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Preface

From May 28 to 30, 2010, the Asian Public Intellectuals Fellowships Program (API) held a 10th Anniversary Regional Celebration in Manila to commemorate the tenth year of the official launch of the API Program. Jointly organized by The Nippon Foundation and its API Partner Institutions — Ateneo de Manila University, Chulalongkorn University, Indonesian Institute of Sciences, Kyoto University, and Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia — the Celebration consisted of three principal events:

- May 28: Symposium — Asia: Identity, Vision and Position
- May 29: Conference — Asian Conditions, Communities and Directions, and
- May 30: Exhibition — API: 10 Creative Years

The Celebration was conceived and organized as a symposium and fiesta. It was attended by 136 API Fellows from the 2001–2009 Fellowship years, who crossed nationalities, generations, genders, disciplines, and professions. They were joined by another 125 participants, including Keynote Speakers, Program founders, Partner Institution coordinators, Resource Persons, and other invited guests. The lively engagements of the participants turned the Symposium, Conference and Exhibition into meaningful forums for critical reflections on the past and hopeful explorations of the future.

Ten years before the Celebration, API was launched with a clear aim of identifying public intellectuals who could make a difference to the societies, communities and lives of the people in Asia — by tackling their pressing political, economic, social and cultural issues. When he inaugurated API in July 2000, Yohei Sasakawa, Chairman of The Nippon Foundation, spoke of a need to support regional intellectual leaders able to work in the public sphere, official or non-governmental, to articulate shared concerns, and formulate proposals for
Since then, the API Program has enabled ten cohorts of public intellectuals to experience its unique format of cross-national learning: each API Fellow conducts an individual fellowship project, of up to a year's duration, in the Program countries — Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, the Philippines and Thailand — but not his or her own. In other words, API Fellows are committed at the outset to cross-border networking, and exchange and mutual learning with colleagues and communities in various parts of Southeast Asia and Japan. The API Program has supported its Fellows and their projects with ample resources in the hope that the Fellows will themselves nurture a regional identity, develop a multi-layered cooperative framework, and eventually establish a relatively cohesive social and intellectual force dedicated to the public interest in Asia. Over the years, post-fellowship activities were organized via Follow-up Grants that supported selected Fellows in further projects, and regional projects that took Fellows beyond individual undertakings into team projects.

The Celebration in Manila was, therefore, a means to commemorate the progress attained by the API Program in the past decade, and an occasion to reaffirm the commitment of the Program and its Fellows to a regional community of public intellectuals as it positions itself for important challenges in the decade following.

This book captures both past and future, by providing an assessment of the progress of the API Program, and showing potentially new directions for the API Community. Much of the assessment is provided in Part I of the book, where Chapter 1 recapitulates API’s vision and mission in different ways, thus setting the background against which Tatsuya Tanami’s broad and detailed evaluation of the Program, in Chapter 2, may be understood and appreciated.

Part II of the book comprises speeches by three specially invited eminent Keynote Speakers on the themes of the API Program that framed the organization of the Celebration. Chapter 3 finds Benedict R. O’G. Anderson, Aaron L. Binenkorb Professor of International Studies, Emeritus, Cornell University, and the author of *Imagined Communities*, *The Spectre of Comparisons* and *Under Three Flags*, addressing the theme of Changing identities and their social, historical and cultural contexts. With his probing curiosity, Anderson explores a seeming paradox: why are API projects so full of interesting research on Southeast Asian societies and yet lacking in influential commentary on their tumultuous politics?

In Chapter 4, Krisana Kraisintu, International Honorary Dean, Faculty of Oriental Medicines, Rangsit University, and the winner of the 2009 Ramon Magsaysay Award, engages with the theme, *Reflections on the human condition and the search for social justice*. She does so by recounting in technical and moving detail her multi-dimensional ‘life-saving journey’ to establish and improve the domestic production of affordable generic drugs, principally by transferring technology from Thailand to sub-Saharan Africa.

The theme of Globalization: Structures, processes and alternatives is given a critical treatment in Chapter 5. Jomo K. S., an internationally respected political economist, himself a Senior Fellow from API’s pioneering batch, and presently Assistant Secretary-General for Economic Development, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, United Nations, debunks ‘myths’ and ‘dogmas’ of trade liberalization, financial liberalization and market deregulation — neoliberal globalization, in a word — which have not reduced the vulnerabilities of developing countries in a global system marked by recurrent crises and severe inequalities.

In Part III, the voices and concerns of API Fellows come through in two basic ways. First, Chapter 6 records six presentations that cover the following areas: Politics and Conflicts, Economy and Development, Social Policy and Social Justice, Communities and Local Movements, Environment and Resource Management, and Visual and Performing Arts. The presentations were made by the respective Conveners of groups of Fellows, which were formed before the Celebration around their major areas of interest as roughly reflected in the projects undertaken by the Fellows. Second, a large selection of views and questions, raised by Fellows and other participants during the concluding plenary session of the Conference component of the Celebration, is given in Chapter 7.

Selections of the creative works of API Fellows engaged in visual and performing arts are given in Part IV of the book. Chapter 8 provides Joselina Cruz’s review of connections between creativity and
society that are germane to the API Program’s inclusion of artists in the realm of the public intellectuals. The chapter also includes photographs of selected items of Fellows’ visual arts, and moments of films, concerts and dramatic performances.

The remaining section of the book contains four appendices, each a document related to the Celebration. Of these, Appendix A, which expresses the hopes and intents of the organizers of the Celebration, and Appendix C, which summarizes the responses of Fellows to a pre-Celebration online Survey, may be of particular interest to readers who wish to form a clearer picture of ‘past and future’ in the API Program. The other two appendices complete an official record of the events and participants.

This book, taken as an official record of an historic occasion, may convey a sense of the solidarity and commitment of the public intellectuals gathered during the 10th Anniversary Regional Celebration of the API Program. It is our hope that the book will also be read as a compilation of engaging reflections on the crucial issues, social concerns and practical solutions that demand the attention of Asian public intellectuals, and, in that way, provide some inspiration and direction to those who are willing to imagine and realize a regional community of public intellectuals.

To thank the people who have helped us in the preparation of the manuscript for this book is, first, and largely, to thank many of the people who worked extremely hard and well to organize the Celebration for over a year and then carry it to resounding success in May 2010.

At The Nippon Foundation, its Chairman, Yohei Sasakawa, has been unstinting in his support, while Michiko Taki, Shota Nakayasu and Sonoko Kinoshita, constantly busy with duties related to the management of the API Program, provided many types of assistance and many sources of information and did so with utmost commitment to the Program.

Likewise, the members of the Steering Committee for the Celebration, including the Regional Project representatives, Herry Yogaswara and Yeoh Seng Guan, consistently supported and assisted us. In particular, many interesting ideas, freely expressed during the Steering Committee meetings in Manila and Kuala Lumpur, are reflected in the Concept Paper that appears here as Appendix A.

We received tremendous help from the Secretariat for the Celebration, stationed in Ateneo de Manila University, and wonderfully headed by Father Jose M. Cruz, S.J. We would like to record our profound gratitude to Isabel Consuelo A. Nazareno and Michelle Gadja for coordinating many crucial matters, including conducting the Survey and analyzing the responses; preparing the transcripts of speeches, discussions and presentations; and providing excellent photographs of events, people and exhibits, all of which were indispensable to the preparation of the book.

At the API Program’s Coordinating Institution, Chulalongkorn University, Surichai Wun’Gaeo headed a dedicated team, including Akiko Kuwajima and Thamonpat Cooperider, that handled an enormous amount of logistical work so well as to ensure that the Celebration proceeded smoothly. While preparing the manuscript for the book, we had to route frequent requests for links, updates and materials via Michiko Yoshida who conscientiously met our sometimes unclear and usually ‘urgent’ requests with impressive efficiency and good cheer.

The first chapter of the book is not merely a reproduction of official speeches but in fact a timely restatement of the vision and mission of the API Program, albeit from slightly different perspectives. For that, we would like to express our sincere thanks to Bienvenido F. Nebres, S.J., Yohei Sasakawa and Surichai Wun’Gaeo.

With their provocative and inspiring Keynote Speeches, Benedict R. O’G. Anderson, Krisana Kraisintu and Jomo K. S. enriched discussions and exchanges during the Celebration, thus helping to fulfill its objective of encouraging intense and critical reviews of issues and challenges facing Asia’s public intellectuals. Their cooperation in getting their chapters quickly completed is much appreciated. We are happy to be able to include here summaries of the comments on the Keynote Speeches which enlivened the discussions; for this, we thank all the commentators, namely, Arnold Azurin, Azymardi Azra, Cynthia Rose Bautista, Chan Chee Khoon, Kavi Chongkittavorn, and Mary Racelis.

One basic idea of organizing the Celebration with a direct and major role for all Fellows before and during the Celebration would not
have been realized without the Fellows’ respective group presentations. Here, not only do we thank all the Fellows who participated in their Group preparations, we would like to note in particular the valuable contributions of the respective Conveners — Gleyc Atienza, Darunee Tantiwiramanond, Tatsuki Kataoka, Lim Mah Hui, Myfel Joseph D. Paluga, and Prangtip Daorueng.

Part IV of the book is made up of a thoughtful review by Joselina Cruz, Managing Curator of the Exhibition component of the Celebration, and selected exhibits from the Exhibition. The Fellows, whose names appear in the List of Artists and Performers, did us a great service by displaying their exhibits or staging their performances during the Celebration, thus making it possible to have an excellent photographic supplement to our textual record of the Celebration.

We leave our final word of thanks to all API Fellows who responded to the Survey, participated in discussions, joined the Celebration, toured the exhibits, witnessed the performances, and in one way or another brought to life the idea of a regional community of public intellectuals, which is the inspiration behind this book.

Khoo Boo Teik and Tatsuya Tanami
Chiba and Tokyo
April 2011

---
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When the program of the Asian Public Intellectuals was established ten years ago, the momentum for our region to take its place in the world and among one another in integration and cooperation, whether you think of APEC or ‘ASEAN + 3’, or however you want to name our region, was already quite evident. But, I think that even we may not have seen how rapidly it would accelerate over the last ten years.

Over the last three or four years I’ve told more and more of our students that we wanted them to move around in our region because this would be their world. Maybe the world, for me and many of us here, was our own countries and colonial, colonizing countries. For them however, this will be their world. This will be their region. Much of the media attention that has been given to ASEAN or ‘ASEAN + 3’ or ‘ASEAN + 5’ has been focused on their economic and political aspects. I do believe that the program of the Asian Public Intellectuals has to be visionary in foreseeing the important role of culture and the important role of bringing leaders — especially intellectual leaders — into face-to-face encounters with one another, and to establish friendships with one another.

Friendships are always at the basis, eventually, of any major change in the world. Policies are important too, but as we all know, in a world of many differences — difference of cultures — deep trust, which comes from friendship, is fundamental. We know this all over the world, but I think our region, in particular, understands how important face-to-face encounters and friendships are. Allow me to speak about a great Jesuit, Matteo Ricci. He went to China in the late 1500s, and was the very first Westerner to actually engage Chinese culture. We celebrated, last May 11, the 400th anniversary of his death in Beijing. There are many celebrations in his honor in the world.

However, the reason I cite him is, one of the gifts he had was to understand precisely the role of friendship and face-to-face encounters in building bridges between nations. He did master the Chinese language, but the very first book that he wrote in Chinese was a collection of translations, plus his own, from Western writers like Cicero or Seneca on the theme of *dell’amicizia* and friendship. So, long ago, he’d understood the importance of the kind of work that the Asian...
Good morning, everyone.

It gives me immense pleasure to be able to celebrate the 10th Anniversary of the Asian Public Intellectuals Fellowships Program (API) with you here today. Let me begin by offering my deepest thanks to our generous host, Ateneo de Manila University, which, this year, is celebrating a milestone of its own, the 150th anniversary of its founding in 1859. I wish to express my heartfelt appreciation and congratulations to the President of the University, Fr. Bienvenido F. Nebres.

Assembled here today are API Community members from Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, the Philippines, and Thailand. You come from different countries. However, you have many things in common. First, you apply your expertise and knowledge, addressing complex social issues. Second, you make your findings publicly available, encouraging wide-ranging debate. Third, you collaborate with people from other fields, devising more effective solutions. And finally, you are motivated by a commitment to work for the betterment of society. In short, you are all public intellectuals.

We created the API Program in July 2000. Even then, we were very aware that the public intellectuals would be indispensable to the Asia of the 21st century and beyond. At the outset, the countries that joined the API Program faced many difficulties as a result of the 1997 currency crisis. They also had to deal with economic disparity, poverty,
countries are often ill-equipped, legally and otherwise, to handle them. One API Fellow used the knowledge gained during an API Fellowship to prepare a guide to living and working overseas. This guide, which is given to migrant workers before they go abroad, helps them avoid many of the problems they would otherwise face. These and other examples show API Fellows are making a real contribution to society. Yet I wonder whether we could be doing even more to utilize your knowledge and insights for the public good. If we can, we will achieve greater results through enhanced collaboration.

Let me mention a fascinating example of the possibilities that exist when API Fellows put their heads together. An API Fellow conducted a survey of the trade in human organs in the Philippines. This Fellow — she is a reporter — went on to publicize her findings in the newspaper, and alert the public to the gravity of the problem. Subsequently, she met a filmmaker at an API Regional Workshop. They discussed the possibility of collaborating on a film about human organ transplant, an approach the journalist had not previously considered. This is just one example of the potential for collaboration within the API Community, and I feel there must be many more such possibilities. Each member of the API Community is endowed with considerable talent. Yet what distinguishes this community is the opportunity to provide for its members to pool their abilities and collaborate. The result you can obtain will be more than the sum of your parts. Gifted individuals with a common purpose, you will form a powerful force for positive change. Together, you can achieve what one person, working in isolation, cannot.

With this in mind, I’d like to suggest that each year the API Community select a theme of common interest — for example, poverty, migration, or the environment — and issue a set of recommendations drawing on the knowledge and insight of the entire community. These recommendations would be given wide coverage. They would also be submitted to the ASEAN secretariat and the government as a means to realizing policy change. I truly believe that if we do this, we would undoubtedly contribute to our goal of the betterment of society.

The API Community has brought together over 250 fellows from five countries over the last ten years. I am immensely proud of
every one of you. In July of this year, we will welcome the first Fellows from Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam. With the API Community soon to span eight countries, we are ready to enter a new phase in which the role of public intellectuals will be more important. I sincerely hope you will go on to do great things, and that the API Community never loses sight of its goal. I wish you a stimulating time at this API 10th Anniversary Regional Celebration, and I eagerly anticipate the constructive and creative ideas that will emerge.

Thank you very much.

Distinguished guests, colleagues, friends, ladies and gentlemen. Sawadee krab.

It gives me great pleasure to greet you this morning in my capacity as Program Director of the Coordinating Institution representing the five API Partner Institutions. On behalf of the Partner Institutions, I would like to take this opportunity to convey our deepest appreciation to all those who have worked hard and made this invaluable gathering possible, and especially as a part of the celebration of the 150th year of the founding of Ateneo de Manila University.

When I look back over the past ten years of the API Program, I think of API as a shared life. I cannot help but think of the faces and the presence of my friends, such as the late Professor Ishak Shari from Malaysia. I must also mention, among others, our longtime advisors and colleagues, including Professor Prawase Wasi and Professor Takashi Shiraishi, who could not be present today. These colleagues have been the driving force behind the ideals of API.

When API was first envisioned, it existed only in our imagination. But, through the hard work and dedication of API partners, friends, and Fellows, API has become reality. Respecting differences among the countries, we have worked around a shared ideal, and discovered much common ground. Over ten years, we created a special role for API in the region; as a result, API has created a special
severe drought throughout the region and in Yunan, China. The drought has inflicted much suffering on farmers and fisherfolk and even urban people. Mekong civil society networks, including groups of academics, toured China to urge more responsibility and accountability from China’s projects with regard to their roles in the drought. Public pressure peaked last April at a public forum held at Chulalongkorn University and then at the Mekong Summit in Hua Hin, Thailand, which was hosted by the Royal Thai Government and the Mekong River Commission and attended by our government leaders, including those from China. The public pressure resulted in China’s agreeing to share more data about its dam operations and water storage on the Mekong River during droughts. This was an unprecedented and positive step in the direction, as the previous speaker said, of a ‘new level of international policy agenda’.

Our Southeast Asian region is certainly a dynamic one. Yet, whilst economic growth continues, on the whole, development has been contradictory. With inequalities deepening at every level, within and among countries, the present development path is subject to numerous climate, energy, food, environmental, and economic crises. Unfortunately, within Southeast Asia, the legitimacy of civil society’s law is continually contested by powerful business interests and often national governments themselves so that creating space for honest and open public debate remains challenging.

We, API partners and friends, must examine the spaces and gaps as they reveal themselves, and use them to create our own civil society strategy, so that we can continue to grow and fulfill our potential. We need to look for ways to enrich this people-to-people engagement. Through API, we have successfully created a framework of regional cooperation. Our challenge is to further empower it to enable the network to be as proactive as possible. Regional and sub-regional imbalances in economic growth and development affect all of us to varying degrees. In the most severe cases of injustice and inequity, social unrest emerges as a response. These longstanding development challenges require greater attention with an even greater emphasis on development at the grassroots level.

To give another example, this time at the sub-regional scale in the Mekong sub-region, local groups have recently connected with international and civil society partners to form a Save the Mekong Coalition in the face of plans for extensive dam development throughout the region that would affect its rivers and fisheries and, consequently, its food security, as well as its cultural heritage. These regional civil society networks which cooperate to protect the Mekong River and promote better solutions for meeting the regional development needs have had some success. This year, for example, the dry season brought severe drought throughout the region and in Yunan, China. The drought has inflicted much suffering on farmers and fisherfolk and even urban people. Mekong civil society networks, including groups of academics, toured China to urge more responsibility and accountability from China’s projects with regard to their roles in the drought. Public pressure peaked last April at a public forum held at Chulalongkorn University and then at the Mekong Summit in Hua Hin, Thailand, which was hosted by the Royal Thai Government and the Mekong River Commission and attended by our government leaders, including those from China. The public pressure resulted in China’s agreeing to share more data about its dam operations and water storage on the Mekong River during droughts. This was an unprecedented and positive step in the direction, as the previous speaker said, of a ‘new level of international policy agenda’.

Our Southeast Asian region is certainly a dynamic one. Yet, whilst economic growth continues, on the whole, development has been contradictory. With inequalities deepening at every level, within and among countries, the present development path is subject to numerous climate, energy, food, environmental, and economic crises. Unfortunately, within Southeast Asia, the legitimacy of civil society’s law is continually contested by powerful business interests and often national governments themselves so that creating space for honest and open public debate remains challenging.

We, API partners and friends, must examine the spaces and gaps as they reveal themselves, and use them to create our own civil society strategy, so that we can continue to grow and fulfill our potential. We need to look for ways to enrich this people-to-people engagement. Through API, we have successfully created a framework of regional cooperation. Our challenge is to further empower it to enable the network to be as proactive as possible. Regional and sub-regional imbalances in economic growth and development affect all of us to varying degrees. In the most severe cases of injustice and inequity, social unrest emerges as a response. These longstanding development challenges require greater attention with an even greater emphasis on development at the grassroots level.

In an interdependent world like ours, crises increasingly
have a system-wide impact, and we simply cannot afford to choose among the threats we face. In this sense, API’s mandate will continue to be relevant as we continue to work in a multidisciplinary way. I must mention that the Regional Committee and the Regional Project maintained by API Fellows have proven to be enlightening experiences in working together and engaging with communities across borders. Despite that success, we are now aware of the limitations of a singular mode of DLC or the Regional Project. Perhaps the time has come for us to prepare for a multi-format approach so that API can make contributions in the new context.

I am truly delighted that through meeting together, we have been provided with this rare opportunity to respond to all of these questions. The answers may not come immediately but with shared determination and by learning together and from each other, the answers will eventually unfold.

Let us renew our sense of mission in anticipation of open and candid discussions. Let us be ready to listen to difficult questions, which may make us feel uneasy and may be difficult to respond to. Let us open our mind in the spirit of seeking a common future. Now, more than ever, we need the clarity, the insights that come from honest exchanges among people with a sense of solidarity.

I wish all of us productive exchanges, encounters, and discoveries here in Manila.

Thank you.
Fellows’ ideas and suggestions for the advance and long-term success of the Program.

I. Background

At the official launch of the API Program in Kuala Lumpur, on July 8, 2000, Yohei Sasakawa, then President (now Chairman) of The Nippon Foundation, observed that although many expected the 21st century to be the ‘Asian century’, the 1997 East Asian financial crisis showed that ‘vast hurdles’ remained to be surmounted before any such prediction could be realized. Sasakawa noted:

While the growth of the middle class continues, there is also a widening gap between the haves and have-nots. The great diversity of race, culture, and religion, and the huge wave of globalization that is sweeping across it have their negative and positive effects such as conflicts and confrontations among the people in the region.

To this situation, which involved no less than Asia’s future, The Nippon Foundation brought a proposal that was consonant with the Foundation’s practical approaches to formulating specific solutions to immediate problems. In promoting many projects in partnership with international organizations, governments, and NGOs, the Foundation had consistently focused on basic human needs, placing priority on solving problems that needed urgent intervention. Even so, the Foundation recognized the importance of addressing ‘underlying causes’ and offering ‘fundamental solutions’.

Here, the Foundation anticipated a need in Asia for a new type of human resource development program that would involve Asians who were moved to confront pressing issues for humanity and suggest feasible solutions and actions. As Sasakawa elaborated:

We need to create a new type of multi-layered intellectual collaborative framework and network and we need to cultivate regional intellectual leaders who can transcend national, organizational, social, cultural, and linguistic boundaries, leaders who are able to work in the public sphere, whether governmental or non-governmental, able to contribute by identifying common issues, raising questions, seeking solutions, and presenting proposals for actual implementation. We need to identify public intellectuals, to organize themselves as a new force to work for the public interest.

II. Towards Asians learning about Asians: Concept and groundwork

To formulate this concept and plan for the implementation of this new program, the Foundation staff met with intellectual leaders, academics, media specialists, artists, NGO activists, and representatives of various organizations and foundations in Asia. The Foundation team conducted a survey and held interviews with potential project partners to appraise the status of intellectual exchanges in Asia.

Some intellectual leaders were concerned that research on Asia by Asians had become overly dependent on received wisdom — knowledge, methodology and paradigms — that originated in Europe and North America. Consequently, too many Asian researchers were unable to produce original thoughts and ideas. It was thought, then, that Asians should not merely conduct independent research on Asia, but should do so in ways that encouraged Asians to know and learn from other Asians through direct experience.

Meetings with representatives of non-governmental foundations, who were experienced in promoting academic and cultural exchanges and advancing Asian Studies, provided valuable insights into various aspects of program implementation. Noteworthy was an awareness of the need in Asia to:

1. facilitate intra-regional movement of Asian researchers to explore possibilities of shaping a regional or ‘Asian’ identity
2. reorient the focuses of research to fields of social sciences from natural science, technology, and economics, and
3. expand comparative knowledge and establish new systems of knowledge production in Asia.

A definitive moment for the API Program was reached in September 1999 when the Foundation organized in Tokyo a ‘brainstorming’ meeting attended by about 30 leading Asian intellectuals, including scholars, researchers, critics, artists, foundation representatives and NGO activists, all of whom were notable for their achievements in their respective fields (Appendix 1). Discussing the definition and roles of public intellectuals, and the nature of the ‘public sphere’ in Asia, the meeting agreed that ‘public intellectuals’ included but were not restricted to academics. Moreover, the public intellectual’s audience was different from an academic audience, and necessarily broader than academic circles. Thus, the API project should ultimately aim to create a new pool of Asian public intellectuals who would influence political systems and policies of regional and national governance. It was envisaged that such a pool of intellectuals would influence and guide regional civil societies in tackling crucial issues faced by each society and formulating alternative solutions to them.

The 1996 meeting in Tokyo conceptualized the API Program in its joint statement:

We need to create an Asian regional intellectual community to address social, political and cultural issues confronting us all in the region. We propose to transform intellectual networks that have evolved in the past half a century to work out our common future and to invite people, intellectuals both vernacular and multilingual, to come out of their own institutionally defined spheres and to join us to be active in the public sphere.

III. The API Fellowship

From the many discussions and the brainstorming meeting, the idea of the API Program was formed. Its organizational framework was based on the participation of public intellectuals in five countries — Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, the Philippines, and Thailand. Subject to application criteria and selection procedures, API Fellowships would be awarded according to two categories: ‘Senior Fellows’ consisting of talented individuals with demonstrated attainment who were likely to build on their individual success, and ‘Junior Fellows’ comprising young people who showed promise of becoming public intellectuals. Fellows in both categories were expected to learn from one another through conferences, professional contacts, and social occasions, thereby producing synergistic effects for the Program.

In the Program’s conceptualization and implementation, a broad definition of ‘public intellectuals’ was adopted that included — and still includes — ‘academics, researchers, media professionals, artists, creative writers, NGO activists, social workers, public servants, and others with moral authority, who are committed to working for the betterment of society through the application of their professional knowledge, wisdom and experience’.

To provide Fellows with a shared focus for exploring challenges and exchanges — and to guide the selection of Fellows — the Program proposed three initial themes:

- Changing identities and their social, historical, and cultural contexts
- Reflections on the human condition and the search for social justice, and,
- Current structure of globalization and possible alternatives.

IV. A unique management mechanism

The formative meetings of the Program considered many practical issues of implementation, including efficient infrastructural support that would enable Fellows to structure their opportunities to conduct research activities in Asian countries other than their own. To realize this novel and widely accepted idea, the Program was based on a joint, collaborative effort among selected institutions in the five countries. Each of these institutions would be a Partner Institution (PI) involved
in managing many aspects of the Program. These PIs, together with The Nippon Foundation, functioning and cooperating on equal footing, would constitute an API Executive Committee that governed the policies and administered the operations of the Program.

After close consultations, The Nippon Foundation invited the following institutions to be its PIs:

- Indonesia: Indonesian Institute of Sciences (LIPI), Jakarta
- Japan: Center for Southeast Asian Studies (CSEAS), Kyoto University, Kyoto
- Malaysia: Institute of Malaysian and International Studies (IKMAS), Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi
- Philippines: School of Social Science, Ateneo de Manila University, Manila, and
- Thailand: Institute of Asian Studies, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok.

The Program also established a Coordinating Institution (CI) that oversaw the Program's financial administration. From 2001 to 2004, IKMAS served as the first CI; since 2005, the Institute of Asian Studies, Chulalongkorn University, has been the CI.

V. The Program in action

For its first period of 2001–2002, after its official launch in July 2000 which announced the API Declaration (Appendix 2), the Program awarded 26 fellowships to a pioneering group of Fellows who conducted their individual activities over a one-year period. To date, a total of 216 Fellows (120 men and 96 women) have completed their fellowship activities. As the following table shows, these Fellows come from diverse backgrounds: academia (88), media (15), government institutions (16), NGOs (39), creative and performing arts (35), and other fields (23).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Indonesia</th>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>Malaysia</th>
<th>Philippines</th>
<th>Thailand</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academia</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative arts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The subjects and topics of Fellows’ research and other activities have been diverse, ranging from politics, economics, and history to cultural and social traditions, literature and the arts. The diversity of Fellows’ backgrounds, concerns and activities contributes to making the API Community unique.

A review of the first five years of the Program showed that API Fellows have a high collective public output. Almost all the Fellows from Malaysia, the Philippines and Thailand had published various forms of their API project work and outcomes. Fellows from Japan and Indonesia concentrated on different outcomes since few among them were directly engaged in public commentary or advocacy. Many of the Fellows from Japan were based in academia and made their API project an integral part of their regular research work. The research and Fellowship product of more than 60 per cent of Fellows from Indonesia was made up of academic publication. Other Fellows, who undertook new research in their chosen areas, produced quite impressive output. A vast amount of Fellowship product remains to be carefully reviewed to evaluate the overall achievements of Fellows since the Program began.

