

INTRODUCTION

The globalization process has vastly reorganized the economic, political and socio-cultural structures of many societies and countries of the world today.¹ States have re-aligned their priorities and foreign policies in the name of global competitiveness and economic integration. World economic institutions have been formed to referee the rapidly collapsing trade barriers and facilitate a new world economic order brought about by globalization. Academics in various disciplines have tried to grapple with the notion of globalization by exploring and analyzing its interrelated dimension and implications. Civil society players are redefining their own missions and strategies to be able to expose, counteract, or work with the impact of a globalizing world order on various aspects of social life. The discourse on the globalization phenomenon, has certainly been rich but contentious.

The debate over the nature and trajectory of globalization has been raging in local, regional, and international arenas over the past years. There is recognition of the need for further studies, more dialogues, and various venues that would enable policy-makers, civil society players and the academic community to gain fresh perspectives in analyzing the reality in which current tasks are framed. Before events within the globalizing environment completely overrun the relevance of this inquiry, the need to systematize new concepts and ideas into a more coherent pattern is seen as an important aspect of this over-all effort.

This study compares and contrasts perspectives of selected organized civil society groups in the Philippines *vis- a- vis* the globalization discourse. Civil society groups in the Philippines define and address the impact of globalization on different fronts. Their analyses, positions and responses toward globalization differ based on their understanding of the issue, their expertise, organizational focus and political orientation. This project is intended to consolidate and plot views and responses of selected Philippine civil society groups on contemporary globalization. Divergences and convergences in analyses and responses were identified to arrive at more informed perspectives and understanding of globalization and its impact, especially on the poor and on the country's development processes.

This is not a reinvention of the globalization "wheel". This exploratory study does not begin with a new canvass but it unfolds the different shades of globalization as painted by its skeptics and detractors. This research initiative presents the perspectives and positions of a particular segment of Philippine civil society that addresses and confronts the challenges of globalization. It examines the phenomenon as viewed by selected major Philippine civil society organizations that have so far been critical or wary about the globalization issue. This work serves to provide material for studies

on the role played by civil society. It goes a step further by examining similarities and differences among closely held views and convictions professed by these selected organizations in order to better understand the globalization phenomenon as well as contemporary Philippine civil society dynamics.

The specific objectives of this study are:

- to identify the definitions, positions, and responses on globalization of major civil society groups in the Philippines;
- to define areas of convergence and divergence useful for policy, research and advocacy;
- to extract new perspectives and understanding of globalization through comparative analyses of responses and participatory discussion;
- to facilitate networking among groups/individuals in areas of convergence; and
- to develop an action agenda on globalization useful to civil society groups and policy makers.

This qualitative study had two phases. The data-collection process constituted the first phase. The methods employed include:

- guided interview of key informants (appointed spokespersons) from the identified civil society groups/organizations; and
- content analysis of organizational brochures, statements and other papers, as well as books, journal and magazines articles, and newspaper reports.

The responses of the interviewed spokespersons of each organization were correlated to issued organizational statements and by questions that verify the consistency of responses (see Box 1 for the questionnaire). The second phase was the validation phase, which included:

- a presentation of findings in the Center's Globalization Summer Certificate Course held in May 2002;
 - an in-house validation workshop on November 25, 2002;
 - a validation workshop with the respondents in November 28, 2002;
- and
- focused group discussions with other organizations to validate and analyze convergences and divergences in perspectives were conducted on December 14, 2002. This phase was undertaken to confirm, clarify and validate initial interview responses through the presentation and distribution of findings and analysis of the study.

This is a short-term preliminary study that was conducted in less than nine months (November 2001 – July 2002) such that majority of the groups covered are Metro Manila-based with three organizations from Mindanao and three from Northern Luzon. Although this study hopes to evolve a synthesis, generate new insights and frameworks, and, possibly, develop an action agenda, it does not feign extensiveness. The choice of target respondents in

this study presents the scope as well as, the limitation of this study. This study purposively identified groups that were deemed critical or wary of the globalization phenomenon so, it does not include the whole spectrum of civil society groups in the country. It only targeted specific civil society groups that fall within the left-to-center segment of the political spectrum. The choice of this particular segment was done following the more exclusive definition of civil society use by Karina David, which is: “*the totality of these self-conscious organizations that are accountable to a defined constituency, that contest the power of the state and insist on a culture of involvement*” (italicized for emphasis).² This definition in effect delimits the coverage of this study to those non-state actors and institutions that promote alternative development or political agenda, that question dominant or mainstream economic or political policies and contest the state in the process.

