promote sustainable agriculture and diversified farming ○ Advocate for safety nets of farmers in anticipation of crop failures

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Give back to the community the control of food ○ Strengthen municipal fishing
Labor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Promote, implement and strengthen the Core Labor Standards of the ILO ○ Review and introduce changes in the Labor Code ○ Re-introduce and incorporate the social clause ○ Put in place programs to help workers ○ Lobby for a living wage
Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Uphold the UN Convention on Biological Diversity and Climate Change ○ Review and amend the Philippine Mining Act of 1995
Culture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Include cultural resource management and cultural diversity in the development paradigm ○ Implement the Indigenous Peoples Rights Act (IPRA)

A. Fiscal and Monetary

The Asian Financial Crisis has situated the re-examination and amendment of fiscal and monetary policies in the main agenda of CSOs. The main argument is that the government is too fixated on speculative investment. Rather than encouraging concrete investment to generate revenue and employment, the government is providing too much incentives, such as tax breaks and repatriation of capital, that are not for mutual benefit. As a result, gains are gradually decreased. An incentive for investors has become a loss for the Philippines.

CSOs propose to institute capital controls and encourage investment in infrastructure and productive capacity instead of real estate speculation. Ibon also recommends the establishment of a nationalized banking system where the banks are more in control of capital coming in and out of the economy. In such a way, valuable resources are invested in the national economy.

Furthermore, Akbayan advocates for tax reform not just as a redistributive measure but also to provide more revenue for the government. In relation to this, interest rates should be kept down by preventing government from excessive competing with the private sector through unnecessary spending and domestic borrowing.

B. Industrial

Industrial policy remains dependent on foreign trade, as maintained by CSOs. Thus, the economic downturn of major trading partners such as the United States and Japan has severe implications for the Philippine industries to achieve a long-term strategy for growth. Sticking to a policy, which ties the economy to exports and foreign investments when neither is forthcoming, is not doing a good deal to the already sluggish economy.

Within this context, CSOs have been pushing for industrial development that is sustainable and appropriate to the Philippines' economic setting. Akbayan proposes a strategy for industrialization based on the use of resources that the country has in relative abundance, as well as its perceived comparative advantage. It also highlights the rural focus of industrial policy to reduce poverty in the countryside. Moreover, Akbayan believes that 'the core of what is known as industrial policy is the protection of infant industries until they are able to compete both in a competitive domestic market and are able to establish firm footholds in foreign markets.'^[20] In order to spur production at the local level and tap alternative markets, Kasarian-Kalayaan (SARILAYA) also finds it

favorable to provide investment options to small and medium enterprises, such as micro-finance and micro-based market systems.

Bayan Muna and Ibon advocate national industrialization that builds a modern and diversified economy with an independent and ecologically friendly technological base. To break the system of industrialization that is contingent on foreign trade, they also recommend to stop privatizing industries needed for national industrialization, such as steel and cement.

At the firm level, Foundation for Economic Freedom (FEF) recommends to force companies and business to have corporate social responsibility on market failures and externalities such pollution, safety and health standards, work conditions, as well as the conditions and prospects of the communities they affect.

C. Trade

Cognizant that the outward-looking stance of Philippine government on trade may reap benefits in the short run, but may eventually weaken without the proper economic and political infrastructure, CSOs have long been encouraging the government to review this policy, even before the country's membership in the WTO. From import-substitution to export-oriented industrialization, the Philippine economy has lagged behind its bilateral trading allies. With the present trading system and a regulatory body that wields too much power in the global trade regime, the Philippines stands to lose more than it bargained for.

Groups like Bayan Muna and Ibon have advocated re-introducing and using responsibly all range of protectionist controls like tariffs, import regulation and credit support to keep local industries from taking a route to their own demise. The unbridled and aggressive liberalization that took place over the past seven years have pulled the plug on industries, which were struggling to boost the economy. In their view, protectionism is the only guaranteed way to develop domestic industry.