VI. Regional Workshops: Themes and findings

Regional Workshops have been organized since 2002 when the first batch of Fellows gathered to present their research findings and project outcomes. Each Workshop forms an integral part of the Program.
as Fellows of each year gather to present their project-based papers, commentaries and other products which are subsequently published as the proceedings of the Workshop for that year. As Caroline Hau, Director of the 2004 Workshop, noted, 'The Workshops aim at establishing a cohesive network of public intellectuals with diverse backgrounds, talents, and projects, spanning different generations, countries, intellectual thought and activist milieus across the region.'

Considerable care has been given to the organization of each Workshop which is overseen by a Steering Committee having representatives from The Nippon Foundation, the CI and the PI that hosts the Workshop. A leading public intellectual in the region is appointed Workshop Director whose principal role is to conceptualize, design and coordinate the Workshop activities. To moderate the tendency of workshops to be academic, the Program devotes special attention to the requirements of Fellows in the creative and performing arts whose Fellowship activities result in non-textual creations and products. As of May 2010, eight Workshops have been organized, each around a theme determined by regional circumstances, Fellows’ research activities and conceptual inputs from the Workshop Director.

The 2002 Workshop which brought together the first group of API Fellows had a theme highly relevant to the time: The Asian Face of Globalization: Reconstructing Identities, Institutions and Resources. Commenting on the exchanges during the Workshop, its Director, Ricardo Abad, said, 'From this workshop, we learned how local forces are woven into local practices, and how the prospects for the future, while constrained by global pressure, still leave room for new hybrid arrangements to emerge.' The Proceedings of this Workshop, edited by the Director, received the Loyola Schools Outstanding Work Award for the Social Sciences, conferred by the Ateneo de Manila University. The Workshop concluded with the hope that Asian communities could adjust to globalization with peaceful, democratic strategies and creative ways to make a better world.

The 2003 Workshop, bearing the theme, Economic Prospects, Cultural Encounters and Political Decisions: Scenes in a Moving Asia, explored the close relationships between economic prospects, cultural encounters, and political decisions and the variations in political decision-making that crossed global, regional, national and community levels. The Director, Edi Sedyawati, noted, ‘Fellows wrote papers that addressed the issues of the changing contexts of norms and legality, identities, and social relations. They looked at the arts and religion as sources of creative energy in the moving Asia.’

In 2004, Caroline Hau was the Director of the Workshop that had the theme, Power, Purpose, Process, and Practice in Asia. The Workshop papers highlighted initiatives within Asia that ‘aim[ed] at thinking through, dealing with, and bringing about, changes that shape and transform everyday life in the region’. In her introduction to the Proceedings, Hau cautioned that Asia faced challenges that were ‘forcing us to rethink the basic concepts of territory, state, nation, sovereignty, community, society, public and private spheres, property, self, and activism’. For the Fellows of that year, a critical question was: ‘How might we go about understanding and acting on power relationships and the different purposes, processes, and practices “from above” and “from below”?’ The Workshop featured separate panels for discussions of ‘Policies and Practices’, ‘Participation and Negotiation’, ‘Safeguarding Rights’, ‘Human Security’, and ‘Arts and Identities’.

The Director of the 2005 Workshop was Abdul Rahman Embong. In relation to the theme, Reflections on the Human Conditions: Change, Conflict and Modernity, four questions were raised for Fellows’ consideration:

1. Can there be alternatives for changes to the current human conditions under the on-going globalization processes?
2. What will be the new and changing identities emerging in the region?
3. Will the moral authority of public intellectuals inspire further consciousness for the improvement of human lives?
4. Will a community of public intellectuals emerge and become a sustainable entity and a moral force for change?

These questions which provoked lively discussions then remain relevant to the Program and the API Community.

The 5th Regional Workshop was held in 2006 with Uthai Dulyakasem as Director. Focusing on its theme, Are We Up to the
The Workshop’s ‘keywords and key questions’ included Asia, Asian-ness, Trans-border Engagements, Knowledge formation, Alternatives, and Sustainable world. According to the Director, Melani Budianta:

The API projects are conducted from comparative perspectives by the actors who will invest in networking with other concerned intellectuals and practitioners with similar concerns in other countries and it is this kind of inter-Asian on-the-ground-work through trans-border engagements that allows API projects to contribute significantly to knowledge formation.

Fellows were urged to ponder several far-reaching questions: ‘How does this new knowledge and new forms of praxis, values and perspectives form a dialogue with the existing body of knowledge about the subject? And, how does API’s experience and new Asian scholarship serve as a common point of reference for future strategies in ensuring the sustainability of the world?’

At this 2008 Workshop, the inaugural API Regional Project, Community-Based Initiative for Human-Ecological Balance, was officially launched. This Regional Project was the expression of API’s commitment to propose and implement alternative ideas for a sustainable world.

In 2009, the 8th Workshop was dedicated to the theme, Confluences and Challenges in Building the Asian Community in the Early 21st Century. The Workshop was conducted from two novel perspectives: the abandonment of ‘city eyes’ and ‘the imperatives of comparison’. The Director, Patricio Abinales, cautioned that, ‘Public intellectuals are often swayed by ideological perspectives and political preferences and these may accord them the status of men and women of principle, but they are often obstructions to open-mindedness and respect for difference.’ It was pointed out that public intellectuals were so often bound by expertise and specialization that it was difficult to encounter a multi-disciplinary public intellectual who could bridge several fields and specializations. Bearing those perspectives in mind, Fellows held critical discussions highlighting the following issues:
Fellows were raising a related question, ‘Where do we go from here?’ and wondering aloud, ‘What will happen next to the API Community?’ In the fifth year of the Program, Fellows initiated efforts to build the API Community.

API Country Workshops were first organized in May 2006 in each of the five countries. Fellows attended the Country Workshop of their country to be acquainted with one another and to explore opportunities for collaboration within their own country. The first Country Workshops concluded with Fellows making such proposals as:

• improving communications among Fellows in the same country via online connections
• organizing seminars, workshops and conferences
• investigating possible collaborative research and action, and
• promoting public relations by disseminating information to general audiences.

Following the Country Workshops, representatives of Fellows from the five countries held a Focus Group Meeting in Bangkok in July 2006 to discuss collaboration that would transcend national boundaries. From this meeting of 24 Fellows and representatives from The Nippon Foundation, CI, and PIs, a Regional Working Committee was established to:

• bridge the country-level and regional-level discussions and dialogues
• participate in API Workshops as discussants, resource persons or facilitators, and
• facilitate the implementation of regional projects.

The Regional Working Committee agreed that the API Community should be accountable in all activities, be more collaborative than individualist in projects, and be aware that marginalized people constituted the hardest hit social sectors. In addition, the Regional Working Committee proposed a three-pronged approach in building the API Community:

• significant changes in how Fellows understood the topics during and after their fieldwork
• how knowledge of the society visited by a Fellow and his/her own society has expanded, and,
• insights into how such encounters could lead to creating an Asian Community.

In total, 215 papers were presented at the eight Regional Workshops, and a majority of them have been published in seven sets of Proceedings. The papers covered a tremendous diversity of subjects in areas such as politics and social conflicts, economics and development, social policy and social justice, environment and resource management, history and local communities, and culture and the arts. These Workshop Proceedings, together with other publications and works produced by Fellows, are a valuable and critical archive of knowledge on communities in Asia. Part of the API Community’s future action plans should be the effective dissemination and utilization of this growing body of knowledge.

A majority of Fellows have expressed their appreciation of the Regional Workshop as a platform to report their work, exchange opinions, and learn from other Fellows. Equally, they have found it an occasion to build bonds of understanding and solidarity with Fellows of their year. Even so, some Fellows have criticized the API Workshop format for being rather academic, leaving insufficient time and scope for individual exchanges. On the whole, though, the Workshops fostered a sense of an incipient ‘API Community’ which can be strengthened with Fellows’ commitment to cooperate in pursuit of common agenda.

VII. Community Building: From Country Workshops to Regional Project

At the 4th Workshop, Abdul Rahman Embong asked whether a community of public intellectuals could emerge as a sustainable social entity and a moral force for effecting changes. By the 5th Workshop, Fellows were raising a related question, ‘Where do we go from here?’ and wondering aloud, ‘What will happen next to the API Community?’ In the fifth year of the Program, Fellows initiated efforts to build the API Community.
1. Are the three themes of the Program still relevant or in need of change?
2. What were your expectations of the Program when you applied and were your expectations met?
3. What features of the Program did you find to be rewarding?
4. Did your achievements from the Fellowship and Post-fellowship activities benefit you personally, professionally, your area of advocacy and your community?
5. Identify the strengths and weaknesses of the Program.
6. Compare the strengths and weaknesses with other programs.
7. What are the areas of most concern over the next five years?
8. What are the major intellectual challenges that Asia will face in the next five years?
9. As a public intellectual, how will you engage with these challenges?
10. How can the API Community cope with and respond to these challenges?
11. Is the present API network developing into an identifiable community?
12. Can the API Community be an intellectual and social force in the betterment of the Asian region and its societies?

More than 100 Fellows responded to the Survey by completing the Questionnaire. It is, of course, infeasible to summarize their responses or to generalize too much from them. However, it may be instructive to highlight, below, some important and shared points for further discussion.

i. API: Strengths and weaknesses

The Program definitely contributed much to Fellows’ individual fulfillment. More than 80 per cent of respondents acknowledged that the fellowship was an opportunity that enhanced their professional capacity and intellectual integrity. The API activities helped their career paths to progress, gained them regional perspectives, increased their professional output, developed their stance on advocacy, motivated them to share their findings with the public, and won them partnerships with people.
and organizations in the region. For the respondents, the Program was unique in helping individuals conduct projects which were not funded by conventional sources, offering a generous grant, administering with flexibility, providing good post-Fellowship opportunities, giving valuable professional support, and maintaining a well-designed multi-country administrative infrastructure.

Some weaknesses were noted. The biggest problem raised by a number of Fellows was the under-utilization of collective knowledge. The Program had a sizeable and valuable archive of accumulated knowledge but it remained largely untapped, by Fellows themselves or the public. Hence, API should disseminate the knowledge more effectively among the public. Besides, the Program did not have a structure or mechanism to allow Fellows within the same field to meet, plan and pursue future collaboration.

ii. Issues, concerns and challenges

On substantive issues, 90 per cent of respondents considered the three themes of the Program — Identity, Human Condition and Social Justice, and Globalization — to be still relevant and flexible enough to accommodate many issues of concern. Even then, many respondents said it was necessary to focus on more specific issues as the three themes were rather broad.

The major concerns of public intellectuals over the next five years were more precisely addressed by the respondents. The highest percentage of respondents cited poverty, inequalities, deprivations, and discrimination as the most challenging social issues. The second most frequently noted concern was ‘environmental issues’, followed by ‘regional politics’. For the respondents, the major intellectual challenges included democracy, conflict and violence, social justice and human rights, and transnational issues. Broad issues of globalization, environment, culture, and identity were also identified as important intellectual challenges. Some respondents intriguingly regarded the ‘emergence of China and India’ as a challenge.

As such, the issues and challenges that lie ahead for Fellows may be roughly classified as follows:

1. social issues closely related to the lives of people, namely poverty, inequality, and human rights violations
2. the politics of democracy, peace and social justice, and
3. global, regional and transnational issues that pertain to the environment, migration, identity, culture, etc.

However, respondents’ answers to the question, ‘How can you cope with these challenges as a public intellectual?’, were conventional rather than innovative. Typical answers included: research and study, publishing findings, raising public awareness through advocacy, promoting communication and teaching. Some respondents proposed building bridges between academics and social actors by encouraging pro-active problem-solving research. In other words, they highly recommended action-oriented research that would translate theories and principles into policies, and then into interventions to benefit marginalized and vulnerable sectors of society. And, to promote collaboration and communication among different actors and camps, more intellectual and public exchanges with a view to creating partnerships were recommended.

These answers may be relevant but are vague and abstract. Many respondents are committed to collaborative activities and partnership-building but seemed not to know how to achieve those goals in practice.

iii. How can the API Community work more effectively?

To the question, ‘How can the API Community cope with these challenges and work more effectively?’, the answers were conventional but more engaging, as the following examples suggest:

1. promote intense discussion among like-minded public intellectuals
2. enhance diverse knowledge and skills through collaborative work
undertaking very different projects. If the API Community wanted to be a ‘force’, its members would require strong determination, vision, mission, and incentives. They would need shared commitment and a common denominator to connect with different social groups and political institutions.

IX. Conclusion: Our future

Within a decade, the Program has come a long way from envisioning a community of public intellectuals to building an actual community spread over five countries (and more soon) in Asia, from supporting individual projects at the local level to organizing a regional collaborative project, and from awarding the first fellowships to providing Follow-up Grants to support Fellows to participate in Post-fellowship activities or seminars.

However, many pressing issues and questions remain for the API Community. In conjunction with the 10th Anniversary Regional Celebration, several such questions were listed for discussion, mostly by Fellows participating in the Celebration, but also by other members of the API Community and specially invited guests. These questions were:

1. Is the Program’s goal of nurturing public intellectuals still relevant?
2. Presently, and for the next 10 years, what are the challenging issues at the regional, national, and community levels?
3. Do Asians know about other Asians better than before?
4. Are there comparable opportunities for Asian public intellectuals to learn from one another?
5. Is a new system of creating knowledge emerging in the region?
6. Will a community of public intellectuals emerge and become a sustainable entity and a moral force for change?

Presently, while pondering such questions, Fellows should bear in mind that while some things persist, other things have significantly changed. For example, as Melani Budianta once noted, ‘At present, we no longer talk about the implications of globalization as it comes to Asia,'
but about the impact of Asia as a global force in coloring and transforming our contemporary world. Indeed, as we witness ‘growing initiatives in rethinking world issues from Asian perspectives and bringing Asian intellectual resources to critique and shape global knowledge’, we realize that instead of being passive receivers of the outcomes and impacts of globalization, Asians should promote exchanges among Asians and between them and the rest of the world.

In short, Asians have ‘Asianized’ globalization. Asia is no longer a region where differences predominate with no unity in sight. Rather, as discourses of an ‘East Asian Community’ or ‘ASEAN Community’ suggest, various actors and stakeholders are demonstrating more positive cooperation in the region to ‘create Asia’ or ‘make our Asia’. Thus, Asia is neither fiction nor mere symbol but a regional community. We now witness greater mobility of people, money and commodities across national borders as well as easier multimedia access (for ordinary citizens) to knowledge of Asian countries and communities. Regional institutions, governmental and non-governmental, now assume more importance in working together to tackle common issues.

Our communities face many challenges, too. Solutions are required for numerous social, political, economic, environmental and cultural issues, not least, widening inequalities, conflicts over ethnic, religious and cultural differences, human rights violations, etc. In a word, a fundamental question will always require our attention: ‘How do we make Asian societies places where human beings can enjoy safe, stable and peaceful lives?’ Partly because of this, human security, sustainable environment, aging, food and water security, family welfare, and public health rank among the most important of public issues today.

National governments, regional bodies and civil society organizations may be more determined to resolve pressing but commonly encountered issues in Asia. But these institutions face organizational and structural limitations. Owing to their weak capacities, limitations in governance and handling of transnational issues, Asian governments approach those issues mainly on a national, not regional or global, basis. Regional bodies such as ASEAN vigorously search for new paths of better regional cooperation among member-states and civil society organizations. Civil society organizations crucially help communities and people, but they themselves need help to strengthen their leadership, expertise and finance.

To consolidate and improve the efforts of all these actors, civil society organizations and civic groups need in-depth expertise and problem-solving resources. We need committed experts in different areas who can provide guidance and advice to regional, national and local administrators, NGO workers, civic group members, and the general public. These socially committed experts are our ‘public intellectuals’.

To return to ourselves, we should ask: Can the API Community be such a community of public intellectuals? Can API create a public space where public intellectuals can express and exchange views on issues of social concern? Can the API Community serve as a ‘knowledge base’ for regional change? Can or must the API Community be an intellectual and social force for the betterment of Asian societies?

The times are difficult, circumstances uncertain, and issues complex. Responding to them, Asian public intellectuals must make their voices heard and heeded, and their role effective and influential. For that, they need to cooperate and act as communities. Ten years after the inauguration of the API Program, we must collectively ask, ‘Where do we in the API Community go from here?’
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Alan Feinstein Coordinator, Intellectual Exchange Division, The Japan Foundation Asia Center
Kūichi Fujiwara Professor, Faculty of Law, University of Tokyo
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Teruo Sekimoto Professor, Institute of Oriental Culture, University of Tokyo
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Surichāi Wun’Gaeo Associate Professor and Head, Institute for Social Development Studies, Chulalongkorn University
We, representatives from five countries in Asia, are gathered here today to inaugurate a new collaborative endeavor.

As we enter the 21st century, we recommit ourselves to unified action toward a better future for Asia, even as we celebrate our cultural differences. While we uphold our national borders and traditions, we seek a regional response, aware as we are that the political, economic, and social challenges which our nations face transcend our national boundaries.

Asians unfortunately remain strangers to each other. The lack of familiarity and strong bonds among us prevents us from articulating regional approaches to the difficulties that are upon us.

The shared challenges beckon us to come together to fashion a shared, collaborative response. We take on the challenges with confidence because, while we take pride in our differences, we are all unified by a common heritage and spirit that is Asian.

An effective response to regional problems will invariably require the participation of public intellectuals — men and women committed to working in the public sphere and to collaborating beyond traditional boundaries in articulating common concerns, in proposing effective solutions and in fostering a perspective that is regional in scope and universal in value.

We announce herewith the establishment of The Nippon Foundation Fellowships for Asian Public Intellectuals, a program designed precisely to help build a community of Asians who can think and work in the public sphere. The Program will be initiated in the five countries we are representing today, and public intellectuals to be identified are to be given opportunities for research and professional activities in other participating countries. By promoting mutual understanding and shared learning among Asian public intellectuals, the API Program aims to contribute to the growth of public spaces where effective responses to regional needs can be generated.

All of us gathered here are determined to work together to realize this goal for ourselves, in the hope that our collective effort will bear fruit for the betterment of humanity.
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API Community Vision
Bangkok, July 23, 2006

A
We are a community of multi-disciplinary intellectuals committed to issues related to and affecting Asia. We recognise our diversity as a strength, respect the freedom and autonomy of our work, and desire to work with others who share similar commitments.

We are committed to knowledge work beyond traditional institutionalised boundaries and exploring the meaning and place of Asia in a global context. In our work, we aspire to bring together thinking and doing imbued by accountability and transparency.

We affirm this sense of ourselves in engaging with issues of social, cultural and political significance.

P
Our publics are varied in their localities, size, composition and contexts. They may be rooted in a localised community, confined within a nation-state, or transcend national boundaries.

They represent various sectors and strata of society. We nevertheless share a concern for the marginalised, victimised and oppressed.

Using our knowledge, expertise and experience, we are committed to leaving a legacy to future generations — a world that is peaceful, progressive, and environmentally healthy — and where humans are responsible for each other, and co-exist with respect and dignity.

We can do this by working with the publics concerned, with those who are concerned with their issues, as well as those who are responsible for creating the situation.

I
Beyond research, self-expression, or public recognition, our work values intellectual engagement concerned with the public good. We seek to present ways by which local, national, and regional communities in Asia can enjoy a fair distribution of power. Our advocacy demands discernment, integrity, and commitment.

We contend with everyday struggles, our ranks strengthened by collaboration. Going past the traditional role of the intellectual as critic or thinker, our network includes anyone with a desire to serve the public good.

The API network supports diverse and creative expression that is inclusive in its understanding of intellectual work and upholds a rich heritage of leadership, collaboration and wisdom in order to promote social security and change in Asia.
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Charter of the API Regional Committee
Phuket, November 30, 2006

1. PREAMBLE
The API Program is dedicated to achieving the API Community Vision by addressing critical issues at local, national, and regional levels. Fellows strive after three key objectives: creating a vibrant API Community; working effectively across borders; and making an impact on society.

As the Program gradually generates a growing body of Fellows across the region, a Regional Committee (RC) is needed to act as a driving force for the achievement of the API Community Vision. The RC will represent the community’s interests, enhance interaction between country groups, nurture trans-border consciousness, and promote activities which realize the core values of the API Community Vision.

The RC will strengthen the API Community by drawing on the experience of the Fellows, by facilitating networks and interactions within the Fellowship, by provoking innovative ideas and approaches, and by providing opportunities for Fellows to act collectively as a community, either independently or in cooperation with The Nippon Foundation.

The RC is committed to activities which are critical for the region, cross-disciplinary in nature, trans-border in scope, and multi-level in approach, recognizing the interlinkage of locality, nation, and region. The RC aims to foster a greater regional consciousness by promoting relationships among cultures, by initiating or endorsing collaborative activities, and by confronting public issues with discernment, integrity, and commitment.

The RC will achieve these goals by initiating or endorsing projects that translate the academic and theoretical into the practical and beneficial.

2. FOCUS OF THE REGIONAL COMMITTEE
The RC represents the API Fellows in guiding the community to achieve its collective aspirations.

The RC serves as a mechanism to bridge API Fellows and the wider community in order to foster understanding, cooperation, and activities which promote a regional consciousness and solidarity.

The RC identifies projects and other activities which build on the researches and networks of the API Fellows in order to fulfill the API Community Vision.

The RC serves as an advisory and coordinating body to guide National Coordinating Committees in defining their own goals in line with regional aims.

The RC endorses projects and activities that address regional themes and issues.

The RC may initiate regional projects and activities that either address urgent needs or achieve the API vision in an extraordinary way.

The RC may submit applications for funding.

In evaluating regional projects and activities, the RC will emphasize regional themes and issues that:

• bridge regional knowledge gaps
• have regional implications
• respond to real-life issues or public urgency
• create and strengthen regional sensitivities on critical issues
• address inequalities based on ethnicity, gender, region, or socioeconomic status
• advance human security and fair distribution of power and resources
• translate the academic and theoretical into the practical and beneficial
• bring together cross-disciplinary approaches
• foster sustainable relationships between cultures within national and regional frameworks
• address a wider public
• expand public space and improve opportunities for self-expression
• promote co-existence between API Fellows and our publics in line with the API Community Vision.
PART II

ASIA:
IDENTITY, VISION
AND POSITION
Over the past few weeks, I have had the enjoyable experience of reading through most of the annual volumes issued by The Nippon Foundation. Most of the contributions are eye-opening, not merely for their quality, but also for their comparative reach, and the doors that they open to various networks of people concerned about the adequacy of a long list of state policies. Nonetheless, as a whole, they arouse certain anxieties in my mind, possibly because I spent many academic years as a so-called political scientist. The past decade, say 1998 to 2008, has seen many rapid changes not only in the countries covered by the Foundation’s initiative, but in the globe as a whole. It has ended with the most colossal, and global, economic crisis since the Great Depression of the 1930s, and followed the regional financial crisis of 1997–1998. Politically speaking, the decade started with an admirable outburst of reformist politics, but has ended depressingly with the entrenchment of oligarchies in Indonesia, the Philippines, Thailand, and Malaysia. In all these places, the level of economic inequality has rapidly increased, human rights have been constantly abused, the degradation of the environment remorselessly continues, and state control of the mass media has become more formidable.

What struck me on reading many of the papers in the Foundation’s volumes was the relative invisibility of all this turmoil. One could use as an example Thailand, now in the grip of a long-term political crisis, of which the signs were already visible at the start of the new century. But the Thailand papers barely mention Thaksin Shinawatra, the problems of the monarchy, or the bitter insurrection in the Muslim, Malay-speaking, Far South. There is no warning in them of the coming Red Shirt movement we read about every day in the newspapers. One could read most of the papers on the Philippines without getting any idea of the disastrous presidency of Gloria Arroyo-Macapagal — and so on. Why should this be so?

One could start with the long-term decline of the traditional public intellectual, whose primary readership or audience was the public at large. In the 1960s and 1970s, the most influential public intellectual in the Philippines was certainly Renato Constantino, who wrote many historical studies with a strong left-nationalist character, and who was bitterly hostile to what he called the persisting ‘colonial mentality’ among his fellow citizens. He was not alone. For example, the Protestant American William Henry Scott also wrote influential books about the early history of the Philippines, and about the abused pagan minorities in the Luzon Cordillera. Neither of them was an academic or a professional journalist. Today, almost no such commanding people exist. No Indonesian had so grand an output as the late Pramoedya Ananta Toer, who never finished high school, but wrote a series of extraordinary novels and short stories, for the general public, even though he spent many years in prison. As yet, he has had no successor. In Thailand, Sulak Sivaraksa has for decades been his country’s most powerful social-political critic, and has repeatedly been accused of insulting the monarchy. He has no academic appointment, and is not a journalist. But he is now in his 70s, and also has no obvious successor. Malaysia has one such person, who is still quite young, the satirist, editor, outstanding film-maker, and essayist, Amir Muhammad. Again, he is not an academic, journalist, or civil servant. But he, too, is rather alone.

You will have noticed that I emphasize particularly the absence of academic occupations among these courageous people. This point leads me to the first of two profound changes making the survival of public intellectuals difficult: it is the professionalization of universities, following the example of America, which in turn borrowed heavily from 19th century Germany. (The contrast is plain with the Enlightenment of the 18th century, whose brilliant leaders cannot be described in
disciplinary terms.) This professionalization was originally built on the powerful institution of the disciplines, in other words the fragmentation of knowledge and study according to the logic of the division of labor. In itself, this trend discouraged historians from getting interested in anthropology and economists from studying sociology. But it also meant that success in scholarly life was largely determined by senior figures in each discipline. In addition, professionalization encouraged the development of technical jargons understandable only by people in the same academic disciplines. More and more, academics wrote for each other, submitted draft articles to ‘professional journals’ and sent book manuscripts to university presses. Writing books for the ‘public’ came to be regarded as necessarily superficial. Unsurprisingly, the price paid for this attitude has been disastrously bad prose.

Nonetheless, America was in some ways unique. First of all, it had no national-level state-owned universities, unlike almost every other country in the world. Most of the top universities were private. Second, the country developed thousands of universities in response to the popular demand, at a time when university degrees were thought of as requirements for well-paying jobs within and without the universities themselves. Third, the country has a long tradition of hostility to university intellectuals in general, meaning that only a small minority of professors had any sustained connections to the political elite or the mass media. Yet the American example was very powerful from the 1950s onwards, given the country’s hegemonic global position during and after the Cold War. Tens of thousands of youngsters from most parts of the so-called Free World were invited to come to America to get advanced degrees, and were amply funded by private foundations and state agencies. On their return home, they were supposed to follow their teachers’ example and reinvent university life, often with substantial American financial and political support. But this task was carried out only in part, given the character of the societies from which the youngsters had come.

In Southeast Asia, for example, the top universities are mostly owned by the state, and their staffs are thus civil servants of one sort or another. There is a long tradition of respect for learning, based on both pre-colonial and colonial-era social orders. This respect for learning is fortified by the strong connection to the state. Professors have access to the political elite and the mass media in a way almost unthinkable in the USA. On the other hand, their high social status has usually not been paralleled by comparable financial awards. In the USA, professors are very highly paid, many senior professors earning over USD 100,000 every year. In most of Southeast Asia, in contrast, professors are badly paid, and so they end up working on useless state research projects, moonlighting in other universities, speculating in real estate, and taking advantage of various kinds of mass media opportunities such as becoming columnists in newspapers, TV personalities and so forth. Students are often neglected, ignored, or treated in the bureaucratic manner. A good many academics prefer not to teach at all, but sit in research institutes which are rarely very productive. This is why so many of the best students are largely autodidacts and despise their nominal teachers.