Box 1. Outline of Interview Questions

OUTLINE OF INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

A. Organizational Profile:

1. How would you classify your organization? (*Ano ang uri ng inyong organisasyon?*)
 - Advocacy
 - Political
 - Issue-based
 - Development
 - Sectoral
 - Community-based
 - Others
2. When was the organization founded? (*Kailan itinatag ang inyong organisasyon?*)
3. What is your organizational composition or membership? (*Ano ang komposisyon ng inyong miyembro o base?*)
4. What are your organization’s program/actions? (*Anu-ano ang mga programa ng inyong organisasyon?*)

B. On Globalization:

1. What is your organization’s definition/understanding of globalization? (*Papaano ninyo binibigyang kahulugan ang globalisasyon? Ano ang pagkakaintindi ninyo sa globalisasyon?*)
2. What are the possible effects/implications of globalization on your constituency? (*Ano ang implikasyon ng globalisasyon sa inyong mga miyembro?*)
3. What are the key policy areas of concern on globalization in which your organization is involved? (*Anu-anong aspeto ng globalisasyon ang pinagtutuunan ng pansin ng inyong organisasyon? Aling aspeto ng globalisasyon ang kinikilusan ng inyong organisasyon?*)
4. What is your position and/or analyses on these areas? (*Anu-ano ang inyong posisyon o pagsusuri sa mga aspetong ito?*)
5. What are your actions and responses to these key policy areas on globalization? (*Anu-ano ang inyong mga pagkilos upang labanan o suportahan ang mga aspetong ito ng globalisasyon?*)
6. How does your organization interact with the State and other civil society

groups in opposing/promoting globalization? (*Paano kayo nakikipag-ugnay sa estado at iba pang organisasyon sa pagkilos upang labanan/suportahan ang mga aspetong ito ng globalisasyon?*)

7. If you are opposed to these identified aspects of globalization, what are your alternatives? (*Kung kayo ay hindi sang-ayun sa mga aspetong nabanggit, ano ang inyong mga alternatibo?*)

Globalization and Civil Society: Conceptual Overview

The collection of scholarly writings on globalization and civil society is quite numerous. Globalization has been examined and scrutinized largely within the halls of the academe yet materials that deal with Philippine civil society groups as they understand globalization remain scarce. The publication of the Institute for Labor Studies conducted in 1999 is notable for examining globalization specifically from the perspective of trade unions. The ILS published the proceedings of the roundtable discussions and workshops conducted in the three major regions of the Philippines: Luzon, Visayas and Mindanao. This published material includes a mapping of responses of specific trade unions and their understanding of globalization, the macro and micro issues that they highlight and their recommendations, as well. The material presents a mapping of perspectives from the viewpoints of trade unions, management and government.³

The next few pages survey related literature on either globalization or civil society that were useful in the conduct of this study.

Globalization

At first glance, the mainstream understanding of globalization stresses the radical transformation of the economic environment at the local, regional and global level. Noted Filipino economists led by Cayetano Paderanga examined the economic ramifications of globalization as the “opening up of national markets to cross-border flows of goods and capital.”⁴ The mobility of goods and capital has led to the globalization of economic activities and increasing interdependence among diverse economies. Basically, such mobility is market-driven.

In the book “*The Lexus and the Olive Tree: Understanding Globalization*” (1999),⁵ Friedman argued that globalization is not just a passing trend but the emerging new international order, and that the impact of globalization is brutal in some countries and benign in others. He emphasized the power of technology, capital and information access across national borders to effect political, economic and social change across nations. While the tension is wreaking havoc between traditional forces and the rapidly globalizing world, Friedman perceives a fluid global environment in search of a balance.

Paul Hirst and Grahame Thompson in an article entitled “*Globalization, Governance and Nation State*” published in the book “*Globalization in Question: The International Economy and the Possibilities of Governance*”, countered the blanket assumption of the beneficial aftershocks of globalization and the end of the nation-state in a more open world.⁶ While globalization enhances a more pluralistic, diversified and multi-polar international economic and political relations, the article posits that the state remains a key source of rules and decision-making in regulating the resulting uncertainties of globalization. They saw the nation-state persisting despite the changing concept of territoriality in the increasing interdependence of nations. Hirst and Thompson contends that “if we are moving into a more complex and pluralistic social and political system then the rule of law will become more important rather than less” such that the State which is the purveyor of ‘constitutional ordering’ shall become more central and not less. Likewise, even if the world economy and polity become increasingly internationalized in the era of globalization, international regimes and agencies will still be governed by binding rules and laws emanating from the member-states.