In contrast, Akbayan proposes selective liberalization with protected industries selected on the basis of a long-term strategy for industrialization. Protection will be limited to a specific number of years and will be allocated based on strict performance targets. Freedom from Debt Coalition (FDC) also promotes the adoption of a democratic trade policy, aimed at developing domestic productivity, ensuring food security, providing for gainful employment for Filipinos, maximizing the strength of the Philippine economy in global trade, and developing mutually beneficial economic relationships. [\[21\]](#)

The advocacies of sectoral groups, on the other hand, are limited to their own areas of concern. For example, Limcoma pressures the government to create a task force which will investigate the smuggling of meat products in the country, apart from its call to increase tariff of poultry and livestock as an anti-dumping measure. Demokratikong Magbubukid ng Sultan Kudarat (DEMASKU) recommends the establishment of an alternative local trading system composed of local communities, which shall ensure the promotion of local products. PAMALAKAYA has also taken actions to oppose Executive Order 254^[22] or the Early Voluntary Sector Liberalization.

Other recommendations on trade are regulation of the export of extractive raw materials, development of competitiveness of high value-added products and favorable exchange of technology and information with other countries.

D. Food Production

Agriculture and fisheries in the age of globalization have moved from traditional local production based on subsistence to one that has put a premium, at least for developed countries, on global market access. Even before the Agreement on Agriculture, there existed a trend towards agricultural liberalization. Since the 80s, there was an effort to slowly decrease support for domestic agriculture and reduce tariffs of imported agricultural products.

Civil society, especially peasant organizations, has been very critical and doubtful about the promises of agricultural liberalization. First of all, for the farmers of developing countries, agriculture is not just an economic activity. It is also a way of life. By submitting agriculture under the control of multinational companies and the WTO, small farmers lose not only their sources of their income, but the basis for their existence.

The proposals of CSOs on the agricultural policy of the government come from the qualms on the foundations of global food production. Studies of NGOs and POs, and academic institutions have further reinforced the flawed assumptions of the strong supporters of agricultural liberalization.

There is a common call in Philippine civil society to take 'agriculture out of the WTO' or 'WTO out of agriculture.' PRRM believes that global agricultural trade functions as an agent of multinational corporations and of big giants like Cargill, Purina and Monsanto. PPI terms

the quantitative restrictions on rice importation as its 'last frontier' against rapid agricultural liberalization.^[23] By surrendering basic agricultural crops to the rules of the Agreement on Agriculture, such as reduction of restrictions, not only is the livelihood of small farmers endangered, but food security is jeopardized as well.

Citizens Alliance for Consumer Protection (CACCP) also advocates getting agriculture out of the trade regime, arguing that consumer's access to more affordable agricultural commodities should not be the foundation of its inclusion in the WTO agreements.

In addition, peasant groups (PPI, PAKISAMA and Mindanao Rural Congress) and PRRM also lobby for safety nets of farmers, to give budget allocation for anticipation of crop failures that result from seasonal changes and insect attacks. There is also a proposal to abandon reliance on farming techniques which are damaging to the environment and to people, and promote traditional, sustainable, ecological agriculture which gives emphasis to farming according to the capacity of nature and use of less external inputs. To strengthen capacities of farmers and develop native farming methods, DEMASKU advocates the establishment of alternative peasant agricultural institutions or farm field schools.

On the other hand, in the fisheries sector, Sentro sa Ikaunlad ng Katutubong Agham at Teknolohiya (SIKAT) asks the government to strengthen municipal fishing through the Fisheries and Aquatic Resource Management Council. It supports the development of fisheries along subsistence level.

CSOs have also expressed exasperation over the long-drawn-out agrarian reform program of the government, which has contributed to the low volume of production in agriculture. Akbayan has included land reform in its economic platform, contending its necessity not just for social justice, but also as a prerequisite to the modernization of Philippine agriculture. Modernization, after all, cannot take place with tenancy. Supporting this need for land redistribution, Bayan Muna maintains that genuine agrarian reform will unleash the potential of the peasantry who constitute the majority of the Filipino people. Therefore, the monopoly of countryside elites over rural economic and political power needs to be dismantled.

E. Labor

Labor unions struggle to cushion the impact of trade liberalization by pushing for reforms in national labor policies. However, in cases when push comes to shove, trade unions lobby global institutions directly and

demand for the incorporation of Core Labor Standards of the International Labor Organization (ILO) in the multilateral trade agreements.