Under such circumstances, many academics pragmatically align themselves with the political elites. They often compete fiercely for grants made available by agencies in the rich countries, who have their own agenda. This tendency has its downside alongside its benefits. I well remember a wonderfully dedicated woman who, many years ago, handled the Toyota Foundation’s grants to Southeast Asian academics. She said she was really shocked to notice that Filipino academics attending Foundation-sponsored conferences not only expected all their expenses to be paid, but even demanded cash payments for their contributions. These cash payments were typically used for shopping during conferences. She was really upset, fearing that this mercenary trend would soon spread elsewhere (she was right). Moonlighting for the mass media has its own problems. Television slots pay well, but usually no one is given more than five minutes, which is not enough to explain anything important. Writing columns at least encourages academics to write for a wide general public, but serious intellectuals cannot turn out weekly columns without endlessly repeating themselves, chatting about themselves, and obeying the instructions of the editors and owners of newspapers. They become employees — of the state, of the foreign foundations, or newspaper moguls and TV managers. Small wonder that they have little time to do real research,
write significant books, or seriously challenge anything. They are also peculiarly isolated.

Let me give you one striking example. A couple of years ago, I gave a lecture at a top Bangkok university for about 200 professors and students. In the course of this talk, I spoke at some length about the first genius that Thailand has produced since the 1960s — the great filmmaker Apichatpong Weerasethakul, who won two top prizes at Cannes within the space of three years, and in 2010 won the most prestigious award in the international film world — Cannes' Palme d’Or. At the end of my talk, I asked those who had ever heard of Apichatpong to lift their hands. About ten hands were raised, all by students. How many had seen any of his films? About six, again all students. I suddenly realized the isolation (ignorance too) of the professors, who only watch Hollywood films, and have no interest in Thai film-makers: They have no degrees! They didn’t go to the schools we attended! They don’t know anyone important in the government! There are thus almost no bridges between professors and film-makers, novelists, painters, and so on. No wonder that film-makers and novelists usually have a very low opinion of professors. Only unprofessional students are connected to the two worlds. All of this suggests some of the reasons why one is unlikely to find public intellectuals in universities, though there are always important exceptions. Professionalization, civil service status, closeness to the ruling elite, low incomes, Philistinism, contempt for students — all play their parts.

But one cannot blame universities and their professors without considering the environment in which they exist. Here I come to the second major change affecting the survival of the public intellectual. This can be described as the changing culture of national elites and the ways in which they make use of the power of the state. The first thing to notice is the gathering trend for these elites to send their children to so-called international primary and secondary schools in their own countries, then send them overseas for various tertiary degrees, mainly to the USA and the UK, as well as France, Japan, Australia, Singapore, and so on. This outlook means contempt for their countries’ own educational institutions, which are for ‘outsiders’ and second-class citizens. If the quality of these institutions declines, it is, ‘who cares? It doesn’t affect us’.

Sizeable budget allocations for ‘education,’ typically involves unnecessary building programs which benefit contractors with political connections, bad and out-of-date textbooks, computers for teachers who don’t know to use them, etc., etc. For these elites only degrees from foreign universities have any real prestige. This situation is the opposite of what occurred in the early days of independence when everyone was proud of their schools, teachers were generally respected, and political leaders were proud of the universities they opened which they hoped would be admired domestically and internationally.

What do the children of today’s elites study, if they study at all? You can be sure the degrees they obtain will be mainly professional-commercial: business management, marketing, economics, engineering, IT, etc., not history, literature, anthropology or psychology. These disciplines are often seen to be ‘useless,’ and irrelevant for ‘our children’ who are to take their parents’ place eventually in political systems in which nepotism is more and more shamelessly promoted. Anecdote: When I last spoke with Amir Muhammad, he told me that his little publishing firm had just printed a collection of short stories by gay and lesbian writers. Knowing the harsh legal penalties for ‘abnormal’ sexual relations in Malaysia, I asked him if he was afraid of repression. ‘Not at all,’ he said, laughing, ‘the great advantage of our country is that the rulers don’t read books, only two-page policy recommendations and the daily press. Plus, the book is in English, which they are not very good at anyway.’ Emblematic in another way is what happened in the long dictatorship of Suharto. In 1978, there was a nationwide rebellion of university students against the regime, which was quickly crushed. The intellectual leaders were mainly youngsters connected with the prestigious Technical Institute of Bandung. But during the successful 1998 rebellion against Suharto, twenty years later, this institute was impotent, and its students did nothing. (The courageous activists came mainly from ‘class B’ universities often in private — Muslim and Christian — hands). Why? The reason is simple. Suharto, eager for development without worries, employed large numbers of ITB graduates, usually sent overseas for advanced study, to man the ministries of technology, heavy industry, and mining, which soon became notorious for nepotism and corruption. The dictator knew
these people were no threat to him. Fully co-opted, they no longer had a political or moral base in Indonesian society.

In 1961, when I applied for a visa to do research on the Indonesian Revolution, I had to wait nine months before it was granted. The main reason was bureaucratic laziness, but there was also the understandable fear that researchers coming from the USA could be agents of the CIA. Under Suharto, a favorite of the USA, changes occurred which made the situation worse. The ambition of the regime was to exercise full control over all foreign students, banning them from studying anything deemed ‘sensitive’. The control was exercised by the military intelligence apparatus, using as a mask LIPI (the Indonesian Institute for the Sciences), a bureaucratic arm of the state manned by ‘trustworthy’ researchers who rarely taught students and had little contact with them. This management technique spread to Malaysia and Thailand and, to a lesser extent, the Philippines. The veto power of the various intelligence apparatuses in all these countries was such that students applying for research visas either turned to safe, innocuous projects, or studied how to lie intelligently, by submitting proposals they had no intention of carrying out in the field.

Most of these foreign students were financed by foreign governments or private foundations. These institutions — American, Japanese, Dutch, British, French, Canadian, etc. — had long term goals in mind, and dozens or even hundreds of students depending on their financial support. Foreign governments, with multiple interests in, say, Indonesia or Malaysia, had to think carefully about not upsetting the host government. Private foundations faced the same problem, how to encourage good research while not offending or upsetting the state apparatus. If they were too bold, they could be banned, their projects blocked, their relations with ministries of education, and, above all, intelligence apparatuses, very difficult. Under such pressures, it is quite understandable that these agencies and foundations felt forced to be very careful and conservative. You can easily see why their well-meaning programs rarely favored public intellectuals, but rather emphasized technocratic or small-scale projects unlikely to create problems — not only for themselves but also for the youngsters that they sponsored and financed.

We need also to consider some very powerful veto-groups. Let me give you an example from each of the Southeast Asian countries involved with The Nippon Foundation’s well-meant programs. In Indonesia, the most important veto-groups are the military and Muslim politicians. I cannot think of a single good book about the Indonesian military (at the national level) published in the last 30 years either by an Indonesian scholar or a foreigner. Most of the best stuff available comes from the world of the NGOs — Amnesty International, Indonesia Watch, etc. — but their work is not systematic and is usually focused on abuses of human rights at various levels and in various localities. But studying the military’s vast empire of businesses, legitimate and illegitimate, is more or less a ‘no-no’. You would also be inclined to think that scholars must be interested in studying the odd situation where the country is nominally 90 per cent Muslim but the combined votes for the various Muslim parties over the past ten years have never reached even half this number. Or, why is it that while the influence of Islam has been visibly increasing over the past decade, the prestige of Muslim politicians has reached an all-time low? But silence prevails.

In the Philippines, the most powerful veto-group is the Catholic Church, which has successfully blocked any enlightened law on divorce, leading to countless marital separations which severely damage women and children. It has also impeded the widespread distribution of birth-control mechanisms: this stance has not only led to uncontrolled population growth in an already poverty-stricken country and hence to massive emigration, but also undermined the struggle against AIDS. The total assets and the internal budgets of the hierarchy are usually well-kept secrets. I cannot think of a single book that systematically investigates the Church’s financial interests and social policies, as well their political and economic consequences for the Philippine nation.

In Malaysia, the crucial veto-group is the ingrown United Malays National Organization (UMNO) oligarchy, which has held unbroken power for more than half a century. Over the years it has made regular use of the draconian Internal Security Act — a ‘security’ law inherited from late British colonialism but ‘improved’ by the post-independence state — to suppress rebels, critics and dissenters. The claim has always been that the Act is essential for preserving social peace,
national unity, and warm inter-ethnic relations. It is true that UMNO today is in decline thanks to deep and widespread social changes, mediocre and corrupt leadership, and simple popular boredom. It is also true that there are energetic environmental NGOs, NGOs working against racial discrimination especially against the miserable Indian (Tamil) minority, and so on. But a frontal assault against the corruption, incompetence, hypocrisy, and the discriminatory attitudes of the UMNO elite itself is not yet in place, not yet, though scholars and the public are getting bolder little by little.

Finally, Thailand. Here the dominant veto-group is that which surrounds the monarchy, protected until very recently by the harsh laws on *lèse majesté*. The only good, serious book on the monarchy is Paul Handley’s *The King Never Smiles*. Handley is a former Bangkok-based journalist, who is now barred from the country. When news got out that Yale University Press was going to publish his book, the court veto-group made every effort to force Yale to cancel its plan — to no avail. Handley’s book was prohibited in Thailand. Needless to say, the book was secretly translated into Thai and circulated on the internet, one jump ahead of the state’s electronic censorship agencies. Another smaller but telling example is the National Museum’s permanent exhibition on the history of Thailand from its misty origins 800 years ago up to the present. The truly strange thing is that this panoramic exhibition gives a name to only four people, all of them ‘Great’ monarchs. Not a single writer, general, doctor, poet, scientist, monk, judge, philosopher, philanthropist or painter, let alone a woman, is mentioned. (Such an exhibit would be unthinkable in ex-colonial Indonesia, the Philippines, or even Malaysia.) The same kind of suppression, even if more sophisticated in form, can be seen in Thailand’s academic disciplines such as art history, history, national literature, political science, ethnology and so on. Naturally there are some free spirits about, including some professors old enough to be retired. But the general picture is far from exhilarating.

The general point is that such powerful veto-groups are so strong that they cannot be discussed openly as veto-groups. Nobody says in public ‘I can’t write honestly about the Catholic Church,’ ‘It is impossible to investigate the Indonesian military’s business interests,’ and ‘We cannot publicly criticize the Thai monarchy.’ It is true that on

the internet people can and do go after the veto-groups, but they usually write anonymously, for fear of imprisonment, physical violence, or social ostracism. But the world history of the public intellectual is generally a history of courageous challenging of existing institutions and veto-groups, sometimes with fatal consequences.

Let me conclude with a few words about books and why for the public intellectual they continue to be so important. Newspapers with their columns are necessarily ephemeral, consumed by the next day’s output. Television can have its vivid moments, but one does not watch last year’s programs. Films can be great, but typically they are watched only once or twice, except by specialists. The internet has emancipatory moments, but the traffic is huge, and the messages in the blogosphere, Facebook, etc., are necessarily short — meant for the moment. Good books, however, can be read many times over and can survive, reanimated, over very long periods. One can still read Lady Murasaki’s great novel with pleasure and instruction, like the works of José Rizal, Milton, Pramoedya, Hafiz, Voltaire, and so forth. They allow space for everything that is complicated and complex. They are read privately in a person’s mind. And they have no specified-in-advance readers; anyone can learn from them. It is here that I would like to say that the development of networks, as promoted by The Nippon Foundation, while highly commendable and valuable, still means friendly communication between like-minded people who think about a familiar cluster of social and political problems, and try at times to find peaceful solutions to these problems. But politics is always based on conflict, not friendliness, and it cannot be wished away. The public intellectual recognizes this reality and therefore tries to speak to the whole public, which includes the intellectual’s enemies, visible and shadowy. Three hundred and fifty years ago, the great public intellectual Jean-Jacques Rousseau wrote that ‘Man is Born Free, but is Everywhere in Chains.’ This famous sentence was intended for both the oppressed and their oppressors: encouragement for the defiance of the former and a warning to the latter. People like Rousseau seem to come out of nowhere, but are also products of the stresses and conflicts of their times. I am afraid that I am skeptical that any ‘program,’ no matter how well-intended, can really produce public intellectuals.
Benedict R. O’G. Anderson has given us a bird’s-eye view of the problems of the public intellectual across Southeast Asia. I have no quarrel with him over his distinction between effective public intellectuals and ineffective ones. But, since he didn’t speak much on the theme of *Changing Identities and their Social, Historical, and Cultural Context*, I’d like to offer some comments on that.

I would disagree a bit with Anderson’s way of strictly separating the public intellectual from the academic intellectual. There is a problem with seeing public intellectuals as somehow floating in the public sphere, with nobody to contend with, with beautiful ideas that are not subject to the academe’s built-in mechanism of peer review.

Let’s take Anderson’s examples of Renato Constantino and William Henry Scott. If we look for the Filipino nation in Constantino’s nationalism there is only the center of the geographic archipelago. The people of the Cordillera, the Moros, and the Mangyans are not there. Only the national heroes of the Metro Manila or Tagalog zone are present. Constantino had mastery of English, but he shared a generation-bound view that assumed the Filipino to be Manila-educated, English-speaking, and Christian.

Scott wrote about abused ‘pagan minorities’ in the Luzon Cordillera but they were not at all ‘pagan’. Rather than being an autonomous public intellectual, Scott went to the Cordilleras as a lay missionary for his Anglican Episcopalian sect. He wrote mythologized views about the Cordillera people, the so-called Igorots. He mistakenly depicted the Ilocanos of the lowland as agents of colonization. Other scholars, including me, would simply say that the Igorots who went down to coastal areas by crossing the mountain became Ilocanos, whereas the Ilocanos who went up became Igorots. In short, between Igorots and Ilocanos lies an issue of changing identities, dependent on geographical setting and the position of people moving about.

One might say that if Scott and Renato Constantino were not so ‘autonomous’ but partly based in the academe, their peers might have debated their best ideas and saved them from various mistakes. Hence, I think a public intellectual can have one foot in the academe, and the other foot outside, in media, say. Perhaps even the idea of a public intellectual who serves a ‘public at large’ is now a fantasy because electronic media has so individualized the channels and programs to which people are connected. There is no more public at large, or a general reader; so the public intellectual would have to deal with several publics.

**Azyumardi Azra**

Professor Anderson emphasized the importance of public intellectuals in Southeast Asia given its social, political, and religious turbulence and disruption. Here, public intellectuals should give guidance and show moral-ethical courage. But the number of public intellectuals seems to be in decline, while the work of supposed Asian public intellectuals lacks the concerns of public intellectuals. Professor Anderson’s examples of public intellectuals did not come from academia, in some cases, not even tertiary education. Born in different social, cultural, political, and religious settings, those notable figures differ from API Fellows who tend to be researchers and members of the intelligentsia. The latter, as a rule, concentrate on limited academic interests; their imagination and concerns do not go beyond their fields.

Yet, public intellectuals cannot refrain from speaking on many issues; hence, many of them are also social activists who sometimes confront the regime and certain segments of society. Beyond that, public intellectuals, particularly in Indonesia, Philippines, and Thailand, are trapped in a difficult dilemma. They, particularly those from universities, are expected to produce excellent work despite having limited resources. Yet, they are expected to engage with public issues, which some do via newspaper columns, magazine...
articles and television appearances, all criticized by Professor Anderson.

It is rare to find someone like Pramoedya Ananta Toer who expressed his imagination and concerns through great literary work. Yet, not many Indonesians are able to buy his books, let alone understand them. Hence, Pramoedya was commonly described as an intellectual ‘in heaven’ (di atas angin), being at a great distance from the people.

There were other Indonesian public intellectuals — such as Soedjatmoko (former Rector of United Nations University in Tokyo), Nurcholish Madjid (former Rector of Paramadina University), and Abdurrahman Wahid (Gus Dur) — who emerged from universities and civil society organizations. Indeed, Gus Dur was called Guru Bangsa — Teacher of the Nation — before he was involved in politics. Now we have Amah Sari Maarif, another Guru Bangsa and a very active public intellectual.

These were writers, public speakers and leading figures engaging important issues of culture, religion, democracy, human rights, pluralism, civil society, and gender equity-equality. Even under Suharto’s autocratic regime, public intellectuals, including those in state-owned universities, were relatively free to express themselves. For example, some rectors, elected by university senates, not appointed by presidential decree, remain critical, even of presidents.

Unfortunately, some public intellectuals, including former President Abdurrahman Wahid, were pulled into power politics, becoming party leaders or pursuing high office, and losing their stature as public intellectuals. Thus, fewer public intellectuals are now involved in power politics, preferring to disengage from the political realm to return to their original habitat.

**Response**

**Benedict R. O’G. Anderson**

My comrade sitting beside me has much better experience than I do in peer review. My experience of peer review in USA, in much of USA, is that people do each other favors: ‘You support my project, I’ll support yours.’ If you put a book out in public it’s there to be reviewed; people can scream about it. So, I’m not sure that the peer review is a solution. It’s still enclosed in the small space of academia. People like Constantino and Scott weren’t heroes of mine. I just mentioned them as people who were influential without having an academic base, or a brilliant and serious journalistic base. The time for those kinds of people, maybe, is gone. We’ll see.

Again, as far as electronic media is concerned, I’m all for it. It’s an excellent thing, but the fact is, the whole function of that kind of exchange is very short. Blogs — nobody reads anything that’s more than a page on the blogosphere either. In that sense, blog-people are like Cabinet ministers in Malaysia. I mean, you just don’t read more than one or two pages. A blog is not a place where you can think seriously about things. And it has to be said also that blogs are written spontaneously, and if you write spontaneously you usually write badly. So academics write extremely badly on the whole, especially in places like Indonesia and Malaysia where there is a compulsive need to use English words to show how cool you are and so forth which just makes it absolutely impossible to read with any pleasure. Blogs are the opposite. They’re a lot of fun to read. But, of course, they’re written very fast and carelessly and nobody’s thinking about anything elegant or distinguished. So we still have to rely on books in that sense.

As for Indonesia, I completely agree with what we’ve just heard, and especially, the comment about Gus Dur, how he started out as a thinker about pluralism and so forth, and ended up as a not very successful president of the country. But, to return to the question of intellectuals becoming involved in the column industry … I frankly think it’s really rather fatal. I long stopped reading these columns in Indonesian weekly magazines because they’re always the same over and over again. It’s not their fault. If you and I had every week to write something about what’s going on in the world, it’s bound to be superficial. You don’t have time to rewrite, or to compare how you want it. The famous thing is, the editor says to you, ‘We don’t want it good, we want it Tuesday.’ And even my great friend, Goenawan Mohammad … it’s been fifteen years since I read any of his columns in Tempo because I can see it’s just the same thing endlessly repeated.

So, the crucial thing about the public intellectual is, he
knows when to keep quiet, knows when to time his interventions, make sure that they have impact; don’t repeat himself or herself too often. It requires a certain kind of concern to write in a way that isn’t condescending, in a normal, everyday kind of language. A little bit slangy and a little bit off the street. And, this is important, not fill it up with technical words. It’s still possible. I was just very struck watching the Red Shirt demonstrations on TV in Bangkok. In a way, because those crowds had to be entertained round the clock, they couldn’t or shouldn’t be bored, and the striking thing is that the most successful orator, Nattawut Saikko, spent a lot of time actually explaining things, but also calling on the people to give their own experiences. This is a very unusual opportunity. Commercial TV doesn’t allow you to do this, but he could speak for an hour on this Red Channel and talk about his childhood, talk about their experiences and so forth. So, maybe, it takes some kind of uprising to allow for this more extended communication in the public sphere on TV.

I wish, first of all, to thank the organizers of The Nippon Foundation Fellowships for Asian Public Intellectuals’ 10th Anniversary Celebration for giving me the honor to associate myself with this event. To me, this Celebration is of historic importance partly because of the composition of its participants who represent Asian public intellectuals, and partly because of its timing, taking place when concerns over global governance and social justice have reached a crescendo.

In light of the current global financial market and economic crisis, it is with much pleasure that I have the opportunity to share with you my personal views and aspirations for my work on domestic production of drugs which leads to greater access to medicines, especially antiretroviral drugs in Thailand, and anti-malarial and antiretroviral drugs in African countries.

It is beyond dispute that we are in the midst of a global health crisis. Millions of people around the world, the majority of them living in developing countries, are dying because they lack access to life-saving medications for diseases like AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria. Cost is a tremendous factor in this crisis.

Two-thirds of the value of medicines produced globally is accounted for by companies in five major countries, namely, the UK, the USA, Japan, Germany and France. Large-volume markets of lower-price medicines exist in the highly competitive markets of China and India. For the period 1985 to 1999, the low income countries’ share of
medicine production in the world market declined from 3.9 per cent to 2.6 per cent, and that of middle income countries fell from seven per cent to 4.5 per cent. The share of high income countries increased from 89.1 per cent to 92.2 per cent.

A critical issue in generic drug manufacturing is access to Active Pharmaceutical Ingredients (API). The global market for generic API is estimated at USD 6 billion, growing at 8–10 per cent annually. The critical mass of sales level of API is essential, with both patented and non-patented medicines relying on outsourced API production. The manufacture of chemicals is not just limited to pharmaceuticals but includes the dyes and other industrial agents, pesticides, etc.

From the point of view of production, the manufacturing of pharmaceuticals and related products can be classified based on the following:

- Bulk manufacture of synthetic organic chemicals (chemical process)
- Pharmaceutical excipient manufacturing
- Bulk manufacture of antibiotics, through fermentation, and synthesis through culture of micro-organisms (biological process)
- Preparation of biological and biotechnologically derived products
- Preparation of human and animal derived blood products
- Production of naturally occurring or vegetable sources (alkaloids, insulin, and hormones)
- Processing of bulk medicines into finished forms (in various dosage forms), and,
- Production of sterile products (small and large volume parenterals).

There is a high level of differentiation in terms of formulation types, delivery systems, and timed released applications. This is relevant to the initiatives that are underway to promote local production of essential medicines to improve and facilitate access.

The development and manufacture of medicines must be aimed at improving public health and well-being, thereby contributing to economic growth. There should be an alignment of the profitability goals of industry with society's needs of improved access and affordable healthcare.

An estimated 487 million workers, or 16.4 per cent of all workers, do not earn enough to help themselves and their families live above the 'one dollar per day' poverty threshold. About 1.3 billion workers (43.5 per cent of all workers) live below two dollars per day. Of these workers, about 90 per cent live in South Asia, East Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa. Social justice is on the line and the challenge for global and national governance is huge and urgent to address the drivers of this grave condition. As the economic gap between the Industrialized and Low Income Countries (LICs) widens, so, too, does the health gap between the rich and the poor. This is particularly evident in relation to the HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria epidemics in Africa. For too long we have accepted the access gap as a fact of life. Twenty eight million people have died from AIDS and, if things stay as they are, the number of such deaths will be close to 100 million by 2020.

Today we are still far from extending treatment to all those who need it. The number of new infections continues to outpace our efforts to stop the spread of HIV. Life-saving combination antiretroviral (ARV) therapy for HIV/AIDS is available, but not to all. In 2001, 500,000 persons in high-income countries took ARVs and fewer than 25,000 died. Contrast this with Sub-Saharan Africa where fewer than 30,000 persons took ARVs and 2.2 million died. For every five newly infected HIV/AIDS persons, only two could get access to treatment. The huge gap in care has been called a crime against humanity and a holocaust of the poor. It certainly brings realization that we need to put an end to the global apartheid of poverty and health.

1. Thailand's local ARV production: a long-term solution for ARV programs

1.1 The HIV/AIDS situation in Thailand

In Thailand, about 600,000 people out of a population of 65 million are infected with HIV. It is estimated that two per cent of men and one per cent of women currently live with HIV. There are 20,000 new AIDS and HIV-infected patients each year. Successful prevention
campaigns have stabilized the incidence of new HIV-infected and Thailand is moving towards a more ‘mature’ phase of the epidemic. More and more people are showing symptoms and requiring care. The healthcare system in Thailand has sufficient resources to treat many common opportunistic infections.

Thailand has had experience with antiretroviral therapy since 1988 but the experience was mixed because of the costs involved and the initially poor implementation of treatment in clinical practices.

1.2 Government Pharmaceutical Organization

The function of the Government Pharmaceutical Organization (GPO), a state enterprise under the Ministry of Public Health, is to manufacture and supply pharmaceuticals and other medical products to support the health service activities of the Ministry of Public Health throughout the country. GPO manufactures more than 300 items of pharmaceuticals, especially drugs in the National List of Essential Drugs, including biological products. It has a total of 2,200 employees and an annual sales volume of about USD 100 million, and it spends about two per cent of sales value on research and development. GPO realizes that one of the factors critical for access to antiretroviral drugs is an affordable price. Drugs should be available at affordable prices so that they fall within the financial reach of health services and individuals in need.

GPO’s Research and Development Institute performs basic, applied and pilot scale research which is essential not only to develop new pharmaceutical products but also to complement and improve existing technologies. The Research and Development Institute has been working on the formulation development and bioequivalence studies of HIV/AIDS-related drugs since 1992.

In 1995, Thailand became the first developing country to make generic ARV available when GPO sold the first generic ARV drug, AZT, to the Ministry of Public Health for use in preventing mother-to-child transmission.

In 2001, a fixed-dose generic combination drug known as GPO-VIR was invented, which contained either 30 or 40 mg of stavudine (depending on the weight of the patient), 150 mg of lamivudine and 200 mg of nevirapine. This fixed-dose combination was able to simplify treatment, increase patient compliance, reduce the emergence of drug resistant HIV, and lower the price of treatment. At the time, patients receiving this regimen took six pills a day at a cost of about USD 474 for original drugs a month, but only USD 85 a month for generic drugs.

The production of GPO-VIR began in April 2002. Now, GPO-VIR is used by about three-quarters of the more than 150,000 people being treated for HIV infection in Thailand. Patients take two pills a day at a cost of USD 27 a month or USD 324 a year.

Manufacturing any generic product is possible only after bioequivalence study. All production phases take into consideration ever more stringent Good Manufacturing Practice (GMP) in manufacturing and quality assurance. GPO now manufactures 11 types of antiretroviral medication in more than 25 dosage forms, with sufficient production for 150,000 patients. Increased production is planned, as well as a new production facility with improved quality standards.

1.3 Conclusion

Owing to GPO’s generic production of these drugs, it is now feasible to attempt to reduce the price of drugs to between five and 20 per cent of its original price, depending on the sources of raw materials. For example, whereas the original AZT cost 40 bahts and the original Stavudine cost 280 Thai bahts, mine only cost eight bahts for each of those.

Thailand will achieve its goal of improving affordability by raising local production where costs are lower and quality can be maintained. In 2002, the Thai government established a policy of universal coverage for antiretroviral treatment and also offered to supply similar drugs to 30,000 patients in Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam.

2. Technology transfer for local production of HIV/AIDS-related drugs in Africa

World medicine production is on the increase but it is concentrated in
a few industrialized countries. Despite the growth observed over the years, studies indicate that Africa’s share of world medicine production continues to decline. Low-income countries (including in Africa) account for about three per cent of global output and while 90 per cent of the medicines used in the African region are imported.

It is estimated that about half the population in the African region lack regular access to essential medicines. In the context of constantly changing socio-economic environment, globalization of trade and patents, double disease burdens, increasing healthcare costs and medicine prices, the public demand for essential medicines remains largely unmet in the region. HIV/AIDS has exacerbated the problem of access to essential medicines.