Walden Bello not only echoes the economic and political uncertainties brought about by globalization but also highlights the deepening inequalities, which result in greater tensions “both within and between countries.”⁷ One of the most vociferous critics of globalization, Bello foresees the disruption of social and political communities across the globe in the face of unbridled free market globalization. His two essays, “*Reflections on the Effects of Globalization on Equity in the Third World*” (1997) and “*Why Reform of the WTO is the Wrong Agenda*” (2000), characterized the current process of globalization as the triumph of capital and markets spurred by the proponents of the neo-liberal project. Bello cited Friedman who said, “*Globalization is us*”, to illustrate the dominance of US capital using globalization as the vehicle for this neo-liberal project. Bello’s analysis serves as backdrop to the widespread anti-globalization movement among civil society groups both in the local and international scale.

The broad range of discourse on globalization is also reflected in the extent of published articles and conference papers on the subject. A relevant article by Fernando Henrique Cardoso, “*Social Consequences of Globalization: Marginalization or Improvement?*” (1996), looks into the social impact of globalization from the perspective of developing countries and the civil society movement in the South.⁸ Articles focusing on the Philippine context includes the following: “*Effects of Globalization on Growth and Equity in the Philippines: An Overview*” by Florian A. Albuero (1997); “*Has Globalization Left its mark on Governance Structures and Institutions in Employer-Employee Relations in the Philippines?*” by Eduardo T. Gonzales (1996); and “*Globalization, Nationalism and the University of*

the Philippines: Challenge and Response” by Leonor Magtolis Briones (1997).⁹

Civil Society

The concept of civil society has evolved through time. From the enlightenment period to 18th century modern political thinkers, the notion of civil society transformed from one unified with the political society to one separated from it. Both Hegel and Marx were the first to posit the separation between the realm of the state as political society and civil society as the arena of the individual and market relations. The development of the nation-state, the debate between the public and private spheres and the assertion of social autonomy were the precursors for the need to problematize the state-civil society dichotomy.

The current discourse on civil society is heavily influenced by the Gramscian notion of civil society as a complex arena of struggle that must be transformed in the process of social emancipation. This context accords equal value to the goals of social and civic sectors in changing political structures and includes state-oriented projects of organized forces as part of the process of emancipation.¹⁰ Activities considered part of civil society according to Scholte (2000) “involve a deliberate attempt – from outside the state and market, and in some other organized fashion – to shape policies, norms and / or deeper social structures.”¹¹ Scholte’s civil society constituencies include “academic institutes, business associations, community-based organizations, consumer protection bodies, criminal syndicates, development cooperation groups, environmental campaigns, ethnic bodies, foundations, farmers’ groups, human rights advocates, labour unions, relief organizations, peace activists, professional bodies, religious institutions, women’s networks, youth campaigns and more.”¹² Scholte’s view is one of the examples of the inclusive notion of civil society.

Coronel-Ferrer (1997) defines the inclusive view of civil society as one that includes all individuals and institutions short of the state and its various apparatus.¹³ The exclusive view of civil society limits the membership to those groups that specifically contest the state power and its policies.¹⁴ Karina David (1997) best represents the exclusive view with her definition of civil society as the “the totality of these self-conscious organizations that are accountable to a defined constituency, that contest the power of the state and insist on a culture of involvement.”¹⁵ For purposes of this study, the researchers adopted David’s exclusionary definition of civil society in the selection of respondents.

The triadic paradigm of the state, market and civil society has also emerged as the dominant model on civil society. Against the state-civil society construct, the triadic model “suggests a further division of civil society into

two – the individual as economic actor or part of the corporate sector and the individual as plain citizen.”¹⁶ Nicanor Perlas offers a triadic theoretical exploration of the concept of civil society in “*Shaping Globalization: Civil Society, Cultural Power and Threefolding*” (1999).¹⁷ Basically, Perlas argues the rediscovery of “principled partnership” between the three key institutions of society – civil society, market and state. The mutual confluence of these three social institutions is the key to countering the advance of elite globalization and promoting sustainable development.

Global Civil Society

A wide range of literature has examined the theoretical and conceptual foundations of civil society in the global environment. Bello (2001), for instance, describes the emergence of civil society organizations as major international actors. He spells out three important functions being carried out by progressive CSOs – ‘a third or fourth actor in the formulation and implementation of macro-political and macro-economic decisions, a key to the evolution of democracy, and a force for effective internationalism that can check the power of politically hegemonic forces like the US government and transnational corporations.’ On the other hand, Scholte (2000) stresses civil society, not only as a means of empowerment, but further, as a ‘democratic legitimation of the governance of globalization’ where stakeholders are involved in the arena of global politics.