APL urges the government to review and introduce changes in the Labor Code, with the end in view of strengthening workers' and trade union rights, including the removal of all obstacles to trade union formation, granting of multiple forms of workers' organization, and development of various modes of bargaining. This rationale for amending the Labor Code is however in contrast with the objective of the state and business. While the government and employers see the change in the Code as a necessity, they see it from a discrete vantage point. Essentially, it is for the institutionalization of labor flexibility in the country.

KMU sees national labor policies as prohibitive and restrictive, in order that government can control unrest in the workplace. The unwritten "no strike, no lockout" policy connotes further withering of trade union rights in favor of capital.

Bukluran ng Manggagawang Pilipino (BMP) encourages labor unions to unify their positions in order to lobby for living wage. A minimum wage policy is not sufficient to alleviate the poverty of exploited workers. Worse, violations of minimum wage are widespread, as multinational corporations continue to exercise exclusive prerogative on wages.

To ease the adverse effects of capital flight and business closures wrought by globalization, such as retrenchment, TUCP recommends to put in place programs to help workers, such as skills training. The issue, TUCP explains, is not just the vulnerability of workers' security of tenure because of closure and shut-downs, but also the obsolescence of the nature and type of work. It is therefore important to prepare the workers to new forms of work, apart from their technical competence in the traditional production line. TUCP also advocates the incorporation of the social clause and safety nets in the trade accord.

F. Environmental

Greenpeace, PAFID and Tebtebba are one in pressuring the government to uphold the UN Convention on Biological Diversity and Climate Change. At the local level, there is a collective demand to control construction of development projects, such as mines and dams, not only for ecological purposes, but to preserve the right of indigenous peoples to their own ancestral domains. In connection with this, a review and possible amendment of the Philippine Mining Act of 1995 is considered necessary.

G. Culture

As homogenization, Westernization and marginalization of traditional cultures are also key areas of concern for civil society, one advocacy domain is on resistance to cultural aggression. Albeit the absence of a specific cultural policy in which NGOs and POs could engage the government and exert pressure for reforms, CSOs like UGAT and PAFID realize the need to include cultural resource management and cultural diversity in the development paradigm being pushed by globalization. With regard to cultural minorities, there is a strong call to defend their rights to their environment and culture by strictly implementing the Indigenous Peoples Rights Act (IPRA), which was created through the lobbying efforts of civil society.

'Re-instituting' and Strengthening the Role of the Government

In the present system of global governance, civil society has expressed reservations on the capacity of the state to uphold the interests of its people. Its functions, after all, have already been diminished. Other NGOs see the retreat of the state to its traditional role – maintenance of peace and order, collection of taxes, building of infrastructure, etc. – and full submission to market forces.

Civil society has thus advocated for the resurgence of the state. Akbayan believes that the country's economic future can only be secured by putting in place an accountable and a strong, activist government that exhibits strong regulatory framework, negotiates with foreign governments and MNCs, and provides a long term economic plan for the majority and not for the selected few. ^[24]_____

Padayon also urges the government not to yield to, but rather regulate, the market to make it address developmental challenges like inequality and poverty. Likewise, Pandayan para sa Sosyalistang Pilipinas sees the privatization of basic utilities and social services as a move to further aggravate the destitution of majority of the people. As the state rids itself of responsibilities and leaves the market to deliver public goods and services, people are subjected to the rules of profit. "The government should ensure that the economy is equitable, environmentally sound, and sustainable and upholds basic human rights," Sosyalistang Partido ng Paggawa (SPP) adds.

In contrast, FEF believes that the government should take advantage of globalization, by making national policies more responsive to its opportunities.

Whether the goal is to protect the interests of the majority of the people against the offensive of market forces, or to exploit the prospects of the free market economy, civil society advocates the strengthening of the role of the government, and the deepening and broadening of democratic processes in the Philippine political sphere.