An assessment of local production of medicines that was carried out by WHO/AFRO (World Health Organization Regional Office for Africa) indicated that out of 46 countries in Africa, 37 have pharmaceutical industries, 34 have secondary-level production (production of finished dosage forms), and 25 have tertiary production (limited to packaging or repackaging). Some countries — Botswana, Chad, Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Mauritania, and Sao Tome and Principe — have no pharmaceutical industries.

The majority of production facilities are privately-owned and locally-produced medicines are mostly generic which satisfy only a small proportion of national requirements. Major constraints in the production of essential medicines in the region include inadequate resources (human and financial), increasing costs, underutilization of capacities, tough competition from imported medicines, and the inability to meet GMP requirements. In this situation, acquiring necessary manufacturing know-how and appropriate technology transfer through South-South cooperation is to be emphasized.

Africa’s 800 million people continue to suffer from a huge burden of preventable and treatable diseases due to HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis (TB), and malaria. These diseases cause incalculable human suffering with devastating human and economic impacts.

Today, 33 million people in the world live with HIV/AIDS, 95 per cent of them in developing countries. While these countries bear the largest burden of HIV infections globally, they account for a very small percentage of the global pharmaceutical market. Africa’s annual share of the global pharmaceutical market is only 1.3 per cent, or USD 5 billion out of USD 470 billion.

Although there is no cure for HIV infection, antiretroviral drugs (ARVs) can dramatically reduce HIV-related morbidity and mortality and improve quality of life. Fourteen years ago the advent of highly active antiretroviral therapy (HAART) transformed the AIDS world. HAART revolutionized the lives of people living with HIV, transforming HIV infection into a chronic and manageable condition. It is estimated that over four million people throughout the world now use antiretroviral medications for HIV. Scale-up in Africa, the continent hardest hit by the HIV epidemic, has been most dramatic, rising from 160,000 at the end of 2003 to 810,000 by the end of 2005. Everyday, over 7,400 people are newly infected with HIV while almost 5,500 people die of AIDS. The progress in the global response to AIDS is real but inadequate. For instance, Botswana, having over 140,000 people on antiretroviral treatment, is the first country in Africa to make universal treatment a reality.

Against all odds, AIDS has been the agent for global solidarity in efforts to raise access to treatment. AIDS has put women and human rights at the centre of global and national development agendas.

Today there are more than 20 different antiretroviral agents licensed for use, and they are grouped as first-, second- or third-line cocktails. However, for the majority of the people in the world on antiretroviral treatment, decisions about an optimal first- or second-line combination are too often made on cost considerations rather than the power of the drug itself.

One of the possibilities of increasing access to ARVs lies in the transfer of technology for domestic production. Yet, experiences so far indicate that technology transfer is not widely applied to the African continent. The enabling factors for building local manufacturing capacity through technology transfer are local technical expertise, incentives for mutual technical cooperation, and the ‘warming up’ of the local market.

I would like to share some observations and reflections on
these issues that are drawn from my experiences of working in Sub-Saharan Africa on projects of technology transfer for local manufacture of essential and affordable drugs. Sub-Saharan Africa has 26 countries, all but one of them classified as Least Developed Countries. I have been working in 16 of them, including Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Democratic Republic of Congo, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Liberia, Mali, Mozambique, Senegal, Tanzania and Zambia.

3. Technology transfer projects

3.1 Democratic Republic of Congo

A project of technology transfer for local production of HIV/AIDS-related drugs was carried out by a private entrepreneur with a social mission in collaboration with German Medical Aid Organization Action Medeor.

Pharmakina (PK), previously owned by Boehringer-Mannheim and Roche, was taken over by the management of PK at the beginning of 1999. PK, the largest private employer in Eastern Congo, is also the world’s largest producer of quinine. PK has put into operation a diagnostic center for malaria, tuberculosis and pregnancy tests which is already open to the public. It also operates 12 Health Centers spread over North and South Kivu.

The aim of this humanitarian project is to reduce the morbidity and mortality of AIDS patients in Bukavu, Eastern Congo, by offering cost-effective diagnosis and low-priced ARV drugs, made up of today’s best available choice of fixed-dose combination of stavudine, lamivudine and nevirapine and taken as twice-daily tablets. This combination, well tolerated in most cases, has few contra-indications and is appropriate for use by women of child-bearing age. It is affordable, easy to take and has proven efficacy under actual field conditions.

When I went there, there was nothing at the factory, so I had to start drawing the layout plan. I did not study this in my pharmacy course, but I had to do it because there was no one else to do it. And I supervised the construction of the factory which took years. The project was part of an on-going Public Private Partnership (PPP) project launched in association with the German Agency for Technical Cooperation (GTZ) that would include screening, counselling and therapy for patients. A total sum of about USD 1 million had been invested and the production of the HIV/AIDS-related drugs began in July 2005.

Action Medeor works in close partnership with PK by providing treatment to a minimum of 50 to 100 patients and monitoring 250 to 500 patients. It has appointed a project manager who is responsible for the implementation of antiretroviral therapy. The laboratory is equipped with a flow cytometer and provides training to personnel. Treatment has already started as locally manufactured drugs are available.

3.2 Tanzania

In Tanzania, a project was implemented to fill technical and human resource gaps in the local production of HIV/AIDS-related drugs.

Of Tanzania’s 33 million people, an estimated two million are living with HIV/AIDS. In 2005, nine percent of its active labor force were HIV-positive. Each year in Tanzania, approximately 50,000 to 60,000 children are born HIV-positive so that about 170,000 Tanzanians living with HIV/AIDS are children 15 years and younger. Indeed, by 2010, AIDS was expected to increase the death rate in Tanzania by more than 50 per cent, and life expectancy was forecast to decline from 65 to 37 years.

Currently only one third of the sub-Saharan African countries have capacities for secondary manufacturing. Even then, their capacities are not matched by comprehensive and good manufacturing practices. The presently best available fixed-dose combination consists of stavudine, lamivudine and nevirapine, for which there is no local production capacity in Tanzania. Yet, the local production of HIV/AIDS-related drugs would provide a long-term solution that could reduce the morbidity and mortality rates among the population.

Tanzania Pharmaceutical Industries (TPI), a pharmaceutical manufacturing company 40 per cent owned by the government and 60
per cent by private entrepreneurs, and having its operations in Arusha, had set out to manufacture artemisinin-based anti-malarial drugs at affordable prices. Moreover, being one of the countries hardest hit by HIV/AIDS, Tanzania decided to start manufacturing life-prolonging drugs for AIDS patients. Since the country has an acute shortage of highly qualified technical and industrial pharmacists, TPI has entered into an agreement with experts from Thailand who agreed to cooperate and transfer knowledge and know-how and all necessary information to support the production of pharmaceuticals, in particular, anti-malarials, antiretrovirals and anti-TB drugs.

A separate project was conducted in collaboration with Action Medeor to transfer technology for local manufacture of affordable anti-malarial drugs because the increase in malaria disease burden in Africa is of great concern nationally and internationally.

Plasmodium falciparum malaria is associated with severe morbidity and mortality, and may be fatal without early diagnosis and effective treatment. In fact, malaria represents the most frequently occurring condition for which patients are admitted to hospitals in most African countries, and remains one of the commonest causes of death in the medical wards. Each year, an estimated 300–500 million new cases of malaria are recorded and an estimated 1.5–2.7 million deaths occur. The highest mortality (more than 90 per cent) occurs among children less than five years old.

However, most artemisinin-based anti-malarial drugs available in private pharmacies in African countries are imported and inaccessible to the population as their prices are too high. It is, therefore, necessary to manufacture the drugs locally or produce simple formulations for poor malaria patients.

In Tanzania, 30 per cent of the people who go to clinics have malaria while 25 per cent of children who die in hospitals die of malaria. Already the country spends 3.4 per cent of its Gross National Product on fighting malaria, spending about USD 100 million each year.

Hence, a project was launched with Tanzania Pharmaceutical Industries (TPI) to develop and implement newly formulated anti-malarials (Artesunate) which involved:

i. providing technical backup for TPI in areas of production and system development, such as standard operating procedures
ii. formulating finished dosage forms, and
iii. ensuring quality improvement and quality assurance

Action Medeor would then make these drugs available at low cost to the public health sector. In September 2003, the newly developed drug, with the name of Thaitanzunate, was launched officially by the Tanzanian Minister of Health. The cost of treatment for adults was USD 0.80. Paediatric dry syrup formulation was manufactured in May 2004.

For this project, Action Medeor acts as a partner responsible for technology transfer and non-profit procurement. TPI itself has been audited by Action Medeor with respect to GMP status.

3.3 Senegal, Burkina Faso, Mali, Gambia, and Gabon

In the above countries, projects were undertaken to bring about technology transfer for local manufacture of affordable anti-malarial and antiretroviral drugs.

In its 2006 Guidelines for the Treatment of Malaria, WHO recommended using artesunate or artemisinin suppositories only for pre-referral treatment, and then referring patients to a facility where complete parenteral treatment with artesunate, quinine or artemether can be instituted.

No manufacturing facility was available or ready for producing anti-malarial drugs in tablet form in Burkina Faso, Gambia and Senegal. But, since the use of artesunate suppository was part of WHO guidelines, it was strongly recommended that artesunate suppository production should be carried out in selected hospitals. Priority in this was given to countries where a quality control laboratory was available. In other words, artesunate suppository, as a life-saving drug against malaria, does not require manufacturing facilities for its preparation and it could be administered conveniently and expeditiously by a hospital to malaria infected patients.

To date, the training of personnel in artesunate suppository production has been successfully completed at the Centre Hospitalier National Pédia trique Charles De Gaulle, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso;
Royal Victoria Teaching Hospital (RVTH), Banjul, Gambia; Centre Hospitalier Aristide Le Dantec, Dakar, Sénégal; and Usine Malienne De Produits Pharmaceutiques (UMPP), Bamako, Mali. Quality control tests have been conducted on the products and most have been found to comply with specifications.

The pharmaceutical plant in Gabon is ready for the technology transfer project of the Thai government related to the production of fixed-dose combination of antiretroviral and anti-malarial drugs provided that HPLC is available for quality control of manufactured products.

The objective of the project has been successfully attained: in all the five West African countries, the technology transfer for local production of affordable anti-malarials has been simultaneously implemented in accordance with the varied needs and local conditions of available facilities and approval of the concerned health authorities.

### 3.4 Mali

In Mali in 2007, the Royal Thai Embassy in Dakar extended its 2006 Project on the transfer of technology for the local production of anti-malarial drugs in West African countries.

The local production of essential drugs was deemed by the government of Mali to be a priority and a crucial contribution not only to the improvement of healthcare but also to the social and economic well-being of its population. The principal objective of the 2007 project was to increase the manufacturing capabilities of the Maliene factory (UMPP) in Mali to produce anti-malarial drugs on an industrial scale for local market and regional consumption.

The UMPP personnel have now mastered both techniques of direct compression and wet granulation to the satisfaction of the expert and all parties involved. They are highly capable of manufacturing artesunate 50 mg tablets and amodiaquine 153 mg tablets as well as a fixed-dose combination of AS/AQ. To that extent, UMPP is the first factory in the whole of Africa to possess the know-how to manufacture these two anti-malarial drugs, particularly the fixed-dose of AS/AQ, on an industrial scale.

The implementation of this phase of the project owed its success to a very large extent to the competence, dedication, efforts and discipline of the UMPP personnel, the greatest strength of the factory. Despite the factory’s lack of modern facilities and degraded infrastructure, its personnel’s contribution to the functioning of the factory is clearly illustrated in the good maintenance of the existing, albeit old machines and their diligent operation of their designated responsibilities. Furthermore, the UMPP personnel demonstrated their ability to utilize the available resources and develop their skills to adapt to the constrained circumstances in order to overcome the difficulties of production. This factor helped tremendously to overcome many challenges facing the project and gave UMPP hope and inspiration to realize their objective of being the first in West Africa to produce high-quality co-blistered artesunate and amodiaquine tablets and also fixed-dose combination of AS/AQ accessible to all.

It is expected that UMPP will greatly contribute to the realization of the country’s National Health Policy Objectives of making available to all Malians essential and affordable pharmaceutical products of quality.

### 3.5 East Africa

Projects were launched in Tanzania, Zambia, Ethiopia, and Uganda to transfer technology for the local production of essential medicines.

In Tanzania, an agreement was reached via a Memorandum of Understanding signed between Berlin Pharmaceuticals of Thailand and Tanzania Pharmaceuticals Industries (TPI) to co-operate and exchange knowledge and know-how, and support each other in the procurement, distribution, sale, and production of essential pharmaceuticals over a period of five years. During this period at least five products would be manufactured as specified on schedule. Since then, Berlin Pharmaceuticals and TPI have formulated and agreed an action plan for their collaboration.

In Ethiopia, Bethlehem Pharmaceuticals took into consideration the priority diseases, such as HIV/AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis, which afflicted the population and has indicated its readiness to manufacture quality and effective drugs for the three diseases
and satisfy the demand of the country at affordable prices.

At the Ethiopian Ministerial Council meeting in November 2006, the pharmaceutical sector was one of four sectors that the Ethiopian government aimed to support to promote efficient local pharmaceutical production. In the course of the implementation of this policy, the utmost effort was made to encourage, emphasize and revitalize local production.

The objective of the project has been successfully achieved with technology transfer from a Thai pharmaceutical manufacturer to local drug manufacturers in Tanzania — and in the future in Ethiopia — for the production of selected essential medicines.

3.6 Burundi

In 2008, the Royal Thai Embassy in Nairobi implemented a project of the transfer of technology for the local production of anti-malarial drugs in Burundi.

With cooperation from Burundian authorities, Burundian personnel were trained to produce 800 artesunate suppositories, 3,000 artesunate 50 mg tablets and 3,000 amodiaquine 153 mg tablets for use against malaria at the Institut National de Santé Public (INSP). Following the success of the project, the Thai government extended its support to the Burundian government in 2009 to establish a manufacturing facility to produce anti-malarial drugs on an industrial scale.

The ultimate objective of the 2009 project was not only to transfer the technology and the expertise in the production of anti-malarial drugs to Burundians, but also to assist the Government of Burundi in setting up a pharmaceutical factory fully equipped with production machines, and able to manufacture other drugs in addition to life-saving drugs in a sustainable manner.

As part of this project, on-the-job training for Burundian personnel in the production and quality control of anti-malarial drugs was an integral part of technology transfer and indispensable to successful long-term pharmaceutical self-reliance and sustainability. Therefore, the Thai side offered a training program for two qualified Burundians at the Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Ubon Rajathannan University in Thailand. The program was tailored to the specific needs of Burundi and the project. The three-week training program was co-organized by Thailand international Cooperation Agency (TICA) and the Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Ubon Rajathannan University. Its objective was to create capacity building in the pharmaceutical industry so that the selected two persons could become future ‘Trainers of trainees’.

Burundi’s Minister of Public Health and the Fight against AIDS authorized the Thai government project to renovate the factory of MUSALAC for the purpose of training Burundian personnel. The renovation work at MUSALAC facility was achieved largely due to the financial investment and manpower of PSG Ltd. The production machines currently installed at MUSALAC have been handed to the Government of Burundi and it is expected that the Government will utilize them for the maximum benefits of training Burundians.

Although MUSALAC is fully equipped with production machines, it cannot function as a manufacturing facility due to its lack of proper partitioning (of interior spaces into rooms for housing the machines), and lack of regular supply of electricity and control of both temperature and humidity required for pharmaceutical production.

Burundian technicians and personnel were given training on the operations of each production machine, trouble shooting and maintenance. They were also trained in the direct compression technique — a new technique in pharmaceutical production in general and especially in Africa — for producing anti-malarial drugs which can be applied to the manufacture of various types of medicine.

This was the first time that a pilot training facility for pharmaceutical production was put in place in Africa. MUSALAC has great potential to become a training centre for students of pharmacy and pharmaceutical mechanics to familiarize themselves with the machines and their methods of operation, and to acquire knowledge and know-how of different techniques of drug production. It is a stepping stone from the laboratory development of a pharmaceutical product to final industrial-scale production, representing a research and development phase of pharmaceutical industry that is the norm in developed countries.
but rarely exists in Africa. Those who wish to invest in pharmaceutical production in Burundi and in the East African Community could benefit from utilizing the new pharmaceutical facilities at MUSALAC for training their employees and developing and perfecting the techniques of production of medicines.

The Government of Burundi has a high stake in the MUSALAC facilities which form a training center for human resource development and capacity building, and a workshop for vocational training. The facilities may be rented for certain periods of time to the private sector to use as workshops to develop formulae and train their employees prior to setting up a pharmaceutical factory.

4. Conclusion

There are technical and human resource gaps that need to be filled up via technology transfer. The creation of good local manufacturing sites capable of receiving the technology transfer represents the most viable, long-term and sustainable option for greater access to medicines in Africa. It would also be the focal point of a knowledge-based and skill-oriented society, and a transition to value-added manufacturing.

The current over-reliance on foreign aid and budget support has reached a point where national sovereignty and dignity are insulted and threatened. Our development should be evaluated and questioned. The potential for self-reliance exists, if we exploit it. To improve access to essential drugs in Africa, the stimulation of local manufacturing of essential drugs provides a win-win solution for all parties involved; most importantly, it represents a viable and sustainable means of tackling the problem at its source.

My goal is to help least-developed countries, least-developed African countries, to produce generic life-saving drugs, especially antiretroviral drugs. Only this, I believe, will ensure affordable supplies to support the lifelong treatment for impoverished patients. Brazil and my country have established free national AIDS treatment programs, thanks to the local production of generics. Size cannot be delinked from social change. Every advance in the laboratory or in the field has the potential to affect the human condition in ways that go far beyond health. I urge you, in the audience, to consider this, and engage more closely in the value-driven debates about how to expand access to prevention and treatment.

Ultimately, the response to AIDS is about social justice and fairness. Indeed, social justice has to begin at home before it is championed at the global level. To replicate the success in Thailand, I will have to demonstrate that antiretrovirals can be produced in these countries without interruption, that production can be scaled up, and that the quality of medication meets international standards. These remain daunting challenges for me. I was motivated by a sense of fairness, and a view of AIDS as a social as well as a health problem. I think everybody should get access to treatment. It is a basic human right. If it is unfair, I will fight to the end.

Earlier, a member of the Organizing Committee asked me, ‘What are the stories that move or inspire you?’ Here is my answer. My work in Benin in 2004 changed my life. While I was training medical personnel to prepare artesunate suppositories for malarial treatment in pediatric patients, a one-year old boy named Jacob was brought by his mother to the center. He had a high fever and the only doctor at the center diagnosed malaria. The doctor asked me if I could use, or if he could use my product for the boy. I allowed him to use my product although it had not yet been analyzed. Normally I sent my products to be analyzed at Dusseldorf University in Germany. After one hour of usage, Jacob survived. I was very happy to witness his survival. This has inspired me and kept me going in Africa until today. I believe that if one can save one life, one’s own life is worth living.

It doesn’t matter what it costs me. Living and working in Africa tests my stamina and patience. It’s not comfortable or easy. It can be like walking in a dark forest on a moonless night. It is an eerie and at times frightening experience. It was the belief in what I was doing that drove me, sustained me through the tough time, that seemed to justify my life. I work with great hope that humanity still has a heart filled with compassion that goes beyond the color of one’s own skin and one’s own border. It is a hope that people will realize that our brothers and sisters are dying in tragic numbers. And a hope
that people are truly more important than profits in this business that is life.

First, I'd like to recall the provocative thesis of Thomas McKeown, a physician and University of Birmingham medical historian. His research and publications demonstrated that more than 85 per cent of the decline in tuberculosis mortality in England and Wales between 1838 and 1960 had occurred before the advent of chemotherapy (streptomycin) and wide availability of BCG in the 1950s. In other words, modern biomedical science and its derived technologies did not contribute much to the historical decline.

What did? It was largely economic growth and improvements in food consumption and nutrition, McKeown concluded. Several scholars challenged his identification of the principal contributors to that mortality decline. But subsequent studies in Sweden, France, Ireland, Hungary, and USA showed a similar picture not just for tuberculosis, but also other infectious diseases like scarlet fever, measles, and cholera. Again marked historical decline in mortality often came before the identification of the pathogen, let alone the availability of vaccination or chemotherapy. Indeed, social movements and campaigns improved public sanitation and hygiene that had a more important role than modern biomedical science.

That much was clear for early industrializing countries. Here's a critical question: can McKeown's thesis be generalized to less developed countries and late industrializers, because in the post-World War II decade, vaccines, antibiotics, and chemical vector-control were important for managing communicable diseases?

The recent H1N1 pandemic also suggests that science and technology research must seriously consider extra-scientific factors. When the World Health Organization declared a stage 6 pandemic, affluent countries raised the production and distribution of pandemic strain vaccines. But when the pandemic was clearly closer to the
1957/1968 flu pandemics, rather than the truly feared ‘Spanish flu’ of 1918, France, UK and USA started to offload their excess vaccines. The WHO’s 6-stage alert and handling of the pandemic have been criticized for potential conflicts of interest. The advance-purchase contracts between affluent countries and pharmaceutical companies had a trigger clause: a WHO declaration of a stage 6 pandemic would activate the contracts. Yet, as NGO activists have charged, WHO’s high-level advisory committee included Albertus Dominicus Marcellinus Erasmus Osterhaus of Erasmus University, an influential flu virologist who served as a consultant to some pharmaceutical companies and had been rewarded with substantial stock holdings in them.

Hence, another question: ‘What should public intellectuals do when the credibility and professionalism of formerly reliable institutions suffer from the interpenetration of business and state motives, and profit-driven incentives?’

Finally, policy research should extend beyond narrowly technical content to the interfaces between research, policy, advocacy, activism, and monitoring evaluation. By this broader notion of policy research that encompasses technocratic cultures and milieu, Singapore is quite technocratic and not consultative. Malaysia is neither technocratic nor consultative. Thailand, though, is technocratic, yet often consultative. Some senior officers in the Ministry of Public Health almost have the sensibility of NGO activists. I can only think that Thailand’s difference must be linked to its political history of the last few decades.

Mary Racelis

Anybody connected with Southeast Asia can only be very proud of Dr Krisana’s fine effort in realizing South-South cooperation. She’s transferring technology to other countries and teaching their local people to manufacture medicines for those who had not had access before. That’s the first important step to reach the poor, marginalized, less formally educated, or disease-stricken. Next is to determine how far communities of these people have demanded affordable medicines.

These two steps must be connected by the communities, NGOs and religious groups to elevate local understanding of issues of health, medicine and treatment. The training programs are very important. So, too, is getting medical and health personnel to understand how local communities define their health problems and needs.

We should go further. Ask local communities: ‘Is the delivery system working?’, ‘What’s the impact?’, ‘Are you receiving medicines and services?’, and so on. Frequently, the problem may be that health clinics don’t open on time, patients can’t afford long waits, or medical personnel may insensitively order people around. Here NGOs can operate better than academics because, from my experience, NGO people’s discussions of social issues and transformation issues are closer to reality and solutions. Thus, knowledge generation and distribution, linking local demand to promising innovations, and finding a role for intellectuals are matters that intellectuals must collectively address and articulate.

Poor, marginalized, powerless people know their situations, and want their children and families to move ahead. But they’re stymied by power structures and relationships. For example, urban poor communities have a large number of street children whose parents can’t care for them. The women are left with this problem. Their husbands can’t support them, are away looking for work, or have given up. In this country, this Catholic country, poor families have on average two more children than they want compared to upper and middle class families. I’m not advocating abortion which is illegal here. But each year an estimated 500,000 Filipino women risk illegal and unsafe methods of induced abortion, and each day several die largely because of poor reproductive healthcare.

More broadly, intellectuals should ask, ‘What should be the role of a university that has a religious faith in our region? What should be the role of a Catholic university in a Catholic country, a Muslim university in a Muslim country, and, maybe, as in Thailand, a Buddhist university?’ How far can academics go, or say, or do? For the problem I mentioned, NGOs, not academics, are the ones providing the research programs and activities.
The question is sometimes difficult to answer. As Professor Anderson said of public intellectuals who challenge regimes and so on, *courage* is necessary. Perhaps each time one begins to quail before threats, one should think about those 500,000 poor women who must go for unsatisfactory solutions that are great threats to them. Our role, if we have one, must be to support them to have a voice against some of the most powerful institutions in society.

**Response**

*Krisana Kraisintu*

In response, let me say first that there are several fundamental problems in Africa. There is the poverty. If you are poor, you cannot go to school, you cannot have better healthcare. This is just it: they are really, really poor. One can hardly imagine it. But, in Tanzania, for example, the hospital has 150 beds and 450 patients — two on the bed, and one under.

Or take Burundi, the poorest country on Earth. Its per capita GDP is USD130 whereas it’s about USD4,000 in my country. Maybe that makes Burundi about 50 years behind my country in development. Some say that this country — the Philippines — is poor, but it’s rich by comparison. Professor Chan discussed the problem of the H1N1 pandemic. But we forget all about H1N1 because we have many other diseases. In a way, H1N1 is nothing to us because *we* — the poor in Africa — die of other diseases, of all the diseases one can think of.

As for the issue of conflict of interest, it’s everywhere. Corruption is extensive in Asia, and rampant in Africa. One just deals with it to put up with the politicians. You cannot change the President, and so you have to work with the President who might be there for, who knows, 20 years. Like him or not, you have to work with him if you want to help people. That’s how you have to go about things in Africa: ‘Just take it easy, *pole pole.*’ You don’t use a watch because nobody has a watch, and nobody pays attention to time. Time comes, and you just go.

To respond to Professor Racelis, I’d say that there is potential for herbal medicine in Africa. I’ve been very impressed by The Nippon Foundation’s medicine box. Strangely, I only saw the box when I visited U-Thong Hospital in Thailand. Now, I’m going to do the same, use the same idea in Africa. After I finish building a factory for modern medicine, I will start on herbal medicine. Perhaps I will have to be born ten times in order to complete my work in Africa. But I am a Buddhist, and I believe in being reborn. At least for my next life, I pray that I will be born African so that I don’t have to travel so much.
Globalization in East Asia: Myths and Realities

Jomo K. S.

It is useful to remember that the term ‘globalization’ means many things to many people — like the proverbial elephant and the six blind men touching different parts of the elephant, and concluding that the part that they touched is globalization. The French even have two words for globalization with different meanings and implications. If you look at dictionaries published before the 1980s, you are not likely to find the word ‘globalization’ because it did not exist then. It is a fairly recent invention that conflates quite a number of dissimilar phenomena, processes and trends.

Over a century ago, John Hobson, the famous English liberal economist, published a book called *The New Imperialism*, referring to a number of phenomena, which he saw as new at that time. In particular, he saw the concentration of capital — what we would call ‘oligopolistic power’ today — as well as greater corporate influence on public, including foreign, affairs as new features which led to colonial expansionism and, hence, imperialism. His analysis was largely adopted by the Russian revolutionary, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, whose pamphlet characterized imperialism as the inevitable consequence of the development of capitalism.

In contrast, the famous Austrian economist, Joseph Schumpeter, a dominant influence in the economics department at Harvard University, insisted that imperialism had nothing to do with capitalism. Instead, he saw contemporary imperialism as an atavism from pre-capitalist times. More recently, Deepak Lal — who led the attack on development economics during the 1980s under the aegis of Mrs. Thatcher — published a book emphasizing the economic advantages of empire.

However, the question of imperialism and its relationship to globalization is not something finished a century ago; it is still very much relevant today. Those of us who went to university three or four decades ago, probably had some exposure to the Latin American idea of dependency, later recast in terms of a world system by Immanuel Wallerstein. Following Braudel, Wallerstein dates the modern world system to about five centuries ago. Take 1492. The date marked the beginning of the Spanish Inquisition when Muslims and Jews were driven out of Spain with the rise of the conjugal empire, as it was once called following the marriage of Ferdinand and Isabel, and the Iberian expansionism, Vasco da Gama and, for Southeast Asia, Albuquerque, and the man who died in Mactan, a Portuguese who came to Malacca as Magalhães.