Viotti and Kauppi (2001) provide an encompassing definition of civil society as it assumes a more transnational character. They perceive global civil society as composed of ‘individuals and organizations that aggregate individual interests usually below the level of the state but operate beyond the border of any single state’.¹⁸ They recognize the important role played by these groups in ‘forming an international consciousness among peoples around the globe on such diverse issues as the environment, human rights, and weapons proliferation’.¹⁹

The Interviewed Respondents

Operationally, the civil society group under scrutiny covers what can be called as “center to left groups” of the Philippine political spectrum. This study groups the organizations under scrutiny into three major categories:

Left political blocs are organizations that have a defined ideological and political program and self-acknowledged as belonging to the Philippine Left. Their categorization may be further subdivided according to their major ideological underpinnings: national democrats, independent socialists, democratic socialists, social democrats and the liberal democrats.

National policy research and network NGOs have an organizationally defined economic / developmental focus and contribute to the discourse through policy studies on general political, economic and social issues or the forging of networks among organizations working on various concerns.

Issue-based and/or sectoral advocacy and policy research organizations are organizations whose work (organizing, research, networking) is focused on certain issues as they affect specific sectors.

This study analyzed the responses of 7 left political blocs, 10 national policy research and network NGOs and 23 issue-based and/or sectoral advocacy and policy research organizations.

Box 2. List of Respondent Organizations

A. Individual Interviews
<i>Left Political Blocs</i>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Akbayan! 2. Bayan Muna 3. Kilusan Para sa Pambansang Demokrasya (KPD) 4. Liga Sosyalista/Sosyalistang Partido ng Paggawa (SPP) 5. Padayon! 6. Pandayan Para sa Sosyalistang Pilipinas (Pandayan) 7. Sanlakas
<i>National Policy Research and/or Network NGOs</i>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Action for Economic Reforms (AER) 2. Focus on the Global South (Focus) 3. Foundation for Economic Freedom (FEF) 4. Freedom from Debt Coalition (FDC) 5. Ibon Foundation, Inc. (Ibon) 6. Philippine Development NGOs for International Concerns (PHILINK) 7. Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement (PRRM)
<i>Issue-based and/or Sectoral Advocacy and Policy Research Organizations</i>
<p><u>Environment</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Foundation for the Philippine Environment (FPE) 2. Greenpeace Southeast Asia (Greenpeace) <p><u>Fisherfolks</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pambansang Lakas ng Kilusang Mamalakaya ng Pilipinas – Nationwide Coalition of Fisherfolks for Aquatic Reform (Pamalakaya/NACFAR) 2. Sentro para sa Ikaunlad ng Katutubong Agham at Teknolohiya (SIKAT) <p><u>Indigenous Peoples</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Philippine Association for Intercultural Development (PAFID) 2. Ugnayang Pang-Agham Tao (UGAT) <p><u>Labor</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Alliance of Progressive Labor (APL) 2. Bukluran ng Manggagawang Pilipino / Partido ng Maggagawa (BMP) 3. Kilusang Mayo Uno (KMU) 4. Trade Union Congress of the Philippines (TUCP)

Peasants

1. Pambansang Kilusan ng mga Samahang Magsasaka (PAKISAMA)
2. Philippine Peasant Institute (PPI)

Urban Poor

1. Community Organizing of the Philippines Enterprise Foundation (COPE)
2. Foundation for the Development of the Urban Poor (FDUP)

Women

1. General Assembly Binding Women for Reforms, Integrity, Equality, Leadership, and Action (GABRIELA)
2. Kasarian-Kalayaan (SARILAYA)
3. Women's Action Network for Development (WAND)

B. Focused Group Discussions

1. Alternate Forum for Research in Mindanao (AFRIM), *National Policy Research and/or Network NGO*
2. Asian Labor Network on International Financial Institutions (ALNI), *Issue-based and/or Sectoral Advocacy and Policy Research Organization*
3. Citizens' Alliance for Consumer Protection (CACP), *National Policy Research and/or Network NGOs*
4. Demokratikong Magbubukid ng Sultan Kudarat (DEMASKU), *Issue-based and/or Sectoral Advocacy and Policy Research Organization*
5. Limcoma Multi-purpose Cooperative (Limcoma), *Issue-based and/or Sectoral Advocacy and Policy Research Organization*
6. Mindanao Rural Congress (MRC), *Issue-based and/or Sectoral Advocacy and Policy Research Organization*
7. Southern Philippines Federation of Labor (SPFL), *Issue-based and/or Sectoral Advocacy and Policy Research Organization*
8. Tebtebba Foundation, Inc., *Issue-based and/or Sectoral Advocacy and Policy Research Organization*