Assessing the Role of Regional Groupings

From bolstering the role of the state in the multi-layered governance, civil society also deems necessary the strengthening of regional blocs or groupings. Sanlakas, for example, recommends the establishment of an international body composed of states, not individual elites, based on genuine cooperation. On the other hand, Focus proposes the revitalization of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) in Southeast Asia, along with other evolving economic blocs, such as Mercado Comun del Sur (Mercosur) in Latin America, South Asia Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) in South Asia, and South African Development Cooperation Conference (SADCC) in South Africa. Bello explains that a key to “strengthening” is making sure these formations evolve in a people oriented direction and cease to remain regional elite projects. [25] _____

PPI and SIKAT, along with other agricultural organizations, also clamor for the abandonment of the Cairns Group, [26] _____ largely because of the group’s deliberate disregard of the advocacies of peasant groups from developing countries. In a statement issued by PPI urging the government to withdraw membership from the Cairns Group, it advocated for the development of alternative linkages and groupings, composed of countries which closely echo the country’s concerns and positions as a developing country. [27] _____

Searching for a New Economic Paradigm: Focus on Multilateral Institutions

Perhaps the most debated area of advocacy among civil society organizations is the policies and role of the WTO, IMF and WB. The ‘Reject-Reform’ debate has, not only invigorated the quest for a sustainable

and equitable economic paradigm, but also intensified polarization of civil society at the national and global spheres.

At the global level, there is the North-South divide. At the national level, apart from schism among groups based on ideological and political lines, there is also a tendency for CSOs to limit themselves on specific areas and remain indifferent on other advocacy points. Strategically, this may prove to be advantageous as groups specialize in a number of policy fields, and collectively spawn an agenda that goes beyond sector-based concerns. But in questioning the role and policies of MEIs, some CSOs, especially sectoral groups, remain policy-oriented in their approach, and have not come up with an encompassing agenda on the institutions of globalization.

However, three popular alternatives have been adopted by civil society. One is through the reform of the WTO, and the other has been to de-link from the system. In between are proponents of what is known as 'deglobalization.' Though it is probably too premature to conclude which organizations are supporters of these three alternatives considering the limited reach of the study, at the end of the chapter, a spectrum of advocacies and alternatives is presented to map the 'reform-reject' debate among the respondents. For the moment, what it can present is the main arguments of the two alternatives to the present role of multilateral economic institutions.

Reform of the WTO

As an institution that exercises too much power, apart from being unaccountable, undemocratic and wanting in transparency, the WTO is seen as the embodiment of the ills of globalization. Compared to the Bretton Woods twins, the WTO is also perceived to be hostile to NGOs.

There is a resounding call among civil society groups to advocate for rule changes in the WTO. WTO, they say, can still be a venue for reforms. And reforms can commence with the creation of rules that are mutually beneficial to developing and highly developed countries. These are:

- o WTO should institute mechanisms of compliance among First World countries on the agricultural agreements and support for agriculture in least developed countries. In relation to this, WTO should strictly impose the removal of subsidies in agriculture given by other countries to create an even playing field.
- o WTO should apply Special and Differential Treatment or special consideration for critical industries in developing and least developed countries.

- o Trade rules should also actively promote and reward production and consumption patterns that are sustainable and environment-friendly. In this connection, WTO members should internalize the costs to nature and the environment into the prices of goods and services.
- o WTO must recognize the Precautionary Principle in its decision-making as a scientifically rigorous approach, consistent with the principles recognized in the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development and other international instruments and declarations. This recognition must include a shift of the burden of proof in dispute settlement proceedings as an integral part of the precautionary principle. [28]
- o The WTO should implement and strengthen the Core Labor Standards of the International Labor Organization in its trade agreements.
- o The WTO urgently needs to improve its transparency, openness and consultation, and cooperate with the United Nations, national governments, regional blocs and NGOs.

In addition to rule changes, further economic liberalization should be put on hold to limit the expansion of the WTO. NGOs have raised concern over the expansive liberalization requirements of services and the possible inclusion of fisheries in the agreements. Until assessments and reforms have been accomplished, further negotiations should be put on hold.

'De-globalize'

Anti-globalization activist and scholar Walden Bello coined the term 'de-globalization' as an alternative system of global economic governance. Although the title has been loosely used by civil society before, 'de-globalization' as an alternative presented by Bello is more than rhetoric, as it outlines a political and economic agenda, which are relevant to both North and South societies.