Magalhães had bought a slave from Sumatra who is now known as Enrique de Malacca. Enrique was taken back to Lisbon, but Magalhães could not get his king to sponsor his proposed voyage to circumnavigate the globe. So, he successfully tried the Spanish court next door and thus became Magallanes, setting out with five ships, and the rest is history. And after the Iberian voyages of exploration and conquest, there was the commercially more profitable Dutch Golden Age before the imperialism of free trade following the English Industrial Revolution.

In *Before European Hegemony*, Janet Abu-Lughod points to earlier patterns of international relations before the period of European domination or hegemony, about five or six centuries ago, associated with the rise of the Italian city-states. Clearly, there are many different views and many different datings of globalization.

One can use 1776 to mark a watershed. The year 1776, when Adam Smith published his classic *The Wealth of Nations*, was, of course, also the year of American independence. A young man named Alexander Hamilton, born in the West Indies, distinguished himself in the Revolutionary War. At that time, he was studying at the college which subsequently became Columbia University but he gave up his
studies to join Washington’s army. By being the last to retreat and the first to advance, he distinguished himself militarily. Washington promoted Hamilton. When the first government was formed many years later, Hamilton became its first Secretary of the Treasury. Thus, Hamilton became the first economic architect of national liberation. The year 1776 then represents a choice between Smith and Hamilton, each standing for a very different economic view of the world, between Smith — in a sense, an advocate, and with hindsight, an apologist for the emerging status quo — and Hamilton who represented the antithesis of empire then, and constructed a post-colonial economic framework for national development.

The distinguished economic historian, Angus Madison — he called himself a Chiffrephile — who died in early 2010, looked back upon the last two millennia and argued that big economic differences among the regions of the world only began to grow in the last two centuries. The increase in such regional differences began about five centuries ago, but not as significantly initially. The Industrial Revolution led to huge differences. These differences grew, except immediately after World War II, a period marked by more Keynesian economic policy and the independence of many countries, and the beginnings of a new era. This post-war period is sometimes called the Keynesian Golden Age, basically referring to the 1950s and 1960s, when many parts of Southeast Asia secured independence and often began to grow more quickly. Decolonization was followed by import substituting industrialization and, very importantly, a big emphasis on food security, often facilitated by the Agricultural Development Council sponsored by the Rockefeller Foundation.

To get a sense of where we stand in the world today, look at Figure 1. On the axis at the bottom are essentially rich people on the left and poor people on the right. Along the diagonal are the poor countries in front and rich countries at the back. So, the richest people in the rich countries are positioned in the far left in the skyscraper-like columns at the back. This figure depicts the inequalities in the world today, among countries and among classes.

This divergence grew over the 19th century and the first half of the 20th century; it lessened during the 1950s and 1960s but subsequently grew again, especially from the 1980s. The 1970s saw an interesting transition because that was a period when the post-war order, including the Bretton Woods system, broke down. That resulted in low economic growth and high inflation in rich countries, particularly in the West, and high growth and varying degrees of inflation in much of Latin America and East Asia, but African regression until the middle of the last decade. The 1970s were also a period of an ideological counter-revolution against development economics, as John Toye of Oxford University called it, the corollary of the counter-revolution against Keynesian economics.

That ideological wave created a variety of problems in the 1970s when Robert McNamara, Hollis Chenery and others tried to develop a different role for the World Bank. However, people like Deepak Lal were appointed by Anne Krueger who then introduced what we know as the Washington Consensus instead. They introduced a range of reforms with touching faith, presuming that the market could do no wrong, no harm. Their reforms were oriented towards stabilization,
narrowly understood, that involved the undervaluation of currencies, among other things, and more importantly, structural adjustment, to get rid of all market fetters.

In the USA, Ronald Reagan let the budget deficit rise, partly to pay for his Star Wars and other military enterprises. In 1985, he forced the appreciation of the Japanese yen, thus ushering in what the Japanese call the endaika or ‘high yen’ period of 1985–95. This gave the Japanese greater financial influence. At the World Bank, the Japanese executive director, Shiratori Masaki, insisted that there must be something wrong with what the Bank was prescribing as it had caused a ‘lost decade’ of economic collapse in Africa and Latin America. He urged looking to East Asia instead, and Japan paid for the East Asian Miracle study which recommended learning from the various policy experiences of East Asia — a grouping of Northeast and Southeast Asian economies — so-called high performing Asian economies (HPAE).1

However, the experiences of Southeast Asia were quite inferior to Northeast Asia’s for a number of reasons. Among other things, growth rates in Southeast Asia were on average two percentage points behind Northeast Asia. But with higher population growth in Southeast Asia compared to Northeast Asia, the two-per cent difference becomes almost three per cent which is quite considerable over several decades. For example, Malaysia, one of Asia’s richest economies coming out of World War II, is no longer among Asia’s top five economies.

Moreover, Southeast Asia has much more unequal societies. Southeast Asia is not a superior case for emulation; it is inferior in comparison with Northeast Asia. Most importantly, Northeast Asia generated a strong industrial community. In Southeast Asia, however, powerful interests went into finance rather than industry, and exercised considerable policy influence which led to the Asian financial crisis of 1997–98, and to rather problematic reserve accumulation for self-protection since then.

Above all, globalization is associated with trade liberalization in the popular imagination. But trade liberalization has generally favored rich countries over poor countries in various ways over the last century. The prices of primary commodities have risen much less than the prices of manufactures. The prices of tropical agricultural goods are much lower than those from rich temperate countries. And the prices of manufactures from developing countries have declined more than those from rich economies, among other things, because of intellectual property rights.

All this has contributed to what Jagdish Bhagwati characterized as ‘immiserizing growth’. Figure 2 shows how commodity prices have basically trended downwards over the last century. The downward trend was most drastically seen in two episodes. The first came in the 1920s, before the Crash, when Southeast Asia, too, experienced tremendous falls in the prices of rubber and other commodities. The second episode was recorded in the 1980s when the 1970s’ promise of a New International Economic Order was demolished by Prime Minister Thatcher and President Reagan. Figure 3 shows how manufactured goods’ prices have trended downwards at the end of the 20th century.

1 Economies that had high growth between the 1960s and 1990s. They included Japan, Hong Kong, South Korea, Taiwan, Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand, and Indonesia.
The World Trade Organization (WTO) today is not formally part of the United Nations system. But more importantly, WTO does not reflect the spirit of the Havana Charter of 1948 — which expressed a strong commitment to creating a new international trading system to complement the establishment of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. Many developing country observers fear that the current round of WTO trade negotiations is hardly developmental. The Uruguay Round (of trade negotiations), creating the WTO to replace the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), has greatly reduced the flexibilities that would allow crucial policy space to developing countries.

Globalization also involves international financial liberalization or financial globalization. Financial globalization has played a significant role in creating the current crisis, as it did the last crisis of 1997–98. Proponents had claimed that financial globalization would increase capital flows from rich to poor countries, but actually the converse has happened. They also claimed that the cost of funds would be lower but this has not happened either. Finally, some old sources of volatility and instability have been reduced, but new sources of volatility and instability have been introduced.

Figure 4 shows that financial globalization has increased far more than trade integration. This has not really been of much help, not just to developing countries, but the world as a whole, as we have learnt from the crisis. As Figure 5 shows, real investment rates, represented by the upper line, actually trended down slightly despite greatly increased cross-border flows of finance which, contrary to the popular belief, do not necessarily contribute to real investments. And, again contrary to the claims of its advocates, financial globalization has sent ‘capital flowing uphill’, that is, greatly increased the flows of capital from poor countries to rich countries (Figure 6).
Increasingly, finance ministers and central bank governors are considered good and effective if they behave in ways which best serve global finance. They have, for example, sterilized capital flows into emerging markets. But high sterilization costs negate their supposed benefits. Instead, the flows of capital have contributed to asset market bubbles — in property markets and stock markets — and consumer binges or overinvestment.

Most cross-border flows of capital also do not necessarily contribute to growth or real investments. Such flows often contribute instead to bubbles and a range of other problems. Warnings about these problems had been issued by some economists before, mostly those of Keynesian sensibilities. Robert Skidelsky, for example, has written a book called The Return of the Master, referring to Keynes. Keynes observed that judging in beauty contests was about conforming, thinking about what fellow judges would deem to be attractive, and behaving in a way deemed normal — rather than trying to determine, by some objective method, the most beautiful contestant. This partly explains how financial markets become casino-like.

From 1988 to 1997, Malaysia, Indonesia and Thailand experienced a decade of high growth partly because their authorities undertook currency devaluations in the mid-1980s. The devaluations were mainly made against the US dollar, but from 1985 to 1995, there was a decade-long devaluation of the US dollar against the Japanese yen. This ‘double devaluation’ made the Southeast Asian currencies and economies more competitive. The resulting costs of production so declined that the region became very attractive not only for Japanese, but other companies to relocate to the region.

Yet, in Japan, sudden financial liberalization or the ‘Big Bang’, terminated the Japanese economic boom, creating new sets of problems. This is partly the reason that China, Japan and others are concerned about forced revaluations.

In highlighting Southeast Asia’s vulnerabilities, I derive no satisfaction from being self-critical, as it were. But our part of the world has an ‘almost-colonial’ status and a colonial-like understanding of economics in that we tend to go with the tide and the trends, particularly those that come from the USA. Hence, we must be much more rigorous to maintain our guard against what I’d call ‘Orientalist economics’.

We saw fearful examples of that ‘Orientalist economics’ in action during Southeast Asia’s crisis in 1997–98. Then, attempts to explain crucial developments were quite incompetent and practically changing from month to month. Those were external and ‘global’ explanations, no doubt. Within our region, though, not enough people...
tried to understand critically what had gone wrong.

Owing to this failure to understand the situation, it took almost a year before we saw some progress, thanks largely to ‘faceless bureaucrats’ with a more pragmatic approach to the problems. Around mid-1998, one year after the crisis, some self-critical recognition emerged in the West when Clinton announced the need for a new international financial architecture. His announcement fundamentally acknowledged the systemic character and roots of the Asian crisis — contrary to the earlier mantras intoned by Western observers. Indeed, in the current crisis, Jeff Garten, a Clinton official and a dean of Yale University, pointed out that the Americans, under Bush and Obama, have carried out what they had once criticized Southeast Asians (particularly Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamad) for doing in ‘East Asia’s’ crisis.

Perhaps we have not quite developed the self-confidence to think critically about our condition. In Indonesia, when I conducted my Asian Public Intellectuals project shortly after the 1997–98 crisis, any number of Australians would tell me what was wrong with Indonesia while no Indonesian economist would challenge their prejudices.

Thus, to recognize and evaluate properly Southeast Asia’s vulnerabilities is crucial for developing an alternative to ‘Orientalist economics’. It is to permit us to understand, too, how globalization has contributed to the current crisis — because, crucially, one particular interpretation of the crisis claims that the present crisis is ‘made in Asia’!

Of course, the villain in this interpretation is China, but the rest of Asia is assigned blame for accumulating reserves for self-protection after the ‘Asian crisis’ of 1997–98. Now, the proposed solution is to have China appreciate its currency and become less export-competitive. This would supposedly solve USA’s problems. In fact, the foreign component of Chinese domestic consumption is only about eight per cent whereas the foreign component of Chinese exports is more than 40 per cent. Should China dramatically switch its focus of production from exports to domestic consumption, its first victims will be Southeast Asians.

Figures 7 and 8 show that the story of ‘China’s surplus’, the alleged root of the current impasse, is a very recent one. For a long time, China had a trade surplus with the USA but China had a trade deficit with the rest of the world, particularly Asia and Africa. China’s overall surplus is recent, starting from the middle of the past decade — whereas the USA’s deficit is an old and persistent phenomenon, going back at least to the late 1960s.
Thus, the origins of the present crisis, its attendant problems, and the fragility of the global financial system lie deeper. I had earlier noted a net flow of funds from the capital-poor to the capital-rich. As Figure 9 shows, half of capital flow has gone to the US while the developing world accounts for less than one fifth.

![Figure 9: Capital inflows](image)

In fact, the inverted pyramid in Figure 10 shows how financial deepening has aggravated the fragility of the system. Financial derivatives comprise more than three-quarters of financial assets while the principal assets barely constitute a fifth of total financial assets right now.

![Figure 10: Financial deepening and fragility](image)

Finally, the systemic fragility and crisis have wrought adverse impacts on developing countries. Since we're meeting in Manila, let us note that the impact on foreign remittances to the Philippines — which has about seven million of its workers overseas — is huge because these remittances are the Philippines' single largest source of foreign exchange. Historically, emigrant workers tended to remit more money to the home countries in times of crises. This was a show of solidarity that defied cynicism but it presumed that overall conditions remained the same.

The present crisis, though, is not a regional but global crisis. Caught in the crisis, as much as they would like to, emigrant workers are unable to increase their remittances. They are themselves losing jobs and incomes. Or, as Figure 11 shows, their incomes are variously diminished, particularly in the Americas, though not by as much in Asia. Besides, all this is measured in devalued US dollars, obscuring the actual diminution of remittances.
Once more this means reduced capital inflows with accompanying social impacts that should be obvious. Yet, throughout the crisis, the USA has behaved in ways that are against what it has consistently required the IMF to impose on the rest of the world. For that matter, Asia has weathered the present crisis reasonably well partly because interest rates have been kept low while stimulus packages have been reasonably large. Told to be export-oriented for three decades or more, East Asia has become heavily export-oriented. But now, East Asia, especially China, is being told to reverse its course on export expansion.

At this juncture, we in Southeast Asia must seriously assess how we got to this crisis and how it has affected the different parts of our region. In this, public intellectuals have an important role. As is often noted, the Chinese ideograph for ‘crisis’, and presumably the Japanese one, too, has two parts. Its left part stands for ‘danger’, of which we must surely be aware. Yet, its right part means ‘opportunity’ which is what we must seize. When crisis has discredited the comfortable dogmas of the past three decades, Asian public intellectuals must not squander the opportunity to pursue the implications of the failure of economic analysis and the failure of development analysis. Only then can we hope to offer a new, creative and collective understanding of the economic realities and social demands of our time.
I find it remarkable that Jomo could pack — within 40 minutes — a nuanced narrative of globalization with several threads, namely:

1. the provenance of the term ‘globalization’, with its roots in different perspectives of empire
2. the shift from development to globalization, from national development and industrial replication to participation in the world market
3. the ideological and political-economic underpinnings of the shift to globalization
4. the tilt of trade liberalization against the developing world and the failure of financial liberalization to realize the promises of its proponents
5. the contention of some economists that the 2007 financial crisis was ‘made in Asia’, and
6. the contradictory impact of globalization on economic growth, inequality, consumption, sustainability, and vulnerability in developing countries.

Not being an economist, I'd like to ask several questions. First, given the swings from the dominance of free-market thinking in the beginning of the 20th century to Keynesian state-regulated capitalism in the 1950s and 1960s, and to self-regulating markets from the 1990s, is the present crisis revising mainstream views of unbridled markets and the value of regulation? Second, how were devaluations in Malaysia, Indonesia, and Thailand, followed by a boom in the early 1990s, connected to the freeing of the financial markets? Did the devaluations result from the net transfer of financial resources from poorer to richer regions? Moreover, did the USA merely absorb Asian savings, or did the USA's deficit spending, credit-based consumption, and demand for surplus funds, credits, and Asian savings, result in the recent crisis? If the production of commodities has given way to the costly production of paper and financial instruments, was this shift motivated, on the demand side, by the USA's deficit spending and credit-based private consumption, or, on the supply side, by a financial sector that captures value from producing financial instruments?

I am also struck by the salience of the double standard that was exposed in Jomo's presentation. That shows why critics have accused the West of hypocrisy — of bailing out their failing companies, for example — of doing, in short, the exact opposite of what the IMF and USA advised other countries, including Asian countries, to do in times of financial crises, notably the ‘East Asian’ crisis. Besides, Western countries, and especially the USA, have continually maintained their own trade barriers — because of their agricultural interests, for instance — while pushing poor countries to eliminate trade barriers which prevented developing countries from exporting their agricultural products and deprived them of export incomes. These double standards and unfairness are reinforced by global governance mechanisms, like the World Trade Organization, which reflect not just struggles between conflicting interests, but the dominance of ‘anti-development’ perspectives.

How do we survive in such a global regime where the remnants of empire are still palpable? In this regard, by opposing Hamilton with his independence from empire to Adam Smith as an apologist for empire, Jomo gave our economists a good starting point from which to shed a subtle colonial consciousness and think independently in the interests of our countries and this region.

Dr Jomo gave very good slides and food for thought with a presentation focused on structure and progress. As a journalist, not an economist, I would like to talk about alternatives, in an unsystematic way, related to three points: poverty, the proliferation of the private sector, and failures of governance. Then, I would like to offer
a hopeful view of new multilateralism or ‘multi-
stakeholderism’, a term I learned a couple of years ago from attending civil society discussions. Our previous thinking on communities and economic prosperity has become obsolete. Even global liberalization, which used to be the received wisdom, has to compete with a new world trend towards protectionism, especially in food. Of late, rising food prices have become a big problem. The financial meltdown in the USA has had a huge impact on us. We used to be told, ‘Export! Export!’ But now, as Jomo said, we have a global financial crisis, and markets are no longer what we expected them to be. Yet, countries such as Thailand still say, ‘Export!’ Hence, we will probably continue to export, without narrowing the widening gap between affluent and not so rich countries.

Another important source of inequality is the concentration of wealth in the private sector. In Thailand, the private sector is dominated by 54 families that control most of the wealth. In fact the private sector, which drives the economy, has more power than the government and can dictate to it. Yet, the private sector has legitimacy because it is needed for national economic development. Even amidst financial crises, incentives are given to private companies in the most ridiculous ways to ‘pump’ them up.

The third important problem is the failure of governance. In Thailand it’s fashionable to talk about corporate governance. Companies may suppress their workers. But they hire a very good Public Relations company to ensure that they look good. They have a program for workers every summer and pass off these things as evidence of corporate responsibility.

We must argue for new multilateralism, based on democratization that lets people voice their views and participate in political processes in our region. In the ASEAN region, in fact, more people live under democracy — just in Thailand, the Philippines and Indonesia together — than under authoritarian regimes. This growing democracy can help our region to create a new multilateralism that expands our voice in the international agencies of the world. To find common, decent stands on global issues, we need more regional civil society involvement which is new for this part of the world. I believe it’s happening, and represents our hope for the future.

Response

Jomo Kwame Sundaram

Forgive me for not responding to the two sets of comments but I’d like to make one final point. We have a very difficult situation. We have multiple crises — financial crisis, food crisis, and, arguably, a very serious climate change problem, global warming problem. We also have the usual range of development problems. How do we address these challenges together?

I have a very simple suggestion if we can turn globalization on its head, if we can achieve unprecedented international cooperation which will involve, in a sense, a ‘New Deal’ at a global level with certain basic elements.

Let me first begin with the crisis. One of its problems is, after the 2001 recession in the USA, the US Federal Reserve, led by Greenspan and his successor, Ben Bernanke, kept interest rates down. The result was a lot of money available very cheaply, and corporations that could access this money borrowed very heavily and invested very heavily — generating over-investment to some extent. Just before the crisis there were many over-invested sectors with under-utilized capacity. Now it’s very difficult to get corporations to invest because anything in which they can make money is over-invested — in other words, surplus capacity, excess capacity, and no new demand. The only way forward, which would be equitable, in my view, would be to distort incentives, and interfere with the market.

If there is a serious climate change problem, for example, with global warming, and most global warming problems are due to fossil fuel energy use, then the challenge is, **how do we promote renewable energy?** The West proposes to deal with this by raising the price of carbon by carbon taxation. But this will make it more difficult for poor people in
poor countries to develop, more difficult to access energy.

Yet, this problem can be overcome by creating incentives in the form of subsidies. One way of doing that has been tried at the national level, in Germany, Denmark, Spain, and so on. What is required is to organize this at the international level so as to pay a low price for fossil fuel energy, but pay higher prices for renewable energy.

So, if your renewable energy comes from solar power or wind power, say, you'd pay more for it. Then you can generate much more electricity and cross-subsidize the savings from paying a low price for fossil fuel energy to support investments in renewable energy. And this has to be carried out internationally so that poor countries like Burkina Faso or Mali and so forth will be able to access energy.

That accomplishes three advantageous things in my view. First: it introduces what I call ‘learning economies’. The first people to get into particular activities learn fast, first, and are able to move and progress. Second: doing that on a large scale, especially in poor countries with no proper energy infrastructure, will set those countries on a renewable energy pathway. In other words, future energy will tend to renewable energy, and as scale economies are achieved, there will be greater incentive to use renewable energy. Third: this way creates more jobs, without which there is no way to reduce poverty in the world today.

Of course, there are many types of renewable energy and many types of fossil fuel energy but about three to five times as many jobs are created with renewable energy — more, if nuclear energy is discounted (because nuclear energy is considered a form of renewable energy without a carbon imprint).

Thus, the possibility of creating jobs is significant. Poor countries can develop. You don’t raise the cost of electricity, you facilitate the transition away from global warming gases, and you can support food agriculture. For people here who are from Thailand, this last thing might not seem attractive: why should there be subsidies for peasants? But, everybody knows that Thaksin derived part of his strength from bribing the peasantry with very little. He was the first Thai government leader in decades to do something for the peasantry in terms of public health and so-called ‘village development schemes’.

Basically, with very little, we can do something for a whole range of countries. We can solve the food problem, but not by raising the price of food, the preferred Western solution; and we can solve the energy problem, but not by raising the price of energy, again the preferred Western solution — but through international cooperation. And precisely because these are sectors which have been under-invested we can contribute to development.

Presently, no serious money goes into renewable energy, or smallholder food agriculture, for obvious reasons. But, with some degree of cross-subsidization from the public sector, we can address not one crisis (namely the current financial and economic crisis), but also global warming, the food crisis, and, generally, the development crisis.
PART III

FROM THE FELLOWS
Towards the Future: Group Presentations

Group 1: Politics and Conflict

Prangtip Daorueng

My Group has had a very passionate and intense discussion since we began our e-Group discussion before coming to Manila. During our meeting just now, although a lot of us were in the mood to debate politics, we returned to the question of identifying ‘the most intellectually challenging issues’ of politics and conflict in our region. We identified three such challenges. First, there is the politics of social divisions — including class conflicts, issues of gender, and politics of identity. The second challenge is bound up with political violence and peace building. In our region, not just in history but recently, we have encountered a lot of political violence committed by states as well as anti-state groups. And, third, is the very important challenge of democracy.

Let me begin with the politics of social division. When we think about conflict, we have to accept that politics is conflict. It need not be a bad thing, because we need conflict, as a source of dynamics, in order to move ahead. We can progress if we manage conflicts well. But, if conflict isn’t well managed, it will lead in many cases to violent confrontation.

Hence, the question is how we deal with political conflict. Several of us expressed our opinions on class differences, such as the widening gaps between the rich and poor in our region. Such differences formed one part of the recent turmoil in Bangkok. We used to believe that the middle class was growing in Asia but some of our group members said that that might not be true. For example, someone described the situation in the Philippines as one where the number of poor people had grown along with greater economic growth — which suggested that the poor were getting poorer and the rich getting richer, and, maybe, the middle class might be shrinking.

If we try to go to the sources of class conflict, we see increasing rural-to-urban migration involving the movement of rural lower middle class people relocating to cities like Bangkok, Manila or Jakarta in search of work. They are still poor. Their lifestyles and their opportunities in life are so different from those of the elites, the rich and the urban upper middle classes. Hence, the gaps between rich and poor could be a major source of conflict in the cities.

Moreover, there is the problem of skewed distribution of resources. We need to know how the state has allocated resources, how much to the urban populace, and how much to the rural people. All of us maintain that resource distribution has been unfair. The poor have fewer opportunities, and the rural people lower access to resources. Hence, unfair practices of resource allocation trigger a lot of conflict among classes. For that matter, we raised questions over the fairness of existing taxation systems, the uses of state subsidies in economic policies, and the influence of neo-liberal ideology over these issues.

We spent time discussing conflicts of identity, too, that are present in Muslim-majority Southern Thailand, in Mindanao, and also Indonesia. Some of the critical problems in these cases were connected to unfinished projects of nation-building in Southeast Asia, but we asked whether it was possible for one nation to have only one identity. And, using many examples from each of our countries, we had to ask how we would manage different identities if each country was to avoid these kinds of conflict.

Now we come to the issue of political violence, a lot of which has been committed by states and anti-state groups. There are different kinds of political violence. There is physical violence, such as that initiated by the state in Bangkok just recently. Yet anti-state groups made up of the poor, the marginalized, and many others, in fact, sometimes resort to violence when protesting against the government on
many grounds. Of course, some of these people may not use violence, as shown by the Hindu Rights Action Front in Malaysia. But, in Mindanao, violence is committed by the state, by different warlords and by anti-state groups. Even the Red Shirts have been questioned, albeit inconclusively, about their levels of violence in Bangkok.

However, there may be another kind of violence which may be termed 'structural violence'. For example, poverty is a form of structural violence. One doesn't see people killing one another before one's eyes, but poverty works violently against the lives of the poor. To take another example, there can be structural violence in domination by ethnic majorities that result in discrimination against minorities.

The last challenge we raised for discussion was that related to democracy which, we all know, is beset by problems here. How do we identify, how do we characterize democracy in our region? Are elections and procedures sufficient for democracy? Or would we have to confront what we might ‘sustainable democracy’, which is not the same thing as electoral or procedural democracy? Besides, would democratization acknowledge and adapt to local traditions, since local traditions sometimes put democratic practices in dilemmas? As someone said, in Indonesia, for example, one can talk about liberal democracy and elections, but in villages people decide things differently. This is part of the realities of politics in our region. If we don't recognize its implications for democracy, can we understand democracy and how it can work for us?

It is crucial that we have no better alternatives to democracy now. If we reject or criticize democracy in its present forms here, we would need to be careful — we would not want to swing back to the repressive culture of dictatorship and conservative forces. If we think we need democracy, we need then to think about we can nurture it. And if we don't have perfect democracy in our region, how can we make what we have better? Like it or not, we have to know why, when we talk about democracy, people tend to think only of elections? Then, again, we have numerous problems related to the abuse of democratic procedures, such as widespread money politics. Even when we try to explain democracy with adjectives like electoral democracy, contextual democracy, guided democracy, empowerment, and so on, we still seem to lack the proper understanding and conceptualization of fundamental values among people that we need in order to nurture democracy.

As for the role of public intellectuals, we have different opinions of our own roles, of how public intellectuals should engage with the public, and how to reach out, especially to the marginalized. One strand of thought suggested that a public intellectual should conduct critical engagement with the public, that is, to provide crucial support but maintain a distance nonetheless. Another view would require us to take a principled position vis-à-vis society, and to adopt moral or ethical stands on specific issues. Someone suggested we should think of the marginalized as if we are part of them if we are to engage more closely with them. Yet, beyond the marginalized, don't we need to engage with the state, the government, civil society, stakeholders, and so on?