Left political blocs

The organizations interviewed represent the major politico-ideological streams in the Philippine Left:

Akbayan defines itself as a socialist, democratic and pluralist political party that ran and won two seats under the party-list elections in 2001. It was founded on January 17, 1998 and has a multi-sectoral constituency. It is composed largely of peasants, workers, women, youth & students, gays & lesbians, middle class, migrant workers, and professionals.

Bayan Muna is a mass-based political party in the party-list elections. It was founded in 1999. Bayan Muna is a national progressive political party representing the national and democratic aspirations of the people, especially the poorest and most disadvantaged. It has 13 regional offices and 57 chapters in major provinces, cities and municipalities nationwide and works closely with other national democratic organizations like Bayan, Kilusang Mayo Uno

and Gabriela. Bayan Muna won three seats in the House of Representatives under the party-list elections in 2001.

Kilusan para sa Pambansang Demokrasya (KPD) is a political organization formed after a break with national democratic groups like Bayan and Bayan Muna. KPD was founded on June 10, 1998. Its membership base include workers, peasants, fisher folk, professionals, religious, nationalist business people, indigenous people, youth and students, and women. Among its programs are campaigns against the economic crisis, and for the provision of ample basic services, genuine land reform and food security. KPD also joins broad coalitions with labor federations, entrepreneurs and religious groups on related issues.

Padayon claims itself as a socialist, pluralist and democratic political organization. PADAYON formally held its Congress in 1999, although it was convened first in early 1997. Seventy percent of its members are peasants, 15% belong to the urban poor and 15% are from the labor sector, youth, et.al. PADAYON is an anti-capitalist project that advances rural democratization thru mass movements and engagements (lobbying, advocacy, direct participation in governance).

Pandayan Para sa Sosyalistang Pilipinas (PANDAYAN) claims itself as a socialist *kadre* organization with a multi-sectoral, grassroots base among workers, peasants and fisherfolks, urban poor, youth and women. Involved both in political and community organizing, it was founded in March 1987.

Sanlakas defines itself as a socialist political organization of workers. It was founded in 1994. SANLAKAS was the former BAYAN National Capital Region chapter that separated from the main organization. Its main base is composed of labor groups and the urban poor in the capital region; peasants in Negros and Panay, community youth, students, and women. Its programs involve mainly political mobilization, campaign and advocacy.

Sosyalistang Partido ng Paggawa (SPP) defines itself as a socialist political organization. SPP is the result of a fusion of two organizations in 1998, the Liga Sosyalista and the Rebolusyonaryong Partido ng Proletaryo (RPP). Liga Sosyalista is a splinter group of the breakaway CPP-Manila-Rizal group led by the former Popoy Lagman. RPP on the other hand, is a breakaway group of the 1930s Partido Komunista ng Pilipinas (PKP). SPP merged with Partido ng Manggagawang Pilipino (PMP) in August 2001. SPP is primarily composed of workers but its constituency also includes peasants, students, urban poor, and women's groups. Among the network of organizations within the SPP-PMP merger are SANLAKAS, BMP (Bukluran ng Manggagawang Pilipino), PM (Partido ng Manggagawa), AMA (Aniban ng Manggagawa sa Agrikultura), PIGLAS Maralita at Kababaihan, and Liga ng Sosyalistang Kabataan.

National policy research and network NGOs

Action for Economic Reforms (AER) is a non-government organization doing policy analysis and advocacy on economic issues focusing on macro-economy and its link to poverty and equity questions. It was founded in 1996 and its formal office was established in 1997.

Alternate Forum for Research in Mindanao (AFRIM) is a social research and advocacy institution founded in the late 1970's to provide data and analyses necessary towards forging a sound development framework for Mindanao. Without abandoning its acknowledged bias for the marginalized sectors, AFRIM has now come to engage in mainstream policy debate, influencing media and policy-makers in and out of government towards promoting the genuine development of Mindanao.

Citizen's Alliance for Consumer Protection (CACP) is a resource and campaign center convened in the 1970s on various consumer issues, including public utilities, housing, prices and fair trade.

Focus on the Global South- Philippine Programme (FOCUS) is a research and advocacy organization founded in 1994 dedicated to regional and global analysis, micro-macro issues linking, and advocacy work. It is one of the leading campaign centers against corporate-driven globalization.