The term 'de-globalization' however needs to be qualified. To be able to discuss what it is, there is a need first to clarify what it is not. It is not a withdrawal from the international economy. It is not autarky or cutting the country from the rest of the world. It is not total rejection of the market economy. Nor is it 're-tribalization.'

In his new book with the same title, Bello defines 'de-globalization' as the empowerment of the local and the national. It is about:

- o Drawing most of our financial resources for development from within rather than becoming dependent on foreign investment and foreign financial markets;

- Carrying out the long-postponed measures of income redistribution and land redistribution to create a vibrant internal market that would be the anchor of the economy;
- Deemphasizing growth and maximizing equity in order to radically reduce environmental disequilibrium;
- Not leaving strategic economic decisions to the but making them subject to democratic choice;
- Subjecting the private sector and the state to constant monitoring by civil society;
- Creating a new production and exchange complex that includes community cooperatives, private enterprises, and state enterprises, and excludes TNCs;
- Enshrining the principle of subsidiarity in economic life by encouraging production of goods to take place at the community and national level if it can be done so at reasonable cost in order to preserve community. [\[29\]](#)

With respect to the multilateral economic institutions, ‘de-globalization’ advocates not the reform of the WTO, IMF and WB, but through various measures, such as decommission, neuter, and radical reduction of their powers. Moreover, these institutions can be turned into actors coexisting with and being checked by other international organizations, agreements and regional groupings. [\[30\]](#) This complements what has been initially discussed in the proposal to reinvigorate economic blocs and regional groupings.

De-Link from the System

With the perception that the WTO is nothing more than a new brand of re-colonization, some members of civil society believe that it is to the country’s advantage to de-link from the present system and create a self-sufficient economy. Membership to the WTO was the wrong answer to the right questions. The costs of relating to developed countries have far outweighed the benefits it has promised. Rather than working to restructure the multilateral trade regime, Philippine civil society should struggle to establish a social, economic, political and cultural order that will ensure freedom from foreign domination.

Withdrawal from the WTO is a first step, followed by total rejection of unfair and unjust bilateral trade agreements. The solution is still national industrialization as a conscious state effort to develop industries. Bayan Muna, however, qualifies that the issue is not whether the Philippines will relate with other countries or not. But rather, the timing and terms on which the country engages in foreign trade and investment should

be determined by what is needed to develop domestic industry and agriculture to the benefit of the majority of Filipinos.

Alternative to a New World Order?

Some members of civil society, nonetheless, cast doubt on the feasibility and sustainability of the policy proposals and institutional reforms discussed. In the end, the advocacies will merely ameliorate problem areas, while deeper structural flaws continue to persist and breed new ills. 'Because the incorrigible evil of capitalism will continue to flourish,' they maintain. Reforms are fleeting. Eventually, capitalist globalization as an exploitative system will take on different forms.

Several groups like BMP, SPP, Sanlakas and KPD claim that the struggle for national liberation and social revolution is the only route to development for the benefit of the majority. Hence, the solution is not to advocate for reforms, but to work for a socialist world, or 'socialist' globalization that is democratic and pluralist with strong solidarity among workers, peasants, the poor and the oppressed. By taking the radical direction, a society where there is no Third World can be envisioned and eventually realized.

Conclusion

The responses of Philippine civil society organizations to the different issues posed by globalization are diverse and comprehensive. The concrete actions discussed add to the growing modes of resistance and protest, which have sustained and galvanized the role of social movements in the society. It appears, however, that the actions taken by civil society on globalization are not distinct to the issue. Organizing communities and building alliances have been employed in other issues like agrarian reform, debt, and peace and development. The principle of 'expose and oppose' has become the norm to further advance the causes of interest groups and to influence the formal and informal processes laid out by key actors. There were, however, new forms of protest and organization that merit further encouragement, such as the participation in parallel and alternative events alongside global-agenda setting conferences.

Notwithstanding, what is interesting is the dynamics of state- and intra-civil society relations in pushing for a broad and concerted action in confronting globalization. Critical engagement with the state is still deemed fundamental. NGOs and POs have utilized the formal means of intervention as mandated by the legal/policy environment to make the government listen in drafting policies on trade-related issues and in implementing

development projects sponsored by multilateral institutions. But, when there is not enough democratic space for debate, political clout and social capital can be used responsibly by non-state actors.