Lastly, how do we network? For ourselves, we propose to maintain our e-Group discussion. This will permit us to engage with one other. But, perhaps, as more than one person suggested, we might need a translation platform to overcome the language barrier in political discourses. To overcome it through translation requires lots of resources. But, otherwise, how do we understand political debates in different languages and different idioms in different countries? Beyond our group, we need to network with others to reach groups that need help: the poor, women and others. Perhaps we should link ourselves to civil society groups, and their networks of civil societies. For that matter, we cannot ignore government organizations, and regional and international organizations.
The first intellectual challenge for us is to rethink the state-market relationship. When the Berlin Wall fell, we learned that state communism and socialism had a lot of political and economic problems. Fukuyama was emboldened then to write of ‘the end of history’. In economics, from Nobel Prize winner Robert Lucas to the American Economic Review, the talk was about ‘the end of economics’. It seemed that economics had solved the problem of depression, and Ben Bernanke could say, ‘I know business cycles.’ All of them have to eat their words now. State communism failed in many ways, but the free market practitioners have also failed. What then are we left with? How do we address this issue if a single model cannot fit all? It is clear that we would have to consider a state-market mix, suited to the national environment even if in Asia we have problems with states, known for non-transparent and corrupt conduct, and the undue influence of cronies and their rent-seeking behavior.

Within our Group, several Fellows from Indonesia, Thailand, and Philippines raised an important issue from the micro level — essentially the position of the informal sector. During the East Asian financial crisis, the informal sector was a vibrant sector. While big corporations were bankrupt and people were going back to the countryside, the informal sector was supporting the economy. World Banks studies showed that, and I found that out, too, while working with the Deutsche Bank in Indonesia from 1998 to 2001. The same happened in Thailand and the Philippines. Hence, a second challenge is to get the state to recognize, promote and truly empower the informal sector.

The third challenge involves alternative models of development. One of our Fellows from Thailand mentioned a village in northeast Thailand that has pursued a self-sufficient economy to the extent of issuing its own currency. Others have said that more locally vibrant, not autarkic or self-sufficient but self-reliant economies are needed in other countries. Perhaps, as Bhutan’s Gross National Happiness model suggests, we don’t have to depend only on a hyper-growth model that privileges growth and measures everything in terms of Gross Domestic Product.

Another challenge lies in how we respond to pressures from globalization. One response is to make the local economy more vibrant. A different response is needed at the level of the national economy, now caught between a sort of superpower economy and nationalism. We can’t be striving for a superpower economy, but we shouldn’t be pushing for nationalism that pits us against one another. We should aim for a multi-polar society and economy, and regionalism. At the macro level, in this region, countries should help one another to develop, not adopt beggar-thy-neighbor policies.

As public intellectuals thinking about issues of economy and development, we realized we should be independent, that is, not beholden to any interest groups, but we can’t be neutral in the sense of remaining in an ivory tower. We have to take sides. In that, our public has to be the oppressed, marginalized, abused, and so on. Yet we can’t compromise on integrity and justice, that is, we can’t distort facts or idealize the poor because there’s exploitation and abuse among the poor, not least of women by men. However, we need to engage with civil society, government, the private sector, if necessary, to lobby to dismantle structures and institutions of injustice.

But how do we achieve that? What should be our strategies to strengthen our networks to serve the public? Our Group suggested some conventional and some unconventional ideas. One idea is to allow individual API Fellows with very good projects to train people who have lost their jobs, provide them with skills, etc. Maybe the API can fund this kind of project which should bear API’s name, rather than an
individual Fellow’s name, which would raise API’s public profile.

Another idea is to facilitate and fund national or cross-border group projects. API has devoted considerable resources to the Regional Project in five countries. But our Group felt that the Regional Project is somewhat ‘contrived’. It would be more ‘natural’ if small groups of Fellows — having shared interests, and similar or complementary skills — can design projects with beneficial impact either on a local community, or across borders. API should consider supporting such groups and fund their projects. Of course, some individual projects are being funded via the post-Fellowship Grant. Maybe, it’s time to modify that part of the API Program to extend cooperation and networking.

One last point: let us have seminars on critical issues, such as migration, or the present crisis, and invite API Fellows, or others, as resource persons. Open the seminars to the public, invite the press, and disseminate ideas beyond the API Community. Finally, we might ponder the feasibility of Mr Tatsuya Tanami’s idea of establishing an API Institute that could serve as a site for alternative forms of research, thinking and training.

I’m asked to present our discussions and conclusion on the theme for our group, that is, ‘Social Policy and Social Justice’.

First, we discussed migration and health quite a lot. Migration has become an important regional issue with many people moving across borders. Typically, the migrant falls into the cracks as far as many kinds of rights are concerned. We should view migration from a human rights framework. Each country has its citizenship rights, but we should think of the rights of migrants in terms of human rights, and migrants as people who are often deprived of those rights. We should learn from each country’s national policy on migrant rights, and address it within a regional framework that seeks to take better care of migrants and ensure their wellbeing. Now, migrants form necessary labor and cheap labor that contributes to the host country. Hence, if another country only considers rights for its citizens, there will be insufficient provision for migrants.

Second, we were concerned with issues of religion, especially ‘state religion’ and how it influences social policy. Here, it would appear that our region shows an increasing dominance of religious influence within the state. For example, policies on health and reproductive health are clearly influenced by different religious institutions. If we examine that influence, we should be concerned whether it results in more inclusive social policy or whether we have to re-negotiate citizenship rights within the nation-state.

Next, we are concerned with democratic space, and whether
this space is shrinking or expanding, and how its changes are influenced by the role of mainstream media. We need also to determine how inclusive or exclusive media expression really is when it is controlled by political and commercial interests, and how much access civil society has to the media. For example, we were interested in evaluating the expanding role of ‘citizen reporters’, such as Nakap Palamunang in Thailand, people who are not professional journalists but increasingly perform the functions of reporting and disseminating news.

There is also the issue of how local communities respond to globalization, which appears as a dominant external force, with glocalization, which depends on local and indigenous adaptations of techniques of production, culture and lifestyles. Perhaps in this way, grassroots responses may be revitalized. This could be crucial if we need to re-think the East Asian development model, with its imbalances in wealth distribution and patterns of consumption which frequently affect local people most. It is clearly not satisfactory if our development remains heavily dependent on exports. We have tried that for fifty years. Yet we have had to face many crises, financial or otherwise. But we will need more egalitarian income distribution and more egalitarian policies if we are to lower our export dependence. So, we should search for alternative development models which are more socially oriented and pay more attention to social needs and public policies pertaining to healthcare services, decent and affordable housing, and quality and accessible education. It’s also crucial to attend to the special needs of children, the elderly and the disabled people.

We have to realize that our region and our governments are beset by corruption. It would seem that somehow the cultural and spiritual values that we think we have internalized have decayed so that greed is ‘everywhere’, if not institutionalized, and many exploitative practices are tolerated for the sake of profits. It is necessary and yet not so easy to recover the deep sense of humanity we need to prevent social injustice, to move away from greed, and not to be trapped in a dominant consumerist culture.

When we turned to the question, ‘Who forms the public that API should serve and engage with?’, we agreed that API should focus on deprived, marginalized and vulnerable people. But, to help them, we need to involve, educate and negotiate with other stakeholders, and find ways to reach the media and convince the powers that be, including those who are influential within religious institutions. In particular, API Fellows can contribute to resolving issues of social injustice in different ways — from carrying out research to expanding outreach via media campaigns and engagement. We’re also well placed to provide training and public education by utilizing the information and products of our research projects conducted over the past decade. In addition, we should offer workable alternatives, present them to office-bearers, and even protest if they refuse to respond. Finally, there is the cooperation and capacity-building that we have put into place, through the Regional Project, for example, which can help us share and exchange knowledge and bring to life not a static community but a living API Community.
For our Group on ‘Community and Local Movements’, the first point of our discussion was the definition of the term community itself because just its definition posed a serious intellectual challenge to us! But we managed to find our way to clarifying the definition, concept, connotation, and forms of community which have been rapidly changing.

From there on, we thought that one major intellectual challenge was to find ways to empower our publics to become their own organic intellectuals, as it were, so that they can express themselves and give voice to the voiceless. In other words, we as public intellectuals should help our communities and local movements to articulate their needs, concerns, grievances, ideas, and so on, because all communities and movements in fact have their own identities and inherent capabilities.

Apart from that, we need to conduct serious research on the core issues of our advocacy, be those matters of human trafficking, regional migration, indigenous mobilizations, etc. That will allow us to address sub-national conflicts across regions. In some instances, we need to engage with radical groups — by which we mean state and non-state organizations — whose activities impinge on our communities and movements. Without rising to these challenges, public intellectuals surely face the risk of becoming irrelevant to communities that must confront developments that arise over the next decade, for example.

Broadly, it is a serious challenge to preserve humanity while coping with big issues and new paradigms, such as depleting natural resources, climate change, economic crisis, and migration also, and spatial movement. To this extent, we must strive to make education responsive to the needs of communities and local movements living under rapidly changing conditions — without sacrificing a sense of humanity. Here, API would do well to foster critical thinking and independence among Fellows, an idea inspired by Benedict Anderson’s discussion, yesterday, of the independence and courage of public intellectuals. It might not be too much, then, to think of our intellectual challenge as one to shape a ‘nemesis’ that opposes oppressive discursive formations that reproduce asymmetric power relations.

Our Group also regarded our ‘public’ to be, fundamentally, the people as a whole, but, primarily, the poor and the disempowered. Members of the API Community should give priority in their work to victimized, marginalized and oppressed communities. Maybe, it should be part of our agenda to work beyond specific local communities to reach a wider public and help to consolidate it as a stakeholder in many development and policy areas. Realizing that the ‘public’ is constantly changing and frequently divided, public intellectuals should perform roles of advocacy that transcend the borders of local communities to reach society at large. Consonant with the views expressed by the Groups before us, our Group feels that the public intellectual’s networking role should not be confined to our fields but expand to include critical cooperation with governments at different levels.

Networking is obviously demanding of effort and time and limited by resource constraints. Still, we should activate and sustain API networks by intensifying communication among ourselves, with Fellows...
collaborating with other Fellows working in similar areas or on closely related issues. We could advance that basic idea by reorganizing our current website to establish an actively maintained Web portal. And, we, too, would like to see more post-Fellowship activities that are not tied to one large-scale Regional Project that involves relatively few Fellows. Smaller, localized project sustained over a period of time have their own efficiencies and promote many levels of engagement with communities.

Group 5: Environment and Resource Management

Myfel Joseph D. Paluga

Our theme being very broad, we first brainstormed to identify and locate different entities within it. Then, we performed a kind of mapping that reflected the composition of our Group, the concerns and the research projects that are contained in API papers. We went through a huge number of words in those papers related to environment and resource management. Four keywords emerged that captured our key concerns: forest, environment, sustainability, and community.

In a way, those were ‘past’ papers and in our further work as public intellectuals, many other keywords have emerged, including: resource depletion, climate change, environmental governance, the importance of scale, the level of complexity of environmental problems, bio-region, bio-regionalism, green economy, carbon credits, renewable energy, etc. In short, our discussion covered old terms, 20th century terms, and, emerging 21st century terms and concepts.

Let me start with the question of our public. Simply, we thought we have many different publics. We engage with many different kinds of communities, local communities, and indigenous peoples. If some of us work in media, we engage with the listeners of our radio or whatever programs, and provide access to others to link to yet others, thus creating a public space. The public is not a body, but more like a space. Hence, if we engage with a community, its outcome, whether artistic or produced in some other form, can be made open and made accessible to entities beyond the original community. That way, if we can answer the question posed to us, we open a wider public space.
Let me just list the major challenges we need to address. They include old, familiar and new ones. First, there is the challenge posed by rapidly deteriorating natural and social environments — which is how we must think of and refer to environment in the 21st century. Second, there are increasing conflicts over power and the distribution of resources because of the increasing complexity of present stakeholders. For example, if there was one community before, it might be split now into many smaller groups with their respective agendas. The third challenge arises because communities and other players operate on a ‘non-level playing field’ that produces or maintains inequality. Fourth, there is an apparent disjunction between local knowledge and formal science. In the 21st century, more than before, we should stop treating indigenous peoples and local wisdom as just things to be appreciated. We should engage critically with local wisdom much of which requires proper calibration for comparison with other kinds of knowledge. Weak public participation in resource management policy-making constitutes a fifth challenge. There are others, but these challenges that our Group noted may help to chart a road map for negotiating areas of environment and resource management.

In response to the first challenge — rapidly deteriorating natural and social environments — we propose redefining the popular idea of sustainability as a concept of survivability. Sustainability is too closely linked to the sustainability of human life and ways. What do we do with the non-human elements of the earth? The idea of survivability points to a more ecological way of thinking, contributed to us, by the way, by Professor Koji Tanaka. Our concern with increasing conflict suggests a need to create a framework — a space — for stakeholder collaboration to deal with the problem of more complex divisions among stakeholders. If that is new, it is an old, old idea, however, to create a level playing field in the interest of promoting social equity and social justice. As for our fourth challenge that is related to local wisdom, we should look to adapting local wisdom to regional and global realities. We don’t mean that local wisdom is not relevant or useful; in many instances, local wisdom paves the way for improved science. But, so to speak, hard science is needed to help local wisdom measure up to the increasing scale and complexity of problems at regional and global levels. It is, finally, necessary for us to strengthen and broaden public participation in policy-making, with our public including anyone who cares enough to use and consult any output we produce, provided we produce output accessible to just about anyone who is interested in our issues.

Let me end with two suggestions from our Group to strengthen networking among API Fellows. Maybe it is time for API Fellows to conduct a collective Regional Project in collaboration with other stakeholders, rather than just among ourselves. And to explore more deeply the matters we’ve discussed, we might think of institutionalizing a Working Group for Environment and Resource Management.
After a very long and lively discussion, our Group would like to share with you our ideas although we did not follow the format of answering the three core questions to the letter. Isn’t it so ‘us’? But we had to begin by asking why ours was called the Visual and Performing Arts Group while other groups had titles based on issues and concerns. Perhaps it’s because when we identify our work and the challenges we face, we do so as a community of artists and cultural workers involved with art production and creation. Some of us call ourselves cultural workers because our work has impacts on our communities when we deal with social issues, issues of migration, poverty, prostitution, and so on, issues which were discussed by the other groups. In other words, we are not limited to art. We work with various levels of engagements, motivations and advocacies. When we create and produce art, we do so with commitment and cross borders to change our communities in political, economic, and other ways.

Even before we became API Fellows, we worked as artists in our own community or communities. Being an API artist, though, brings to our work different meanings and manifestations: being, positioning, transformation, categorization, art as knowledge production, and art as a tool for transformation.

The first one, being, a term we use in theater, pertains to realizing our identities and roles — as artists, of course, but also as members of academe, teachers, advocates, and members of a family, mothers, fathers, sisters, brothers, etc. Hence, our different positioning, which involves a lot of networking, and our involvement in many kinds of transformation to the extent of creating new works of art, or innovations, adaptations, or sourcing materials from our own community experiences. Sometimes when we want to engage our community in an art experience, we confront issues like poverty — when it may be more important for our community to build a wharf than for us to take pictures of a boat crossing a sea. That was our experience in Batanes. We were engrossed in taking pictures of the beautiful sea but the community there was more concerned with caring for the fisher-folk because it was very dangerous crossing the waters. In fact, in certain communities some who create art don’t call themselves artists. For that matter, before we were called public intellectuals, we were already working for the communities because we are engaged with them. It is only a bonus, if you will, to say, ‘Oh, we are public intellectuals’, nice and interesting, but no more than a label.

We also have to raise a point about art as knowledge production because art has always been considered entertainment, something for decoration or to serve as an ornament. But in doing art, we create knowledge, and people, especially API Fellows, must understand this. Most API artists use art as a tool for transformation. This is their form or mode of social engagement. For example, one of us does animation not just because it’s interesting but because he uses stories of incest or child molestation to transmit his messages.

Thus, our goal is to create spaces to address community concerns and issues through diverse and multiple narratives that help to fulfill human potential. There are several major challenges we face as artists within our circle. One is documentation because some of the work we do is living art — once done, it’s done — whereas some, like the visual arts, leave behind materials. Subsequent challenges involve art production and preservation because we want to continue producing and archiving.

As API artists we don’t do all this without facing other ‘non-artistic’ challenges: climate change, poverty and marginalization, economic crises, identity, political representation, migration, and survival. So, within the API Community, how would we negotiate this movement between performing artistic work and engaging with non-
artistic challenges?

Our Group thought that we can identify the art and the artists as tools for transformation through art production and advocacy in cultural work. We have done this for quite a while. In addition, we need to archive existing bodies of work for future use. We should also maintain a data base management system that updates the documentation of API Fellows and their works to allow us to connect, and to link with the rest of the API Fellows such that we can engage with them in our work and initiatives. That way, we also build a support system through networking that informs us of needs and the readiness of Fellows to participate in community work. And we want to carry out collaborative projects, each involving a small number of Fellows together with members of the community, because that would be a more effective and it would be easier to manage.

We have some specific recommendations. It would be good to have API proposals expressed in local languages, to open more possibilities for more artists to be Fellows and to be engaged with API. Lastly, we thought it would be good to hold an Art Summit that shows API Fellows how artists and cultural workers think, produce and create knowledge, albeit in their special ways.

To end, we couldn’t help but raise some questions ourselves. What is happening with the Regional Project? What are the prospects for an API Institute, rumors of which have reached us? Would the API Program involve additional countries, and if so, how do we network, work with new Fellows from these new countries? It is so ‘us’, isn’t it?
Khoo Boo Teik

Thank you, Surichai. First, I should say that I’m not an API Fellow, and have no official position in the Program. I had been invited to help organize this Celebration only by the accident of location and timing. Hence, my views may not accord with the expectations of API Fellows who have participated in Country Workshops, Regional Workshops, and so on. But I hope my comments are not irrelevant to our thinking about the future of the Asian Public Intellectuals Program — about ‘Living the Community’.

When I was a student, one of my professors said of intellectual work that, at its best, it would be work and play at the same time. We might extend that and say that ‘public intellectual work’ could be play and work and commitment and intervention. This is important for us when we think about our deliberations so far and particularly the points made by the Keynote Speeches about public intellectuals being critics of society, politics and ideology. By critic, I don’t refer only to those people who write or undertake extensive analysis or research. People in the creative arts section have said that they do these kinds of work, too, and there’s no reason to think their works don’t contain social criticism. That generic understanding of social criticism and the role of the public intellectual gives us a common link to the three Keynote Speeches.

For our present discussion, perhaps we should try and find some clues about what we can expect in these times. For example, supposing one were to go back to Thailand soon after the 1997 financial crisis, one might ask, as a Thai intellectual, what issues would confront Thai society and Thai intellectuals for a decade thereafter. Likewise, we might ask if there is anything particular, special, unique, or pressing about these times for Asia that requires the attention, research, analysis and intervention of public intellectuals.

If I may use a historical analogy, there was a time during the colonial period when being an intellectual, or a public intellectual in the colonies almost invariably meant taking a position on colonialism, nationalism, independence and so on. Something like that might provide a context for discussion. We might not hit on all important issues, but discern some fault lines that deserve our concern. And we might do it in a nonconformist way if you will, because as Dr. Krisana’s speech indicated, it’s necessary to be nonconformist towards established ways of doing things, towards structures of corporate power that impinge on the rights and the access to essential services. Likewise, Jomo K. S. showed us that certain situations, such as the current crisis of neo-liberalism, demand that we don’t feed into dominant discourses of globalization but interpret the world in dissenting ways, moved by the specific interests of Asia or of broader interests throughout the world.

Of course, public intellectuals are important, but they can be terribly wrong, too. In the early 1960s, a number of intellectuals wrote about ‘the end of ideology’. But, as many people know who cut their political teeth in the late 1960s, after that came the social eruptions associated with the New Left. And, yesterday we heard about Fukuyama and the ‘end of history’, and Bernanke and ‘the end of economics’ — and all that has been overturned by the crisis of neo-liberalism. In that sense we should try to understand our society, our communities, and our region in ways that would help other people understand, position and prepare themselves for the kinds of struggles that would be needed.

If the API Community wants to advance, the people in it cannot be contented with what has been done the past ten years. Here, I think it behooves public intellectuals to take leave of platitudes, buzz words, stock phrases and clichés, to stop being happy, as it were, with simple references to engagement, giving voice to communities, and similar things that we often hear. Are there initiatives by individuals or a collective, on a national or regional basis, that the API Program and Community should consider for the years to come?

No doubt, it’s not easy to discern the future. When we do so in our work in political science or economics, we often find the results to be disappointing. Even so, we need to think about these things, to depart from our comfort zones and see what we can achieve by collective reflection now, and use that as a basis for action later on. This last session is not a ‘Q&A’ session; please don’t address questions to Surichai or me. It’s an open discussion where you can just express your views about things we’ve been discussing since yesterday.
Philip Koh (Malaysia)

As I reflect on the public intellectual, three terms come to my mind from ancient analogy. In some way he or she is called to be a prophet, because he speaks truth to the power of the throne or the elite. Second he is called to be a sage. Professor Juree Vichit-Vadakan spoke about wisdom, distilling wisdom from knowledge and information. So, a public intellectual is a sage. He or she ought to be a priest, too, but in a de-secularized modernity, how can one be a priest? Yet the word ‘priest’ simply means mediator and implies bridge-building — even at tremendous personal cost.

Eavesdropping on conversations throughout the day, I’d suggest that Asian public intellectuals should strive for four things — empowering and emancipatory political practices and processes; good governance and rebuilding institutions that appropriate local knowledge; transformational leadership in the creative arts and dramatic forms; and constructive citizenry which includes civic education transcending the narrow boundaries of nation states. With these, the Asian public intellectual can be a prophet, sage or priest.

Dave Lumenta (Indonesia)

The Group presentations might have missed a major challenge, which is the pervasive anti-intellectualism that dominates public life and academic life today. Not the decline of funds for publications, but, with the evolution of media, new technologies are actually producing new media based on short attention spans. Look at the popularity of Twitter or Facebook, with people reading about 155 characters. I’ve found the popularity of reading rapidly declining among my students.

The current structure of educational funding is particularly worrisome for people like us who teach in public or state universities. The situation is gloomy, with its dumbing down of universities. The funding structure has rapidly changed universities the past ten years, directing them to some kind of privatized institution. To be competitive, universities are forced to develop corporate links and channels, and use corporate slogans and taglines to prepare entering students. We should anticipate and discuss this anti-intellectualism.

Mary John Mananzan, OSB (Philippines)

I’d like to share something that we are doing, namely, examples of what Asian public intellectuals can do.

One thing we do is maintain a sanctuary program. One of the greatest problems everywhere, but especially in the Philippines, is corruption. There is corruption because there is a culture of impunity here. Anyone who tells the truth about anybody else will get all kinds of cases brought against him, and his life will be threatened, too. My association, the Association of Major Religious Superiors, has a sanctuary program: we protect and keep whistle-blowers in our refuge houses. For example, and Filipinos here would know, we are taking care of Jun Lozada, whistle-blower in the NBN-ZTE deal. We have others, like Dante Madriaga and Nancy Gadjane. This is very important: how will these people testify if there’s nobody to protect them? There is no witness protection program, which is one of those things we have to advocate. So, we’re doing something about that although it can be very much improved.

Second, because of the recent elections, I’d like to have a ‘citizen’s watch’ for good governance. Just as our groups watch the COMELEC, really watch them so that they’re always on their toes, we’d like a ‘citizen’s watch’ over government. Not because we want them to fail but because we want them to succeed. We have a stake in this. Our mistake in EDSA I and EDSA II, which were great people’s power victories, was, we left the leaders alone after they were in power. Now
we don’t want to leave them alone. I’d like to invite my API colleagues in the Philippines to join me. Let’s have a citizen’s watch — watch the presidency, congress, senate, and judiciary!

*Sharaad Kuttan (Malaysia)*

One issue that comes out in all our discussions is the question of community, and whether the API is producing a community. I wonder if we lack a historical understanding of our region and attempts that have been made to create networks and communities of intellectuals. We’re not the first to try and probably won’t be the last. Recovering that history is essential to our project of creating community. If we aspire to community, let’s not pretend we’re the first to do it, but somehow, let’s learn from the lessons of the past.

*Alwin C Aguirre (Philippines)*

API has prided itself on being multidisciplinary or trans-disciplinary. But API Fellows have been confined to their fields and areas of specialization, except for the Regional Workshop which gives us a chance to share projects, concerns and specific issues. Maybe API can have other avenues for sharing our research, its results and highlights. If not, it’s rather restrictive since not every Fellow is content with submitting a written report. Some of us would prefer to submit a documentary, or a dance piece or artwork. I suggest that we reformat the API website to make it a more engaging area where we can quickly exchange ideas or post questions and quickly get responses from other Fellows. We’d visit the API website more often if it is relevant to our concerns. Just as we have Facebook accounts which we always visit, maybe we need a social-networking system because we aim to form a community and that’s social networking, isn’t it?

*Benedict R. O’G. Anderson*

One thing struck me that might be helpful. I’ve been in Bangkok for six months of the year for a number of years now and I’ve been watching the development of the Thammasat University Southeast Asia Program. This program is for undergraduates, and it provides opportunities for undergraduates to learn other languages in Southeast Asia. I was very skeptical in the beginning that this would work, considering how spoiled Bangkok middle-class youth is. But it’s been an astounding success. You can now find Thais who are fluent in Indonesian, fluent in Vietnamese, fluent in Burmese, fluent in Cambodian. It’s pretty impressive that these people like going to the countries where they can speak the language, where they have really good friends, and they go back regularly. They share the political anxieties of the friends that they meet in Indonesia or Vietnam and I think this is spreading to other places. There are now Cambodians studying in Bangkok who are also learning how to sympathize with the problems of Thailand by being there and talking with Thais in Thai, and, conceivably, in the Cambodian language.

The problem with these regional things is that they have to be officiated usually through a language that nobody loves at all, which is English. Many people feel, ‘Well, I don’t need to learn any languages because I can always get along with English if I go somewhere.’ But we know that if you rely on English you will meet a very small sector of the real population in Thailand or Indonesia or anywhere else. The breakthrough with the language is not just that you can understand more, but you can feel more. You can talk to different kinds of people. It seems to me that a project like the API Program should add some kind of language requirement to it such that people show that they have some command of the language of the country they’re going to. They are the people who will feel attached to those countries. You can’t feel attached to five countries in Southeast Asia, and I don’t believe you can be deeply attached to Asia as such. But you can be deeply attached to your neighbors. And the neighbors, as it were, cross: Filipinos are friends with Indonesians and Indonesians are good friends with Malaysians, Malaysians are good friends with Vietnamese. These things will work themselves out. Then you can start to appreciate local literature, you can enjoy films and so forth, not just abstractly having common goals and saying, ‘Let’s be good to the common people, let us devote ourselves to issues like global warming’, which neither Thailand nor Vietnam has
any control of. It's something useful to start thinking about. It's really possible to get young people really interested in their neighbors, which is the first place to start.

The second thing I just wanted to mention is, I was slightly disturbed by our friend who spoke about a public intellectual as a kind of priest or a sage. This is a gross overestimation, in my view, of what a public intellectual is. We can't possibly be any of those things. It shows, in some way, that we need a more honest … no, not a more honest, that's the wrong way to put it … a more humble way of talking about ourselves. I know this is difficult, because if you read academic books, academic articles, one thing that's always invisible there is laughter. You are supposed to be deadly serious all the time in what you write. It gets difficult for especially senior academics to laugh at themselves. But laughing at yourself is extremely healthy, and a good dose of it will stop you from getting on your high horse and saying, 'I'm the moral leader of society, we'll tell you what to do, and I'll imagine the future for you.' So, in future, don't give anybody a scholarship unless they can laugh at themselves.

Finally, one small thing that you raised nicely, and politely, which maybe I'll raise it in my usual impolite way, is that the language that I see here is saturated. Not in ordinary talking, that's fine. But if you look at what's written, it's saturated with clichés. Stakeholders … everybody has stakeholders. Where does this come from? Globalization, identity, all these things are phrases that no longer have any substantive meaning. They are a way of not getting at problems rather than getting at them. And if we can think about the public intellectual as someone who writes in a way that is not bound by these temporary and very quickly vanishing clichés, you will get people who talk more directly to actual problems that are evident, either already started, or likely to start in the near future.