Foundation for Economic Freedom (FEF) is an institution established in 1999 intended both as a research center for pro-market policy solutions and network for advocacy and public education. The Foundation for Economic Freedom was established by economists, policy-makers, business leaders, and advocates of change in the Philippine economy.

Freedom from Debt Coalition (FDC) was formally established in March 1988. It claims to have a membership of around 200 organizations with varying political and ideological perspectives. The FDC has a broad-based membership encompassing a broad range of social and political forces and a high degree of professional and technical competence. It envisions a free and democratic Philippines where debt is not a burden but an instrument of growth and equity.

IBON Foundation Inc. undertakes studies on socio-economic issues that confront Philippine society and the world and seeks to bring this knowledge and information to the greatest number of people. Through information and knowledge, IBON intends to effectively participate in building a self-reliant and progressive Philippines, a nation that is sovereign and democratic. It was founded in 1978.

Philippine Development NGOs for International Concerns (PHILINK) is a consortium of Philippine development NGOs, NGO networks, and people's organizations working for equitable, participatory and sustainable development. PHILINK is a membership organization. It counts among its members two of the most vibrant national NGO networks in the Philippines with a combined base of 120 affiliates; a national federation of provincial peasant organizations; and individual NGOs with independent concerns. This brings PHILINK's effective membership to more than 150 NGOs, people's organizations and cooperatives all over the Philippines. Its inception dates back to December 1988 when exploratory meetings were held to form a consortium that was initially named IDNN (International Development NGO Network).

Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement (PRRM) Founded in 1952, PRRM is a nongovernmental organization engaged in the design and implementation of community and habitat development programs across the archipelago. It aims to enhance the capacity of rural communities in the planning, advocacy and implementation of sustainable development, through an integrated program of education, livelihood, health, habitat, environment and self-governance program.

Issue-based and/or sectoral advocacy and policy research organizations

Alliance of Progressive Labor (APL) founded in November 1996, is a labor center composed not only of trade unions but also workers' community associations, urban poor, informal sector organizations and other forms of workers' associations. It advocates trade union rights, workers benefits and the concept of social movement unionism.

Asian Labor Network on International Financial Institutions (ALNI) is a network of trade unions, NGOs and academics from Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines and Thailand established in 1998. It seeks to bring about changes in the policies of international financial institutions like the IMF, the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank where these policies directly and indirectly impact upon workers and society in general. ALNI seeks to engage IFIs in constructive dialogues regarding these policies and push for policies and programs that protect workers and their organization, encourage the participation of labor and the civil society in the development process and advance the democratization agenda.

Bukluran ng Manggagawang Pilipino/ Partido ng Manggagawa (BMP-PnM) defines itself as a political center advancing a socialist orientation for workers and unions. It was formed in 1993, right after the regional chapter of the Kilusang Mayo Uno (KMU) in Metro Manila and Rizal, claiming to represent more than 70% of KMU's total membership, bolted out from KMU. The former KMU-NCRR decided to form the BMP espousing a democratic

and socialist orientation. BMP claims membership of more than 200 local unions nationwide with a mass membership of over 100,000. It also claims influence to some 800 independent unions through KPUP (Kapatiran ng mga Pangulo ng Unyon sa Pilipinas), a fraternal organization of local union presidents in the Philippines. Its base and allied unions are organized in manufacturing and service industries, chemicals and mines, agriculture, construction and transport.

Community Organizing of the Philippines Enterprise Foundation (COPE) is a non-government organization based in urban poor communities founded in 1977. COPE basically has organizing, education and advocacy functions for urban poor concerns and issues. It works with the urban poor in Metro Manila and the Bicol region, and with the rural poor of Quezon Province.

Demokratikong Magbubukid ng Sultan Kudarat (DEMASKU) is a provincial-wide organization of peasants, farm workers, small landowners organized in November 20, 1993. It is engaged in community-based research, education and training, alternative rural trading and cooperative development towards the realization of genuine rural development.

Foundation for the Development of the Urban Poor (FDUP), founded on September 8, 1988, is an advocacy, issue-based, development and community-based organization for the urban poor communities. It is composed of urban poor communities in Metro Manila, Rizal, Cavite, Antipolo, Bulacan, Nueva Ecija and other key cities in Luzon.

Foundation for the Philippine Environment (FPE) is the first grant-making institution on environmental organizations in the Philippines. It aims to reverse the rapid destruction of the Philippines' natural resources by initiating programs and activities that strengthen the role of NGOs, POs and local communities in the responsible management of the ecosystem.