Within civil society, cooperation is based on issues, tactics and strategies. Ideological and political lines, as well as sector-based concerns, have again constrained civil society to generate a unified position or alternative to globalization. The positions and advocacies of civil society groups concentrated on their areas of concern in which they have been working on long before WTO, IMF and WB re-aligned government policies. Also, civil society organizations which are receptive to institutional and policy reforms, have more opportunities for influence and popular support. Ostensibly, this has earned the ire of some groups who perceive globalization as irrevocable without changing the structures, which stimulate its existence. Confronting the globalization issue should be a struggle to overthrow capitalism in tandem with revolution.

The recognition of actors beyond the state has also defined the actions and advocacies of Philippine civil society. The emergence of a global civil society has facilitated the coordination of actions and advocacies in the global arena. The strengthening of these global movements has increased international solidarity and has made possible the direct lobbying of regional blocs or groupings and the multilateral institutions as well. Civil society has taken advantage of this diffusion of authority and multi-tiered governance to guarantee that the interests of the majority are upheld.

ENDNOTES

[1] See Cajiuat and Regalado, "Dynamics of Civil Society and Government in the GATT-UR Debate in the Philippines: Lessons for Policy Advocacy" in *State-Civil Society Relations in Policy-Making*, Philippine Democracy Agenda (Volume 2)

[2] Eric Gutierrez, "Changing Modes of Political Protest: The Story behind the Battle in Seattle," *Political Brief*, Vol. 7 No. 12, December 1999

[3] See Miriam Coronel Ferrer, "Civil Society: An Operational Definition," in *Democracy and Citizenship in Filipino Political Culture*, Philippine Democracy Agenda (Volume 1)

[4] O'Brien, Robert, Anne Marie Goetz, Jan Aart Scholte and Marc Williams, *Contesting Global Governance Multilateral Economic Institutions and Global Social Movements*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000, p. 12

[5] Ibid.

[6] Major anti-GATT formations during the ratification on the GATT-UR Agreement were Pambansang Ugnayan ng Mamamayan Laban sa GATT (PUMALAG) headed by Kilusang Magbubukid ng Pilipinas (KMP), Pabi-GATT, SANLAKAS headed by Renato Constantino,

Jr., Kilos-reforma Agad sa GATT (Ka-GATT), Philippine Council for Sustainable Development (PCSD) NGO-PO Counterpart, and Farmers Group Coalition. See Cajuat and Regalado for more detailed description on membership and participation.

[7] PUMALAG II is composed of KMP, PAMALAKAYA, Amihan, Kadamay, KAMP, National Federation of Sugar Workers (NFSW), National Food Authority Employees Association (NFA-EA), and the National Federation of Employees in the Department of Agriculture. Rep. Satur Ocampo and Rep. Crispin Beltran of party list Bayan Muna are individual members of PUMALAG II.

[8] The FTA is composed of the Federation of Philippine Industries (FPI), Philippine Cement Corporation (PHILCEMCO), Ceramic Tile Manufacturers' Association (CTMA), Philippine Steelmakers' Association, Philippine Sugar Millers Association (PSMA), National Federation of Labor (NFL), Philippine Ecumenical Action for Community Empowerment (PEACE), National Federation of Labor Unions (NAFLU), National Labor Union (NLU), National Mines and Allied Workers Union (NAMAWU), Unified Filipino Service Workers (UFSW), Association of Democratic Labor Organization (ADLO), Kapatiran ng Kristong Manggagawa (KKMI), Samahan ng Magsasapatos sa Pilipinas, , PARAGOS – Demokratikong Kilusang Magbubukid ng Pilipinas (DKMP), PHILNET-Rural Development Initiatives, Action for Economic Reforms (AER), KASAMA-KA, La Liga: Citizen's Movement for Reform and Renewal, Niugan, Philippine Human Rights Information Center (Philrights), and Citizens' Action for Consumer Protection (CACP). The main convenor of the alliance is former senator and Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement (PRRM) president Wigberto "Bobby" Tañada.