**Andi Faisal Bakti (Indonesia)**

This is a tremendous moment for the API Community, but we face a critical challenge — how to keep in touch, how to sustain this network. Hence, I really appreciate the proposal of the Creative and Performing Arts Group to establish an API Institute to sustain communication and collaboration between the API Community and outsiders.

---

**Nicholas De Ocampo (Philippines)**

I was struck by Sharaad's point that we should not just reflect on the intellectual activities we're undertaking as 21st century intellectuals in Asia. If we reflect on what 20th century Asian intellectuals did, although they were separate and not organized under one roof, as The Nippon Foundation and API provided, if we look at some of the names and the legacies left by those intellectuals, we would find them quite awesome. However, some paid a high price and left bloody legacies while trying to realize their visions of a de-colonized Asia.

For example, there were Sun Yat Sen, Jose Rizal, Rabindranath Tagore, and, from Japan which produced a lot of these intellectuals, Yukichi Fukuzawa and Tenshin Okakura. In books like *The Ideals of the East*, there was much debate — what was Asia, what did it mean to be Asian? So, we stand on the shoulders of giants, real giants, whose generations paid their price and left us the gifts of independent nation-states. Although our generation is beset by discontent with the nation-state, previous intellectuals responded to the issue of their time — colonization.

I miss this intellectual tradition. Maybe, that's why, after ten years of my engagement with API, I wonder when API can address this matter — whether by having a seminar, or holding an orientation, or producing a simple bibliography to show how one can imagine Asia from the previous writings and novels of some of the intellectuals of the time. It would be a challenge to look at the older intellectual tradition of being Asian and imagine the difficult situations that we may have to face in this century.
**Henry Chan (Malaysia)**

As someone who has been involved with API from the beginning and in many projects and various discussions, I’d like to say that I find it rather difficult to work among ourselves, because we have different expertise, experiences and interests. My question is, ‘Are we able to transcend national interests, national agenda, and even our personal interests in order to work together?’ Although a project may not be to our interest, and we don’t agree with particular objectives, can we get together, work together? Over the past three years, I found that we were going through a very difficult journey. In fact, after this workshop we have a meeting to discuss our work on the Regional Project.

What I’d learned from the community with whom our project is linked, is humility. I asked a community leader, ‘What problems do you have with your community?’ He replied, ‘If my people are slow, I’ll slow down. I’ll wait for them. When they reach me, we go to the next step.’ I think we need to do that, be humble enough to admit that some of us are not good enough, and that we have to guide them. We have to help one another, accept that some of our ideas may not be good enough. But if other people aren’t ready to take on more challenges, let us be humble enough to work on things that we can do together. What’s important is to have a sense of community which I doubt we have achieved among API Fellows.

**Khoo Boo Teik**

With that comment, further discussion within the API Community will have to focus on practical matters and suggestions that can advance the objective of building a community based on the API Program, or foster the sense of an Asian region because that itself has many problems that many of us haven’t really thought through. I’d like to make one specific point about this before we end. When people speak of Asian regionalism, which inspired the API Program to some extent, they often think in terms of identity, a common identity within the region, or an identity vis-à-vis other regions. If you go back to reading George Orwell, you’ll find that if there’s an Asian bloc and Fortress Europe, and NAFTA, that would mean dividing the world into three super blocs with all other people less powerful being left to fend for themselves.

Or is it really a matter of identity? How do we even think about merging states and nations in a regional framework when the intra-regional socio-economic inequalities are so vast? People talk and teach about learning from Europe and European integration. But in Asia and for Asia, not many people have asked what sense it would make to integrate regionally when very large portions of the population in certain countries survive on one or two US dollars a day? What kind of a regionalism can emerge from that standard of living? What kind of a community is worth building with burdens arising from such inequalities? Until we get the right time and place to discuss this larger regional framework, I hope you’ll give ample suggestions to the Program committees and coordinators for improving the Program’s implementation and attainment of its objectives.

**Rufa C Guiam (Philippines)**

From the Philippines, in API’s ten years, only two Fellows from Mindanao — Myfel Paluga and me — have been selected. I suggest that we widen the field selection to reach under-represented regions in any country. The ‘Philippine nation’ is an imagined nation. Mindanao has several identities too. One reason Mindanao feels separate from the Philippines is, we’ve not been included in many activities, including policy discussions. The next round of selection in the Philippines should encourage more applications from Mindanao universities and civil society groups.

There has been much discussion on the underutilization of the collective knowledge produced. How can this knowledge be disseminated to people for whom we want to serve as public intellectuals? I like the idea of translating and consolidating ideas in local languages.

**Surichai Wun’Gaeo**

API has expanded the program to include Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam. Can we then maintain the same system of having a Partner Institution
in each participating country? What about de-nationalized communities and region-wide contexts? It may not be a popular idea to revamp the structure. But it’d be good to think about such new possibilities of structural change for opening up applications and selecting fellows based on additional or different kinds of criteria without any discrimination.

Lim Mah Hui (Malaysia)

When Malaysian Fellows tried to raise certain positions in public last year, they were met with ridicule from some for calling themselves ‘Asian Public Intellectuals’. Perhaps we should form cross-border multi-professional groups to discuss what they would like to do, with regards to migration, supporting marginalized people, ‘state and market’, and economic decentralization.

Cristina Montiel (Philippines)

I like the idea of taking in younger Fellows. Within API, the intellectual pursuits are very individualistic. I haven’t been with the community long. But our meetings seem like simultaneous monologues, not aimed at building a team that goes beyond one’s own agenda. I liked the format of the Group meetings this morning when we could listen to Thai Fellows speak about their crisis, for example. We can have workshops on community building, how to produce a team and not just individuals with their own agenda.

Shamila Annie Mohamed Ariffin (Malaysia)

The language we use has to be more humble. Some of the programs today (or in the annual Country Workshop) are heavily biased towards academia. We don’t, but we should consciously take advantage of our diversity. It would be nicer if more non-academic Fellows were more visible. I don’t have an MA or PhD but policies are coming out of my ears!

Mary Racelis (Philippines)

How do we focus on the marginalized, etc.? We don’t have a good grasp of what’s happening from a regional perspective. There are associations that span the region (for example, federations of urban groups, farmers, and fishermen). API could make systematic contact with regional federations or organizations doing something to move people out of marginalization. Do we have a role in this? Can we cooperate with them? We can bring out what they are doing via newsletters, film, internet, and we can elevate the knowledge they generate. There may be a connection at the grassroots level we can think about.

Arnold Azurin (Philippines)

This is the premise of my suggestion: any change in society must begin in the minds of men and women. As Asian public intellectuals, we can begin by sharing with our neighbors what’s happening in our countries. For instance, Thai Fellows can explain to us what is happening in Bangkok. I propose to maximize our engagement with the public, make a series of CDs and distribute those to TV stations and media in our countries, not just CNN and BBC. We can have closer teamwork. Several Fellows will have to work at it, discuss if they dare say things about their countries. We can stimulate the minds of others through 10-minute videos of API insights. We become more visible by daring to face the public with the ideas we pretend to have.
Next anniversary, each Fellow should submit a one or two-page report of their accomplishments. From these reports, a selection can be shared. I don’t know some of the Fellows from my country. There should be stronger organization — more team-building, camaraderie — to realize API’s vision and mission.
A Creative Index: Pauses and Considerations

Joselina Cruz

Like all men of the Library, in my younger days I traveled; I traveled in quest of a book, perhaps the catalogue of catalogues.

*Man, the imperfect librarian, may be the work of chance or of malevolent demiurges; the universe with its elegant appointments — its bookshelves, its enigmatic books, its indefatigable staircases for the traveler, and its water closets for the seated librarian — can only be the handiwork of a god.*

Jose Luis Borges (*The Library of Babel*)

An index serves as a guide; its function, simple. It creates a list to point out, to direct, facilitate reference; it allows easy access to information. An index pretends silent objectivity, its particulars devoid of affection or affectation. Indices hide the ugliness of control, the confusion of choices, of animated arguments. It is a soothing instrument of classification of things presented — a catalogue. *Creative Index* performs a similar role: it presents a range of articulations, from a group of individuals actively involved in the public realm and coming from a range of disciplines, within the creative framework of an exhibition. The exhibition thus becomes a platform whereupon greater social issues are engaged with; it works as a catalogue of creative enterprise.

I. Creativity and society

Contemporary art exhibitions are rarely stages for addressing specific social issues, concerns or particular urgencies: poverty, starvation, sickness, marginalization of tribal and indigenous groups, species endangered, climate change, war. *Creative Index*, having been produced from the standpoint of (personal) critical inquiry as regards the ossified site of exhibitions, becomes a stage for active reflection on concrete social events; this, rather than the tiring proclivity of art exhibitions for self-referential navel gazing. Thus, anthropological research does not emerge simply as an undertaking remote or excluded from creative production; the research supplies the substance of creative and social results. Such an exercise could become a similar tract following research that stems from larger social issues, for instance, concerns regarding endangered plant species, victims of political violence, struggles for the right to democratic exercise, urbanity, and the fight for peace. Social research and public involvement become important and vital sources for cultural production. The public stage of social action is transformed as a site for art-making, one that takes comfort in cross-disciplinary investigations. In some instances, fieldwork moves production beyond the solitary confines of a studio. In others, artistic pursuits consider larger social concerns in-depth, as well as important historical revisions. While permanent solutions to such societal problems are the end-goal, their considerations (within the framework of artistic dialogues or in other forms) are equally essential.

The API Program is designed to create a new pool of intellectuals within the region of Southeast Asia and Japan. The range of interdisciplinary expertise that such a fellowship program ably winnows across the region creates a stock of important and relevant research that sees social change as its objective. As a result, the Fellows’ integral involvement in their fields of specialty seamlessly endows them with the capacity to use the vocabulary of each sector to address current and pressing concerns.

Within the realm of art, such social and intellectual processes that concern API Fellows are given form, and perhaps the necessary *gravitas* that may be denied them within their own fields. In his book,
Postproduction (2002), Nicolas Bourriaud writes that:

when entire sections of our existence spiral into abstraction as a result of globalization, when basic functions of our daily lives are slowly transformed into products of consumption (including human relations, which are becoming a full-fledged industrial concern), it seems highly logical that artists might seek to rematerialize these functions and processes, to give shape to what is disappearing before our eye.

The works shown in Creative Index come from an intermingling of influences. Anthropologists use the structure of video documentation to create easy access to their research, while artists manage fieldwork to consider anthropological matters as well as specific troughs in social relations. Scholars use botanical drawings to direct attention to endangered species and as a process for mapping geographical shifts. Forays into film record and test the current social temperature, but do not offer panaceas for problems. Composers create structures of sound based on social investigations, while others work within philosophical thought to produce music to challenge our aural faculties.

This diversity of cultural expression goes beyond the visual component, and most likely, the comfort zones of the artistic community. In a field accustomed to visual spectacle, and inclined to dissect aesthetic production rather than cues from social contexts, this exhibition is a provocation to contemporary artistic practice to involve itself with sociopolitical concerns that dissect, study and produce complex ‘re-materializations,’ or renderings of visual observation as protest. There is a necessity to insert artistic production into the sphere of sociopolitical networks, and if not necessarily to influence these, to seek the recognition of sociopolitical processes at work that may be critiqued and utilized as artistic material.

Creative Index may frame (but some sectors could point to it as a misstep), certain fields within a visual context that may be seen as a blunting instrument to their perceived significance in their respective fields. However, contemporary exhibitions have reached such a point of malleability that cross-disciplinary practice is an accepted norm, if not part of an inescapable evolution of the field, in thought and praxis. In a sense, the contextual texture associated with such a wide remit gives us the wherewithal to post hesitations while facing a sweep of subjects and their wider significance. These intermittent pauses are important points for, and of reflection. Without visual cues being removed, the burden of what is presented weighs on us. What are we to do about it? How are we to respond? Are social enterprises and excursions truly removed from art? As part of a social remit, art has been said to be the precursor of things to come, the field which is most prescient of the future. With his fictional library that repeats itself endlessly, its mass of books containing all knowledge, Borges’ fiction is said to have anticipated the World Wide Web well before its creation. Are we able to utilize art’s accommodating resilience as a laboratory for probable social solutions? Borges saw the books in his library as being the work of gods. It surrounds man, a work of chance. We need to read those books, to embed ourselves within society’s concerns, rather than view the massive library from a distance. We need to look at art as a space through which social concerns pass, refreshed by a variety of considerations and hopeful solutions.
II. Sites of the Exhibition

At the Art Informal exhibition center in Mandaluyong City, the creations of Dave Lumenta (Fellow 2001), Shigeaki Iwai (Senior Fellow 2008) and Yeoh Seng Guan (Fellow 2005) were displayed.

The Jorge B. Vargas Museum and Filipiniana Research Center, University of the Philippines, Quezon City, hosted the works of Jonas Baes (Senior Fellow 2008), Jesus M. Santiago (Senior Fellow 2005) and Kidlat Tahimik (Senior Fellow 2009). Ramon Santos (Senior Fellow 2005) performed at the UP College of Music, Quezon City.

At the Silverlens Gallery in Makati City, the works of Nadiah Bamadhaj (Fellow 2002), Phuttiphop Aroonpheng (Fellow 2008) and Dain Iskandar Said (Fellow Year 2006) were on display. The works of
Mohd. Naguib Razak (Fellow 2006) and Tomonari Nishikawa (Fellow 2008) were exhibited at the Pablo Gallery in Taguig.

The San Agustin Museum, Metro Manila, displayed the works of Lalita Rochanakorn (Fellow 2002) and Nicholas De Ocampo (Fellow 2001). At the Ateneo Art Gallery, Ateneo de Manila University, Quezon City, the works of Motohide Taguchi (Fellow 2002), Kaori Fushiki (Fellow 2006), Takako Iwasawa (Fellow 2007) and Michi Tomioka (Senior Fellow 2006) were exhibited. Featured at the Publications Archive, Ateneo Art Gallery, were works by Tan Sooi Beng (Senior Fellow 2008), Colin Nicholas (Senior Fellow 2001), Karnt Thassanaphak (Fellow 2008) and Amir Muhammad (Senior Fellow 2003).
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API 10th Anniversary Regional Celebration Concept Paper

The Nippon Foundation Fellowships for Asian Public Intellectuals
10th Anniversary Regional Celebration
Steering Committee

On May 28 to 30, 2010, The Nippon Foundation Fellowships for Asian Public Intellectuals (API Program) will hold a Celebration at Ateneo de Manila University, Manila, The Philippines, to commemorate its 10th Anniversary.

The Celebration is jointly organized by The Nippon Foundation and its Partner Institutions in the API Program, namely, School of Social Sciences of Ateneo de Manila University, Institute of Asian Studies of Chulalongkorn University, Indonesian Institute of Sciences, Center for Southeast Asian Studies of Kyoto University, and Institute of Malaysian and International Studies of Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.

The formal Celebration will comprise three events:

• May 28: Symposium — Asia: Identity, Vision and Position
• May 29: Conference — Asian Conditions, Communities and Directions
• May 30: Exhibitions and Performances — API: 10 Creative Years

Specially invited Keynote Speakers, Fellows and members of the API Community will participate in the Symposium and the Conference. The Exhibitions and Performances, which will take place at various venues in Manila will be launched on May 30 and open to the API Community on that day; they will be open to the public for a week thereafter.

I. Background: ‘Intellectual, public and Asian’

On the eve of the new millennium according to the Western calendar, feelings about Asia, within and outside the region, were at best mixed. There had been much prediction and even more debate over the likelihood that the 21st century shall belong to, or be dominated by, or revolve around Asia. International academic and media circles promoted and sustained a major and often heated discourse even if little was resolved by it: Will the 21st Century really be the Asian Century?

Whether or not the century would be theirs, Asians themselves were already compelled to grapple with many pressing concerns in and over Asia, including the following:

• Could Asia, famed for a developmental ‘miracle’, and yet laid low by a financial meltdown, solve the economic, social and political problems that continually confronted its people in their own societies and nations, and across the region?
• Could Asia, not long since a major cockpit of extremely divisive Cold War conflicts, aspire to a regional identity that would help to bring its peoples closer to resolve contentious issues peacefully, and manage productively challenges that increasingly required regional cooperation beyond the capacity of any single state?
• Had intellectuals in Asia a major role to play in the region’s multidimensional but unending search for equitable progress, social justice and a dignified position in a rapidly globalizing and shrinking world?

Regional and international diplomacy went to work over these related geopolitical and security matters, some of them hangovers from an earlier era and others the harbingers of potential conflicts. Away from all that, the API Program laid the foundations of a novel form of regional identity, cooperation and camaraderie.

For that purpose, the API Program turned to Asia’s intellectuals who were already involved in many different expressions of public advocacy and civic intervention in their own communities within their own nations. Convinced that these intellectuals and their communities
had much in common — not least a history and a future — the API Program established an institutional framework and created opportunities for such intellectuals to be public and to be Asian by learning from one another within the region.

Indeed, it has been a guiding and operating principle of the API Program that its Fellows must conduct research and projects in countries other than their own: as always, to know others is to know oneself better. It was felt and it has been validated in small but significant ways, that a regional identity could not be separate from national distinctiveness and multicultural diversity. To that extent, the API Program has taken an important step towards recovering the unifying visions and reaffirming the shared hopes of an older Asian tradition of concerned intellectuals.

Beyond that, the API Program encourages Fellows to be clear about the communities they serve and support, to identify and monitor urgent social, economic and cultural issues that these communities face, and to maintain links and cooperation within and outside those communities in search of better solutions to their problems.

II. Objectives

Since its inception, the API Program has drawn together over 270 Fellows from five participating countries. The API Fellows came from different sectors of occupation and areas of activity, bearing expertise and experience in an impressively wide range of fields. Their individual and collective work, research and projects, moreover, were facilitated by the assistance and cooperation extended by numerous host organizations and ‘local counterparts’, thus making the actual API Community larger and more effective than the number of the Partner Institutions suggests.

This Celebration, therefore, is intended as an open recognition and sincere appreciation of the dedicated efforts of the API Program founders, Fellows, Partner Institutions and other community members. Not least, it recalls with deep gratitude the unnamed and humble ‘local communities’ in the participating countries of Asia which graciously received and made room for our Fellows. Without such an Asian public, there could have been no API. Remembering this, the Organizers of this Celebration call upon all participants, and especially the API Fellows, to look back, reflect and think ahead: how can the API Program better achieve its goals and better serve its Asian public in the next five to ten years?

Indeed, in the ten years since the API Program was launched, the world and Asia changed in important ways, but they also did not change in equally important ways.

At the beginning of the first decade of the 21st century were hopes of a more peaceful world; at its end, we see instead widening violent conflicts. There has been no peace dividend since the end of the Cold War while a so-called ‘war on terror’ has made terror out of all kinds of conflicts. In the process, besides the incalculable destruction and suffering, inestimable resources are over and over again diverted to purposes that are worse than useless.

We appear to have moved from a time when the Kyoto Protocols were unilaterally brushed aside to a time when climate change has replaced global warming as a dire alarm for humankind. And, as it were, we have also moved from the ‘East Asian’ financial crisis of 1997 to the ‘global’ financial crisis of 2008. If the failures of Asia’s governance regimes were said to lie at the heart of the 1997 financial crisis, now the success of Asia’s development strategies seems to be at risk from the 2008 economic crisis.

However we interpret these changes, the truth is, Asia’s socioeconomic inequalities and inequities still abound, and progress in many areas has been stifled because of many factors.

These circumstances make it incumbent on API Fellows to remain attentive to social problems, matters of social justice, and issues of identity, and how we should approach and deal with them. The vast experiences of the API Fellows teach us that issues are directly bound up with communities, and intervention calls for good ideas and practicable methods.

It is unnecessary here to repeat many platitudes about a borderless world, and transnational this and that. Suffice it to remind ourselves that in future even more than now, if many of our local communities are to receive the attention, support and assistance they require and deserve to advance solutions to their problems, regional cooperation will be a necessity, not a luxury. That applies to cooperation among public
intellectuals, too.

In general, therefore, the Symposium and the Conference have been designed to address several important questions intimately related to the basic themes of the API Program. These questions, intended to encourage Fellows to think and act between the past, present and future, include the following:

- How effective was the API Program in its ‘First 10 Years’ when measured against the expectations of the Program and all its Fellows?
- What important lessons have emerged from the experiences of the API Fellows of different years that shed light on changing issues and concerns for public intellectuals in the region?
- Has the API Program helped its Fellows to develop clearer ideas about the ‘public’ that their work and activities as have served and helped?
- Have the cross-country learning experiences clarified which communities most require the attention and intervention of public intellectuals in the next decade?
- Have the cooperation and mutual learning in the regional projects charted new directions or suggested better ideas for the API Program?
- Does the growing number of Fellows reliably signal that the ideals of inter-community collaboration and intra-regional cooperation are surely being realized?
- In what ways should Fellows translate their present links into voluntary, active and sustained networks of public intellectuals to serve their communities more effectively?

To summarize, therefore, the principal objectives of the Celebration are:

1. Commemorate the visionary founding of the API Fellowships Program
2. Reaffirm the commitment to build a regional community of public intellectuals
3. Assess Asia’s intellectual challenges and how the API Program addresses them
4. Seek new directions to act as a community of public intellectuals in the next decade

5. Share with the public the API Program’s ten years of creative achievements.

III. Structure and events

A. May 28: Symposium — Asia: Identity, Vision and Position

Ten years of API Fellows’ work and research have produced a remarkable level of cross-national learning at public, grassroots and community levels. For a variety of sectors, there has been a growing archive of instructive knowledge and collective experience, and a moving record of learning, exchanging and participating in settings away from home, far from what was familiar, together with people whom one wanted to know.

Still, it is improbable for us to feel that we belong to a community if we lack reliable and shared ideas about our ‘other community members’. Hence, the Symposium begins with a reflection on issues of identity and regional history.

Moreover, it is hardly valuable to belong to a community if one is not entitled to an equitable share of its commonwealth in principle and practice. Hence, the Symposium continues with discussions of visions of social justice and ways to attain it.

Finally, it is by now scarcely viable for local communities, especially those that deserve the support of public intellectuals, to be isolated from other communities. Hence, the Symposium devotes a third session to a contemplation of the reach and impact of globalization.

For the Symposium three eminent Keynote Speakers have been invited to share their views of the themes that move API and inspire the work of its Fellows.

The Symposium sessions, open to API Fellows, API Community Members, and invited guests, are as follows:

- Session 1: Changing identities and their social, historical and cultural contexts. The Keynote Speech will be delivered by Benedict R. O’G. Anderson, Aaron L. Binenkorb Professor of International Studies, Emeritus,
Cornell University, the author of *Imagined Communities, The Spectre of Comparisons* and *Under Three Flags*, among other acclaimed books, and renowned for his majestic studies of Southeast Asia and profound commentaries on historical and social developments.

- **Session 2: Reflections on the human condition and the search for social justice**
The Keynote Speech will be delivered by Dr. Krisana Kraisintu, 2009 Ramon Magsaysay Award recipient, International Honorary Dean, Faculty of Oriental Medicines, Rangsit University, Thailand, and an international campaigner for the transfer of technology and local capacity building in the manufacture of affordable generic drugs in Africa.

- **Session 3: Globalization: Structures, processes and alternatives**
The Keynote Speech will be delivered by Dr. Jomo K. S., Assistant Secretary-General, United Nations, an internationally respected economist and API Senior Fellow whose work as academic, researcher and public intellectual has enriched our understanding of the different dimensions of Asia's changing position under conditions of rapid globalization.

**B. May 29: Conference — Conditions, Communities and Directions**

This is above all, a conference 'by and for' API Fellows.

In a departure from the organizational format adopted for each year's API Regional Workshop which involves principally the Fellows of that year, Fellows attending the 2010 Conference are not required to present individual papers on research projects or topics that occupied them over the duration of their fellowship. Instead, Fellows will be required to express their views on the key concerns of the API Program in the next five to ten years, namely:

- Current concerns of Asian public intellectuals
- Target communities and special sectors
- Practicable ways of working and networking.

To optimize the engagement of Fellows with these concerns, Fellows will be required to participate thoughtfully in several activities organized before and during the Conference.

Before the Conference, Fellows must complete a questionnaire that seeks to obtain their views on the key concerns mentioned above. Subsequently, within assigned groups, and by email or other internet-based methods, Fellows will discuss the information and views collated from the questionnaires.

The Conference itself is divided into four components:

- a Break-up Meeting for each group to formulate a collective and coherent view of the key concerns
- a second Break-up Meeting for each group to prepare a Power Point presentation of its views
- a Plenary Session during which each group will make its Power Point presentation, and,
- a Final Session which brings together all Keynote Speakers, commentators, and Fellows to discuss, in an open and free manner, the ideas and views contained in the group presentations.

To facilitate Conference organization and decentralize its management and coordination, each Fellow will be assigned to a group (according to simple and rough considerations of country, field and year of fellowship) and each group will be assigned a Convener. Each group should select its own team to prepare its presentation.

**C. May 30: Exhibitions and Performances — API: 10 Creative Years**

In recognition of the creative efforts of many API Fellows, the 10th Anniversary Celebration will mount at different venues in Manila several exhibitions of actual art works (visual, film, photographic, musical, performance).

In addition, Fellows are encouraged to submit texts such as books, journals, magazines and papers arising from their research. All such submissions will be included in a research archive that will form part of
the Exhibitions.

The Exhibitions and Performances will be launched on May 30 during which day they shall be open to all Keynote Speakers, API Fellows and Community Members. These Exhibitions and Performances shall be open to the public for a week thereafter. Not only will the Exhibitions and Performances showcase the cultural and artistic attainments of API and its Fellows, they will return to the public, albeit the public in Manila and the Philippines initially, some of the rich and valuable experiences which API Fellows have received from an Asian public in the course of the past ten years.

On Day 3, Fellows and other Guests shall be divided into several tour groups to visit at least three of the exhibition spaces located within Metro Manila. The tour will end in the early afternoon to allow the Fellows to have lunch and do a bit of exploration. The Fellows shall then be brought back to the hotel.

In the late afternoon, the Fellows shall be convened for the Closing Program, which is to be arranged by the Regional Committee. This is to be followed by the Closing Dinner to end the three-day Celebration.

IV. Our mutual hopes

With the active participation of all attending Fellows, it is very much hoped, the Celebration will express the sense of community that is critical to the spirit and success of the API Program. The Organizers will do their best to provide a milieu that will allow Fellows to celebrate a valuable venture, which they have made theirs, and create an opportunity for them to relive some fellowship experiences, meet again many Fellows previously encountered, and meet others for the first time.

Naturally, the success of the Conference in particular depends crucially on Fellows’ engagement with the topics of concern, the ideas of the Keynote Speakers, and the Group presentations. Above all, the API Program hopes to hear Fellows’ concerns for the Next Ten Years so that the Program, embracing Fellows present and future, and the Participating Institutions, can attain our fundamental vision of creating and sustaining a vibrant, living community of Asian Public Intellectuals who play a role in the daily lives and pursuits of Asian communities.

The founders of the API Program never envisioned ours to be a community of the movers and shakers of the world, as the phrase is commonly understood. Yet after our first ten years, we have good reason to believe that what we have done, what we do, and what we shall do will move some and shake others as we shape our regional identity, pursue social justice, and demarcate a rewarding and dignified engagement with the rest of the world.

At the 1st Regional Workshop held in Cebu in 2002, the API Program Director, Tatsuya Tanami, asked, ‘Where have all the “traditional” intellectuals gone?’ Wherever they had gone before, with API we can humbly say that in a small but visible way they have come public in Asia.