General Assembly Binding Women for Reforms, Integrity, Equality, Leadership, and Action (GABRIELA), founded in 1984, is a national alliance of women's organizations. It claims membership of 200 grassroots-based organizations, institutions, desks and programs in Davao, Butuan, Panay, Iloilo, Cebu, Bohol, Negros, Samar, Leyte, Socsargen, Western Mindanao, Bicol, Cordillera and Central Luzon. Internationally, GABRIELA has solidarity networks in the United States, Canada, Germany, Australia, Japan, Belgium and The Netherlands.

Greenpeace Southeast Asia, based in Philippines and Thailand, was formally established in March 1, 2000, as part of Greenpeace International's global campaign to protect biodiversity and the environment. Their work in the region has included stopping hazardous waste imports, opposing radioactive

shipments, campaigning against forest destruction, lobbying governments on sustainable energy issues and drawing attention to the dangers of waste incinerations. Often working with other local groups, it has run successful campaigns in the Philippines, Taiwan, India, and Indonesia. Greenpeace International was founded in 1971.

Kasarian-Kalayaan (SARILAYA) is an organization of women-development catalysts committed to promoting women's empowerment and gender equality. It was founded in 1994 and aims to mainstream gender and development in every member's work place, community and the broader movement for social change.

Kilusang Mayo Uno (KMU) founded on May 1, 1980, is a labor center composed of labor federations and local trade unions in the agricultural, industry and services sectors. Its membership covers labor unions not only in urban areas but also rural areas. KMU advances workers rights and issues such as wages, collective bargaining and the right to strike.

Limcoma Multipurpose Cooperative, Lipa City Multi-Purpose Cooperative Marketing Association, Inc., as it was first called, came into existence in March 25, 1970, as a solution to the growing problem then of uncontrollable feed prices of the integrators. At present, it is engaged in the advocacy of protection of livestock and poultry against the importation of smuggled meat.

Mindanao Rural Congress, an assembly of Muslims, Christian settlers, and indigenous peoples in Mindanao, is a gathering of farmer leaders that serves as a forum for the surfacing of issues pertinent to farmer interests and shaping appropriate advocacy agendas

Pambansang Kilusan ng mga Samahang Magsasaka (PAKISAMA) was founded in 1986. PAKISAMA is the umbrella organization of with several agricultural coalitions and federations. It strengthens two sectoral federations under its umbrella namely, the federation of peasant women and fisheries groups.

Pambansang Lakas ng Kilusang Mamalakaya ng Pilipinas – Nationwide Coalition of Fisherfolks for Aquatic Reform (PAMALAKAYA-NACFAR) was founded on December 4, 1987. It is a nationwide federation of fisherfolk organizations with a total individual membership of 80,000 based in different parts of the Philippines.

Philippine Association for Intercultural Development (PAFID), founded on August 1, 1967, is a social development organization, which helps indigenous communities regain and secure their ancestral domains.

Philippine Peasant Institute (PPI), founded in 1983, is a non-government organization that aims to promote and advance the Philippine peasantry's interests for agrarian reform and rural development in partnership with local peasant organizations. It is a farmer-based NGO engaged in policy research and advocacy work for small farmers.

Sentro sa Ikaunlad ng Katutubong Agham at Teknolohiya (SIKAT), established in March 19, 1991, is an NGO working to establish community-based coastal resource management, promote appropriate fishing technologies, and advocate for genuine fishery policy reform.

Southern Philippines Federation of Labor is a labor federation of unions based in Iligan City.

Tebtebba Foundation, Inc., the Indigenous Peoples' International Centre for Policy Research and Education, was established in 1996. Tebtebba, "*discourse*" from the Philippine indigenous *Kankanaey* dialect, is firmly committed to the recognition, protection and promotion of indigenous peoples' rights worldwide. Its main thrust is to help build the capacity of indigenous peoples to assert their rights and articulate their own analyses and perspectives on issues directly affecting them.

Trade Union Congress of the Philippines (TUCP), founded on December 14, 1975, is a labor center composed of labor federations, trade unions and other workers' organizations or associations. Its members come from all sectors and industries (from agriculture to manufacturing service) including government employees. It aims to promote equal rights and opportunities for all workers. It is dedicated to improving conditions of work and life of workers and their families.

Ugnayang Pang-Agham Tao (UGAT) draws most of its members from among anthropology students, researchers, teachers and others interested in the discipline. Founded in 1977, PAFID is a regular member of the Philippine Social Science Council (PSSC) and is affiliated with the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (IUAES).