[9] "A Call for National Unity and Change! A Call for Sanity in Trade and Industrial Development!" Unity Statement of the Fair Trade Alliance presented at its launching, October 29, 2001, Hotel Rembrandt, Quezon City

[10] Membership in the Stop-the-New-Round! Coalition-Philippines includes 24 organizations (Action for Economic Reforms, Akbayan! Citizens Party, Alliance of Progressive Labor, Alternate Forum for Research in Mindanao, Bayanihan International Solidarity Secretariat, Center for Agrarian Reform, Empowerment and Transformation, Confederation of Independent Unions in the Public Sector, Focus on the Global South (Philippine Program), Global Network-Philippines, Integrated Rural Development Foundation, Kalayaan, Katapat, Kilusang Mangingisda, Kilusan para sa Pambansang Demokrasya, Kilusang Makabansang Ekonomiya, Labor Education and Research Network, Pambansang Katipunan ng mga Samahan sa Kanayunan, Partnership for Agrarian Reform and Rural Development Services, Peoples' Global Exchange, Philippine Peasant Institute, Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement, Sarilaya, Sanlakas, Southeast Asia Regional Initiatives for Community Empowerment, Tambuyog Development Center and WomanHealth Philippines) and 6 individuals.

[11] <http://www.focusweb.org/publications/Buletins/Fop/2003/Issue9.html>

[12] O'Brien, Robert, et.al., p. 17

[13] Bello, Walden, *The Future in the Balance: Essays on Globalization and Resistance*, Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 2001, p. 228

[14] O'Brien, et. al, p. 14

[15] Wui, Marlon and Ma. Glenda Lopez, "State-Civil Society Relations in Policy-Making," *State-Civil Society Relations in Policy-Making*, Philippine Democracy Agenda (Volume 2), Quezon City: Third World Studies Center, 1998

[16] 'Back-door tactics' was also used during the deliberations on the ratification of the GATT-UR. Civil society groups used their social capital to influence the policy process, from

“wining and dining” to establishing good public relations with members of the Senate and Congress.

[17] These are Rep. Augusto Syjuco, Senators Loren Legarda and Juan Flavier, and former Senator Raul Roco.

[18] Pieterse, Jan Nederveen, “Globalization and Emancipation: From Local Empowerment to Global Reform,” Barry K. Gills, *Globalization and the Politics of Resistance*, London: Macmillan Press Ltd., 2000.

[19] Scholte, Jan Aarte, *Globalization: A Critical Introduction*, London: Macmillan, 2000

[20] The Akbayan! Economic Platform, www.akbayan.org

[21] Freedom from Debt Coalition, “Articles of Association and Mandate Paper,” Quezon City, 2000

[22] Executive Order 254 modifies the rates of duty on certain imported articles as provided for under the Tariff and Customs Code of 1978 to implement the 2000-2003 Philippine schedule of tariff reduction under the accelerated Common Effective Preferential Tariff (CEPT) scheme for the ASEAN Free Trade Area (AFMA). This was issued during the term of former President Joseph Estrada.

[23] Bernabe, Riza, “Rice Trade Liberalization: Endangering Food Security,” www.ppi.org.ph

[24] Akbayan’s Eight Planks of Economic Platform, www.akbayan.org

[25] Bello, Walden, “Prospects for Good Global Governance: The View from the South,” A Report Prepared for the Bundestag, Federal Republic of Germany, April 15, 2002, www.focusweb.org

[26] The Cairns Group is a coalition of agricultural exporting countries, founded in 1986. Members of the Group are: Argentina, Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Indonesia, Malaysia, New Zealand, Paraguay, the Philippines, South Africa, Thailand and Uruguay. The annual ministerial meetings are chaired by the Australian Minister of Trade.

[27] “Leave Cairns Now!” www.ppi.org.ph

[28] “The Greenpeace International Seminars on Safe Trade: The Use of the Precautionary Principle in International Trade,” Report of the seminars held in Seattle, December 1999 and Geneva, March 2000 convened by Greenpeace International, July 2000

[29] Bello, Walden, *De-globalization: Ideas for a New World Economy*, London: Zed Books, 2002

[30] Bello, “Prospects for Good Global Governance,” p. 24