Join us in this Celebration to advance our imagination and construction of Community — that binds our national communities via the API Community to our regional community.
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THE NIPPON FOUNDATION
FELLOWSHIPS FOR ASIAN PUBLIC INTELLECTUALS
10TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

MANILA
MAY 28 – 30, 2010

PROGRAM

■ May 28 (Friday)

8:30–9:00 Opening Session

Welcome
Bienvenido F. Nebres, S.J., President, Ateneo de Manila University
Yohei Sasakawa, Chairman, The Nippon Foundation
Surichai Wun’Gaeo, Chair Professor, Chulalongkorn University

Symposium — Asia: Identity, Vision and Position

9:00–10:30 Session 1: Changing Identities and their Social, Historical and Cultural Contexts

Moderator
Taufik Abdullah, Chair, Social Science Commission, Indonesian Institute of Sciences

Keynote Speaker
Benedict R. O’G. Anderson, Aaron L. Binenkorb Professor of International Studies, Emeritus, Cornell University

Discussants
Arnold Azurin, Affiliate Scholar, Archaeological Studies Program, University of the Philippines, Diliman, API Senior Fellow 2002, Philippines

Azyumardi Azra, Director, School of Graduate Studies, Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University, Indonesia

10:30–10:45 Coffee Break

10:45–12:15 Session 2: Reflections on the Human Condition and the Search for Social Justice

Moderator
Tham Siew Yean, Professor and Director, Institute of Malaysian and International Studies (IKMAS), Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia

Keynote Speaker
Krisana Kraisintu, Recipient, 2009 Ramon Magsaysay Award, International Honorary Dean, Faculty of Oriental Medicines, Rangsit University

Discussants
Chan Chee Khoon, Women’s Development Research Centre (KANITA), Universiti Sains Malaysia, API Senior Fellow 2004, Malaysia

Mary Racelis, Professor, Professorial Lecturer 5, Department of Anthropology, College of Social Sciences and Philosophy, University of the Philippines, Diliman

12:15–13:00 Lunch

13:00–15:00 Session 3: Globalization: Structures, Processes and Alternatives

Moderator
Koji Tanaka, Professor Emeritus, Kyoto University, Japan

Keynote Speaker
Jomo K. S., Assistant Secretary-General for Economic Development, Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA), United Nations, API Senior Fellow 2001, Malaysia
Discussants
Cynthia Rose Bautista, Professor, Department of Sociology, University of the Philippines, Diliman
Kavi Chongkitavorn, Assistant Group Editor, Nation Multimedia Group, API Senior Fellow 2008, Thailand

15:00–15:15 Coffee Break

15:15–17:30 Session 4: Reflections and Responses
Moderator Jose M. Cruz, S.J., Dean, School of Social Sciences, Ateneo de Manila University

19:00 Welcome Dinner

May 29 (Saturday)
Conference — Conditions, Communities and Directions

8:30–9:00 Session 1: The First 10 Years of API: Expectations and Achievements
Remarks Tatsuya Tanami, Executive Director, The Nippon Foundation
Herry Yogaswara, Chair, API Regional Committee

9:15–12:00 Session 2: Group Meeting

Group 1. Politics and Conflicts
Convener: Prangtip Daorueng, Independent Researcher, Southeast Asian Press Alliance, API Fellow 2001, Thailand

Group 2. Economy and Development
Convener: Lim Mah Hui, Senior Fellow, Socio-Economic & Environmental Research Institute, API Senior Fellow 2007, Malaysia

Convener: Darunee Tantiwiramanond, Director, Women's Action and Resource Initiative (WARI), Bangkok, API Fellow 2002, Thailand

Group 4. Communities and Local Movements
Convener: Tatsuki Kataoka, Associate Professor, Kyoto University, API Fellow 2001, Japan

Group 5. Visual and Performing Arts
Convener: Glecy Atienza, Professor, University of the Philippines, Diliman, API Senior Fellow 2006, Philippines
Convener: Myfel Joseph D. Paluga, Chair, University of the Philippines, Mindanao, API Fellow 2006, Philippines

12:00–13:30 Lunch

13:30–15:30 Session 3: Plenary Meeting for Power Point Presentations

15:30–15:45 Coffee Break

15:45–17:45 Session 4: The Next 10 Years — Living the API Community

Moderators
Surichai Wun’Gaeo, Chair Professor, Chulalongkorn University
Khoo Boo Teik, Executive Senior Research Fellow, Area Studies Center, Institute of Developing Economies – Japan External Trade Organization

May 30 (Sunday)

All Day Exhibitions and Performances — API: 10 Creative Years
At different venues in Manila, exhibitions of actual art works (visual, film, photographic, musical, dance and dramatic) will be presented

Evening Closing Dinner
APPENDIX C

Survey Findings: A Summary

The Nippon Foundation Fellowships for Asian Public Intellectuals
10th Anniversary Regional Celebration
Steering Committee

Background

The Steering Committee conducted a pre-Celebration online survey of all API Fellows to obtain their views on API’s themes, challenges, strengths, and areas for improvement. A total of 166 Fellows responded to the survey. The distributions of respondents by country and year of API Program are shown by Figure 1 and Table 1 respectively.

Figure 1: Distribution of Respondents by Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Distribution of Respondents by API Fellowship Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>API Fellowship Year</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Relevance of API Themes

The vast majority of API Fellows regarded the current three API themes to be still relevant (Table 2).

Table 2: Perceived Relevance of Current API Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current theme</th>
<th>Perceptions</th>
<th>Still relevant</th>
<th>In need of change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changing Identities and their Social, Historical Context</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflections on the Human Condition and the Search for Social Justice</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalization: Structures, Processes and Alternatives</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, some Fellows suggested that the API Program should consider including a variety of other themes related to such matters as:

- Environment and climate change
- Reconstructing and reimagining Asia
- Ethnicity and social divisions
- Democracy
- Depopulation of villages
- Substantiation of art
II. Expectations of the API Program

Respondents were asked for their expectations at the time they applied for an API Fellowship. Table 3 shows that the two most frequent expectations were to obtain funding support for projects and to be able to collaborate with other Fellows or public intellectuals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectations</th>
<th>Responses* Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding support</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with other Fellows or other public</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intellectuals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to travel to other countries</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Asked to indicate more than one expectation, where applicable.

Besides the expectations listed, some Fellows hoped to:

- Network with government, non-government and other entities
- Learn new knowledge
- Conduct relevant social research
- Understand other cultures and countries
- Combine scholarship with advocacy
- Receive assistance for publications
- Conduct a change of lifestyle.

All but one respondent said that their expectations were met during the Fellowship period. However, a majority said that their expectations were not met via Follow-Up Grants and post-Fellowship opportunities (Table 4).

Table 4: Extent to which Fellows’ expectations were met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Were expectations met?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During Fellowship period</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the Regional Workshop</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In activities after/beyond API Program</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Follow-up grant/post-Fellowship opportunities?</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Assessment of API Program

i. Most rewarding feature

Respondents were asked to indicate the most rewarding feature of the API Program. As seen in Table 5, respondents appreciated the most being able to conduct their individual project, learning from communities in other countries and writing, presenting and publishing their findings.

Table 5: Most Rewarding Features of the API Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of responses*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conducting an individual project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning from communities in other countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing, presenting and publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending Regional Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linking home communities with those you visited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending Country Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in collaborative activities with other fellows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in Regional Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Asked to indicate more than one feature, where applicable.
ii. Benefits of API Program

The Fellowship benefitted most Fellows professionally and personally (Table 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of advocacy</th>
<th>No. of responses*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professionally</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personally</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Asked to indicate more than one feature, where applicable.

iii. Extent to which API clarified ideas

Table 7 shows the different ways and extents to which respondents thought the API experience had clarified their ideas about the role of a public intellectual, the public they wished to serve, their contribution, and forming a regional identity (Table 7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The role of a public intellectual</th>
<th>No. of responses*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The public you want to serve</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution you can make</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional identity that can be formed</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Asked to indicate more than one feature, where applicable.

A minority of respondents expressed uncertainty about what a public intellectual and a regional identity really meant. Others felt that such clarification will take time and cannot happen within the Fellowship period.

iv. Strengths of API Program

When asked what they perceived to be the strengths of the API Program, Fellows’ responses included the following:

- API Community: open, friendly, united and committed
- Diversity in the mix of nationalities, ages, interests, talent and fields: valuable in addressing regional issues
- Opportunity for cross-country collaboration and networking
- Support systems and structure: good planning and organization, access to host institutions, and annual Country Workshops
- Opportunity for research: freedom and support in conduct of individual projects
- Opportunity for cross-cultural exchange from travel and learning from other countries
- Financial resources which supported Fellowship and post-Fellowship projects
- Recognition and prestige of API Program
- Strengthening Japan’s role in regional development.

For the respondents, the following were regarded to be the weaknesses of the API Program:

- Underutilization of knowledge and expertise possessed by the API Community or generated from the Program
- Diversity and a lack of focus because of the difficulty in bringing together people of diverse interests and disciplines; breadth of the goals; lack of direct impact, engagement of dissemination of project outputs
- Reach or coverage is limited to five countries, and opportunities are limited for those working in the sciences and engineering
- Bureaucratic procedures, and inflexible format of workshops and limitations to participation in other activities
- Lack of post-Fellowship activities and a widely felt lack of interest in the Regional Project
- Regional Workshop’s overly academic approach that constrains
meaningful dialogue
• Lack of a sense of an API Community because of limited communication among Fellows and lack of post-Fellowship commitment
• Lack of support and monitoring during Fellowship period
• Reputation in that API itself is not well known
• The use of English in the Program constrains those not fluent in the language.

iv. API in Comparison with other regional Programs

Relatively few responses to this issue were received, probably because most respondents were unable to make comparisons based on their own experiences. Qualitatively, some respondents saw comparative strengths in API’s community-building, multi-disciplinary expertise and interests, ample resources and staff support, focus on cross-cultural research, and researchers’ autonomy in project design.

Some respondents, however, noted that, compared to some regional programs, API had abstract and unclear goals, limited reach, lack of structures to design projects that directly impact communities, and lack of common ground to promote collaboration among Fellows.

IV. Future challenges

i. Issues that should concern API Fellows in the next 5 years

Table 8 summarizes the main issues that respondents thought should be API’s priorities for the next five years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8: Priority issues for API</th>
<th>No. of responses*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Society: poverty, inequalities, deprivations, discrimination</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment: ecological degradation, climate change, pollution</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics: violence, suppression of civil liberties, violation of human rights, chronic instability</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture: denial of artistic expression, threats to diversity, discrimination against minority cultures</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource management: food shortage, water loss, energy depletion</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy: underdevelopment, unemployment, unfair treatment of labor</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime: transnational networks, trafficking, targeting vulnerable groups, corruption</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage: destruction of sites, loss of traditions</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public health: transnational transmission of diseases, pandemics, inadequacy and rising costs of health care</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Asked to indicate more than one feature, where applicable.

ii. Intellectual challenges that Asia will face in the next 5 years

Respondents listed the following areas, subjects and topics that would constitute Asia’s principal intellectual challenges in the next five years:

• Environment, growth and resource degradation
• Democracy, political conflict and Civil Engagement
• Social inequity, poverty
• Business productivity, sustainability, competition, economic trade
• Crime
• Human rights
• Asian culture and heritage
• Social cohesion
• Technology
• Theory, methodology, research
• Capacity development
• Intellectualism and academic institutions
• Corruption
• Migration
• Methodology and frameworks
• Governance and involvement
• Regional collaboration
• Health

iii. Engaging the Challenges of the Future

When asked how they planned to address future challenges, respondents’ answers were clustered around the following themes:

• Social engagement and advocacy work (36)
• Establishing linkages, collaboration and networks (18)
• Knowledge building (18)
• Capacity building (15)
• Arts and humanities (13)
• Dissemination (10)
• Continuous learning (7)
• API participation (1)
• Others (2)

The majority of respondents planned to be directly engaged in social action programs, interventions or advocacy work. However, some considered it important to act as a bridge between different stakeholders, and establish linkages and networks to bring people together. Building up knowledge was also regarded as being an important response with some respondents planning to teach and train other people. Still other Fellows wanted to address challenges through their work in the arts. There was a concern with disseminating work through publications or presentations, and continuous learning and reflecting.

V. The API Community and the future

i. API Community Responses to the Challenges of the Future

A fairly large number of respondents (35) suggested that API should address future challenges by strengthening collaboration and exchange within the API network. Other respondents (30) emphasized the need for conducting collaborative and regional social action projects. Again, it was stressed that there should be better dissemination of Fellows’ work in traditional formats and new forms of media. Other suggestions were related to the need to review API’s goals, themes and selection procedures, and to improve its organizational structure to expand its reach within the region.

ii. API as a Community

Of 138 responses to the question, ‘Is the API network developing into a community?’, 78 (56.5%) replied positively, while 60 (43.5%) did not think so.

Those who answered in the affirmative cited the API network, the outputs of API Fellows, community interaction, regional projects and API’s reputation. Those who responded negatively noted API’s lack of development as a community, which they attributed to API’s lack of visibility, ‘branding’, focus, and social action.

When asked to rank certain approaches for strengthening API as a community, almost half of all respondents considered an expansion of post-Fellowship activities to be the most important (Table 9).
### Table 9: Approaches to strengthening the API Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expand post-Fellowship activities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionalize programs of regional cooperation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly disseminate news of API Fellows</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase regional projects</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depend on voluntary networking of Fellows</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralize communication and coordination</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### iii, API as a Force for Social Change

About 87 per cent of respondents agreed that the API Community could become an intellectual and social force that worked for the betterment of the societies and region of Asia. To do so, respondents suggested tapping Fellows’ expertise and commitment, clarifying the focus and structures for collaboration and social engagement, providing venues for professional development, and using regional projects as mechanisms for cooperation. Some respondents stressed a need for greater visibility and dissemination of the work of API Fellows.

Those (13%) who did not think that API can be a force for social change thought the diversity of Fellows makes it difficult to find common goals. They thought that individual contributions rather than collective efforts would be more feasible, given the limited capacity of API Fellows to initiate social change.

### APPENDIX D

#### List of Participants

#### Keynote Speakers

- **Benedict R. O’G. Anderson**
  - Aaron L. Binenkorb Professor of International Studies, Emeritus, Cornell University, USA
- **Jomo K. S.**
  - Assistant Secretary-General for Economic Development, Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA), United Nations, API Senior Fellow 2001, Malaysia
- **Krisana Kraisintu**
  - Recipient, 2009 Ramon Magsaysay Award; International Honorary Dean, Faculty of Oriental Medicines, Rangsit University, Thailand

#### Special Guests

**Indonesia**

- **Edi Sedyawati**
  - Professor Emeritus, University of Indonesia
- **Sediono Tjondronegoro**
  - Professor, Bogor Agricultural Institute
- **Sjafri Sairin**
  - Professor, University of Gadjah Mada

**Japan**

- **Keiko Chino**
  - Columnist/Editorial Writer, The Sankei Shimbun

**Malaysia**

- **Abdul Rahman Embong**
  - Professor Emeritus and Principal Fellow, Institute of Malaysian & International Studies (IKMAS), Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia
- **Philip Koh**
  - Mah-Kamariyah & Phillip Koh, Advocates & Solicitors, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
- **Ragayah Haji Mat Zin**
  - Professor & Principal Fellow, Institute of Malaysian & International Studies (IKMAS), Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia

**Philippines**

- **Cynthia Rose Bautista**
  - Professor, Department of Sociology, College of Social Sciences and Philosophy, University of the Philippines, Diliman
Eliseo Mercado Jr., OMI
Chair, National Council for Peace and Kusog Mindanao, Director,
Institute for Autonomy and Governance
Resil B. Mojares
Professor Emeritus, Asian Studies Center, University of San Carlos
Bienvenido Lumbara
National Artist for Literature
Ernesto Garilao
President, Zuellig Family Foundation
Czarina Saloma-Akpedonu
Director, Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University;
Chairperson, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Ateneo de
Manila University

Thailand
Uthai Dulyakasem
President, Silpakorn University
Sunit Chutintaranond
Director, Institute of Asian Studies, Chulalongkorn University
Vicharn Panich
Special Advisor, The Thailand Research Fund
Juree Vichit-Vadakan
Chairperson, Center for Philanthropy and Civil Society, National
Institute of Development Administration (NIDA)

International Selection Committee
Azyumardi Azra
Director, School of Graduate Studies, Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic
University, Indonesia
Mary Raccelis
Professorial Lecturer 5, Department of Anthropology, College of Social
Sciences and Philosophy, University of the Philippines, Diliman
Koji Tanaka
Professor Emeritus, Kyoto University, Japan

The Nippon Foundation
Yohei Sasakawa, Chairman
Tatsuya Tanami, Executive Director
Michiko Taki
Natsuko Tominaga
Katsuhiro Motoyama
Shota Nakayasu

Coordinating Institution
Institute of Asian Studies, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand
Surichai Win'Geao, Chair Professor
Michiko Yoshida
Shanya Artasillekha
Akiko Kuwajima
Jharas Boontrak

Partner Institutions
Indonesian Institute of the Sciences, Jakarta, Indonesia
Taufik Abdullah, Research Professor
John Haba
Yekti Maunari
Robert Siburian

Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan
Yoko Hayami, Professor
Naoko Maeno

Institute of Malaysian & International Studies (IKMAS), Universiti
Kebangsaan Malaysia, Malaysia
Tham Siew Yean, Professor and Director
Dorothy Fernandez Robert
Noraini Dhiuiddin

Ateneo de Manila University, Manila, Philippines
Bienvenido F. Nebres, S.J., President
Jose M. Cruz, S.J., Dean, School of Social Sciences
Isabel Consuelo A. Nazareno
Reina Rose A. Perez
Michelle C. Gadja
Felice Noelle M. Rodriguez
Melissa Elissa J. Lao

Conference Coordinator
Khoo Boo Teik
Executive Senior Research Fellow, Institute of Developing Economies –
Japan External Trade Organization, Japan

Managing Curator
Joselina Cruz
Independent curator; Lecturer, College of Fine Arts and Art Studies,
University of the Philippines, Diliman
APPENDIX E

Exhibitions and Performances: API — 10 Creative Years

List of contributors

Amir Muhammad (The Last Communist, Film Documentary, 2006)
Jonas Baes (Banwa & Inayta, Performance, 2010; Sound Installation 2010)
Dain Iskandar Said (Near Invisible Lines, 4-channel video, 2006)
Nicholas De Ocampo (Sino/Cine: Spanish Beginnings of Philippine Cinema, Film, 2009)
Shigeaki Iwai (Family Snapshot #3, Two-channel video installation, 2009)
Karni Thassanaphak (Gray Red Shirts, Photographs, 2010)
Kidlat Tahimik (Ay Ape! May Bambookam Indigenous Film Crew!, Installation, 2010)
Lalita Rochanakorn (Various Botanical Drawings of Endangered Species of Orchids, Digital Prints)
Dave Lumenta (Beneath Batanes, Photographs, 2010)
Mohd. Naguib Razak (Glass Enclosure, Film/Single Channel Video Installation, 2002)
Nadiah Bamadhaj (Quiet Rooms, Drawing, Installation, 2009)
Tomonari Nishikawa (Clear Blue Sky, Single Channel Video Installation, 2006)
Phuttipong Aroonpheng (A Tale of Heaven, Single Channel Video, 2009)
Jesus M. Santiago (Songs for Life, Video, 2009)
Ramon P. Santos (Dangal, Music and Lyrics, 2006–2007)
Motohide Taguchi, Michi Tomioka, Takako Iwasawa and Kaori Fushiki (Cross Overlap, Performance, 2010)
Tan Sooi Beng (Music of Sound: Building Bridges through the Performing Arts, Video Documentation, 2009–2010)
Yeoh Seng Guan (Manong Diokno, Video, 2009)

Indonesia
Year 1 (2001–2002)
Surmiati Ali
Sri Nuryanti
Benny Subianto
Pande Ketut Trimayuni
Henry Yogaswara
Nur Ahmad Fadhil Labis

Dave Lumenta
Aprilia Budi Hendrijani
Mohammad Azzam Manan
Anas Saidi
Slamet Trisutomo
Tatak Prapti Ujiyati

Year 3 (2003–2004)
Yayan Indriatmoko
Mangestuti Agil
Muktasam
Addinul Yakin
R. Muhammad Mulyadi

Year 4 (2004–2005)
Ambar Yoganigrum
I Nyoman Nurjaya
Petrus-Damianus Prasetyohadi

Year 5 (2005–2006)
Ekawati Sri Wahyuni
Yuli Ngroho
Nina Widyawati Purnomo
Sri Wahyono

Year 6 (2006–2007)
I Ketut Gunawan
Mokhammad Yahya
Heru Suseyo
Krissnadi Yulianwan Saptadi

Year 7 (2007–2008)
Andi Amri
Dias Pradadimara
Rina Shahriyani Shahrullah
Dicky Sofyan
Priyono Tjiptoherijanto

Year 8 (2008–2009)
Andi Faisal Bakti
Semiarto Aji Purwanto
Suribadi Samad
Ekoningtyas Margu Wardani
Yonariza

Japan
Year 1 (2001–2002)
Tatsuki Kataoka

Tetsuya Araki
Motohide Taguchi

Year 3 (2003–2004)
Yayan Indriatmoko
Mangestuti Agil
Muktasam
Addinul Yakin
R. Muhammad Mulyadi

Year 4 (2004–2005)
Ambar Yoganigrum
I Nyoman Nurjaya
Petrus-Damianus Prasetyohadi

Year 5 (2005–2006)
Ekawati Sri Wahyuni
Yuli Ngroho
Nina Widyawati Purnomo
Sri Wahyono

Year 6 (2006–2007)
I Ketut Gunawan
Mokhammad Yahya
Heru Suseyo
Krissnadi Yulianwan Saptadi

Year 7 (2007–2008)
Takako Iwasawa
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Philippines

Arnold Berrillo M. Azurin
Jose M. Galang Jr.
Sr. Mary John D.R. Mananzan OSB
Wilfredo M. Torres III

Year 2 (2003–2004)
Persida V. Rueda-Acosta
Doram T. Dumalagan
Carlo Irwin A. Panelo
Rachel Pastores-Corro
Danilo Francisco M. Reyes
Isagani Antonio E. Yuzon

Year 3 (2004–2005)
Rosalie B. Arcala-Hall
Rudyard Pesimo

Year 4 (2005–2006)
Theresita V. Atienza
Fe Sumilang delos Reyes
Jesus M. Santiago

Year 5 (2006–2007)
Alwin C. Aguirre
Glecy C. Arienza
Myfel Joseph D. Palaga
Iderlina B. Mateo-Babiano

Year 6 (2007–2008)
Edward Paciano S. Cabagnot
Joel Hernandez
Jay Flores Ticar

Year 7 (2008–2009)
Jonas Baes
José Aranacilo L. Estuar
Rufa C. Guiam
Cristina P. Lim

Year 8 (2008–2009)
Benigno C. Balgos
Claire Lacdao
Dante Simbulan, Jr.
Phuttiphop Aroonpheng

Year 9 (2009–2010)
Saya Kiba

Year 10 (2010–2011)
Prangtip Daorueng
Sukran Rojanapaipong
Pataya Runkaew
Somchai Preechasinlapaun

Malaysia

Year 1 (2001–2002)
Henry Chan
Colin G. Nicholas
Wong Soak Koon
Jomo K. S.

Mustafa Kamal Anuar
Nadiah Bamadhaj

Year 3 (2003–2004)
Rajeswari Kanniah
Tan Pek Leng

Year 4 (2004–2005)
Chan Chee Khoon
Wan Abdul Manan Wan Muda
Shamila Annie Mohamed Ariffin

Year 5 (2005–2006)
Yeoh Seng Guan
Said Halim Said Nong

Year 6 (2006–2007)
Ahmad Hezri Adnan
Sharad Kuttan
Jose Mary Fernandez

Year 7 (2007–2008)
Lim Mah Hui

Year 8 (2008–2009)
Toh Kin Woon
Tan Sooi Beng
Shanti Thambiah

Year 9 (2009–2010)

Thailand

Year 1 (2001–2002)
Prangtip Daorueng
Sukran Rojanapaipong
Pataya Runkaew
Somchai Preechasinlapaun

Vasana Chinvaraokom
Darunee Tantiwiramanond
Chalida Uabumrungjit

Year 3 (2003–2004)
Anchalee Cahiworaporn
Wimonrat Isarathumnoon
Ubonrat Siriyuvask

Year 4 (2004–2005)
Kannika Angsuthanansombat
Pennapa Hongthong
Kokaew-Wongphan

Year 5 (2005–2006)
Narumol Aphunives
Oranuch Lerdulladilok
Sawawit Pratoomraj
Penchom Saetang

Year 6 (2006–2007)
Varintra Boonchai
Kamaruzzaman Bustamam-Ahmad
Chaiwat Tulathorn
Supa Yaimuang
Sing Suwannakij

Year 7 (2007–2008)
Kavi Chongkittavorn
Sirirat Katanchalekul
Olarn Ongla
Chaiyapart Prabhasavat
List of the members of the Steering Committee

Jose M. Cruz, S.J.
Dean, School of Social Sciences, Ateneo de Manila University

Surichai Wun’Gaeo
Chair Professor, Chulalongkorn University

Tatsuya Tanami (Chair)
Executive Director, The Nippon Foundation

Yeoh Seng Guan
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Coordinating Institution and Partner Institutions

Coordinating Institution
Thailand
Institute of Asian Studies (IAS), Chulalongkorn University
3rd Floor, Prachathipok-Rambhai Barni Building, Chulalongkorn University
Piyathai Road, Bangkok 10330, Thailand
Contact: Ms. Michiko Yoshida / Ms. Ratana Poopitakchatkaew / Ms. Thamonpat Cooperider
URL: http://www.api-fellowships.org
TEL: +66-2218-7422
FAX: +66-2652-5283
E-mail: api_fellowships@chula.ac.th

Partner Institutions
Indonesia
Research Center for Regional Resources (PSDR), Indonesian Institute of Sciences (LIPI)
Widya Graha, 9th Floor, Jln. Jen. Gatot Sbroto, No.10, Jakarta 12710, Indonesia
Contact: Dr. John Haba / Dr. Yekti Maunati
URL: http://www.api-indonesia.info/
TEL: +62-21-526-5152/525-154 ext. 680/737
FAX: +62-21-526-5152/570-1232
E-mail: darahkubiru@yahoo.com / yektim@yahoo.com

Japan
Center for Southeast Asian Studies (CSEAS), Kyoto University
Contact: Ms. Naoko Maeno / Ms. Motoko Kondo
URL: http://www.cseas.kyoto-u.ac.jp/api/
TEL: +81-75-753-7348 / +81-75-753-7391
FAX: +81-75-753-7165
E-mail: api@cseas.kyoto-u.ac.jp

Malaysia
Institute of Malaysian and International Studies (IKMAS), Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM)
43600 UKM Bangi, Selangor Darul Ehsan, Malaysia
Contact: Ms. Dorothy Fernandez Robert / Ms. Noraini Dhaiauddin
URL: http://www.ikmas.ukm.my/api/
TEL: +60-3-8921-3576 / +60-3-8926-1022/9253
FAX: +60-3-8926-1022/9253
E-mail: drob@ukm.my / ainidee@ukm.my / apifellowships@yahoo.com

Philippines
School of Social Sciences, Ateneo de Manila University (ADMU)
Ground Floor, Center for Community Services (CCS) Building
The Nippon Foundation

International Program Department
1-2-2 Akasaka, Minato-ku, Tokyo 107-8404 Japan
URL: http://www.nippon-foundation.or.jp/eng/
TEL: +81-3-6229-5181
FAX: +81-3-6229-5180
E-mail: api@ps.nippon-foundation.or.jp