Women's Action Network for Development (WAND) is an umbrella organization of women and people's organizations. Founded in 1990, WAND is also a development and sectoral organization with community development as its major program for its members. WAND assists members to develop capacities of women to participate in the development process and implement projects at the community. WAND supports local level initiatives for women such as instituting ordinances.

From the foregoing examination of the brief profile of each organization, the year of establishment may be summarized in Table 1 below.

At a glance, it can be seen that the organizations that cooperated in this study have a certain degree of legitimacy in that they have been recognized active civil society actors for at least a period of four years. Among these organizations that were surveyed and interviewed, the oldest was established in 1952 and the youngest was formed in 1999. PRRM was established in 1952, while the newly-formed organizations were Bayan Muna, PADAYON and FEF, which were established in 1999. However, some of these organizations were formed or remolded in the 1990s. It can be deduced that half of the number of organizations that were interviewed are products of the post-EDSA phenomenon. This period marks the resurgence of democratization and the regularization of Philippine politics.

Table 1. Year of Establishment of Respondent Organizations

Year Founded	Name of Organizations		
	Left Political Blocs	Research/Network NGOs	Issue-based/Sectoral Groups
1950s		PRRM (1952)	
1960s			PAFID (1967)
1970s		IBON (1978) AFRIM CACP	Limcoma (1970) Greenpeace (1971) TUCP (1975) COPE (1977) UGAT (1977)
1980s	PANDAYAN (1987)	FDC (1988) PHILINK (1988) PHILSSA (1988)	KMU(1980) PPI (1983) GABRIELA (1984) PAKISAMA (1986) PAMALAKAYA (1987) FDUP (1988)
1990s	SANLAKAS (1994) Akbayan! (1998) KPD (1998) SPP (1998) Bayan Muna (1999) PADAYON (1999)	FOCUS (1994) AER (1996) FEF (1999)	WAND (1990) SIKAT (1991) FPE (1992) BMP-PnM (1993) DEMASKU (1993) SARILAYA (1994) APL (1996) Tebtebba (1996) ALNI (1998)

ENDNOTES

¹ Ishak Shari, “Globalization and Human Development”, paper presented at the Public Symposium on “Development, Culture and Emancipation” organized by International House of Japan-Japan Foundation Asia Center, Tokyo, October 30, 1997.

² Karina David. “Intra-Civil Society Relations: An Overview” in ed. Miriam Coronel Ferrer. *Philippine Democracy Agenda Volume 3*, Quezon City: Third World Studies Center, p. 21.

³ Institute for Labor Studies, “Understanding Globalization and Trade Union Responses”. Proceedings of roundtable discussions and workshops conducted by ILS in Luzon, Visayas and Mindanao. Manila: ILS, 1999.

⁴ Cayetano Paderanga. *The Philippines in the Emerging World Environment: Globalization at a Glance*, edited by Dr. Cayetano Paderanga. UP Center for Integrative and Development Studies, University of the Philippines Press, 1997.

⁵ Thomas Friedman. *Understanding Globalization*. New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux, 1999.

- ⁶ Paul Hirst and Grahame Thompson. *Globalization in Question: The International Economy and the Possibilities of Governance*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996.
- ⁷ Walden Bello.
- ⁸ Henrique Cardoso.
- ⁹ Quoted various sources
- ¹⁰ Isagani Serrano. "Re-imagining Civil Society". Unpublished. 15 August 1994.
- ¹¹ Jan Aart Scholte. "Global Civil Society" in ed. Ngaire Woods. *The Political Economy of Globalization*, Macmillan Press Ltd, 2000, p. 175.
- ¹² Ibid.
- ¹³ Miriam Coronel Ferrer. "Civil Society: An Operational Definition" in ed. Maria Serena Diokno, *Philippine Democracy Agenda, Volume I*. Quezon City: Third World Studies Center, 1997, p. 5.
- ¹⁴ David. op. cit.
- ¹⁵ David. op. cit.
- ¹⁶ Isagani Serrano. op. cit.
- ¹⁷ Nicolas Perlas. *Shaping Globalization: Civil society, Cultural power and Threefolding*. Quezon City: Center for Alternative Development Initiatives, 1999.
- ¹⁸ Paul R. Viotti and Mark V. Kauppi. *International Relations and World Politics: Security, Economy, Identity*, (2nd ed.) New Jersey: prentice-Hall, Inc. 2001, p. 19.
- ¹⁹ Ibid.