Globalization and Responses of Agricultural Communities: Limits and Opportunities for Empowerment in Bilar, Bohol

(Draft only)

Maria Ela L. Atienza, PhD
Associate Professor, Department of Political Science
and Director, Third World Studies Center
University of the Philippines, Diliman
E-mail: ela_atienza@yahoo.com; ma_ela.atienza@up.edu.ph

This paper examines the impact of globalization and the responses of farming communities in Bilar, a municipality in the province of Bohol, Philippines. In particular, this study looks at the impact of the Plant Variety Protection Act of 2002, one expression of the Philippine government’s commitment to the World Trade Organization’s Agreement on Trade-Related Intellectual Property Rights. Using everyday politics as a framework of analysis, this paper also looks into and assesses the courses of action taken by farmers, civil society groups, and local governments in response to the effects of the law. Furthermore, the study attempts to provide a “history from below” based on the narratives of ordinary people as they share how they have lived their lives and how, why and whether or not their experiences and behavior have changed over time within the context of a globalizing environment.

Introduction

The discourse on globalization, associated with increased global economic integration and internationalization, has largely centered on the political, economic, and sociocultural changes at the macro level. But at a time when the forces of globalization are penetrating deeper into communities, the importance of the local cannot be discounted. The local is being transformed into a site of various claims and contestations (Sassen 1998). As evidenced by dam-resistance campaigns (see T. Tadem 2008) and the challenge of rural sufficiency (see Wun’Gaeo 2007), the local is also a strategic space for movement formation.

1 This is one of the case studies in the project Examining the Impact of and Responses to Globalization of Selected Local Communities in the Philippines and Thailand, funded by the Southeast Asian Studies Research and Exchange Programme (SEASREP) Foundation and administered by the Third World Studies Center, University of the Philippines (UP), Diliman. Additional funding for this case study is provided by the UP System’s Creative and Research Scholarship Program Grant. Early drafts of this paper were presented at the Annual Conference of the Global Studies Association, Royal Holloway, University of London, 2-4 September 2009, the 2010 International Conference of the Philippine Political Science Association, UP Baguio, Baguio City, 8-10 April 2010, and the Ninth International Conference of the International Society for Third-Sector Research, Kadir Has University, Istanbul, 7-10 July 2010.

2 The author acknowledges Glenda Lopez Wui and Chantana Wungaeo who originally conceptualized the whole project; Sharon Quinsaat who initially developed the project’s theoretical framework; Epigenio Mahinay and Prosperidad Abonete for coordinating the key informant interviews (KIIs) and focus group discussions (FGDs) and serving as translators in October 2008 and February 2009; Mitzi Austero for transcribing the October 2008 KIIs; Retchel Sasing for facilitating the February 2009 FGDs and documenting the proceedings; Nelson Cainghog for conducting and documenting the FGDs in December 2009 and KIIs in March-April 2010 as well as researching supporting documents; and Eduardo Tadem (UP Diliman), Vira Somboon (Chulalongkorn University) and Willem Wolters (Nijmegen University) for their constructive reviews and comments on early drafts. However, all shortcomings are the author’s sole responsibility.
However, the inordinate focus on the “universal” facets of globalization has rendered marginal the histories of local lives and communities. For instance, the politics of globalization focuses largely on the life of the nation-state as its unit of analysis, examining the changing relations of state and capital, the emergence of new international players, and the implications of new forms of regional and global governance. Such conceptualization reflects the bias toward institutions and formal processes as the realm of politics. This conventional approach limits the politics of globalization to a handful of actors (e.g. governments, regional bodies, and multilateral organizations) or courses of action that impact on rules and decisions regarding the allocation of resources (e.g. lobbying and protest movements).

But globalization is not “out there” waiting to be experienced, removed from everyday existence. The scales and spaces of everyday lives are among the cluster of domains globalization bears upon, and the spatial reordering associated with globalization is often accompanied by shifts in power relations and economic prospects that are experiential realities. At the local level, these may trigger both new opportunities and problems or further preserve existing conditions. In any case, such state of affairs becomes manifest in individual lives in a rich variety of ways. The politics of everyday life is still an almost unexplored field of study under the rubric of globalization. By documenting and analyzing the everyday politics that takes place in communities as they “live through” globalization, this study fills an enormous research gap.

Rather than focus exclusively on official or advocacy politics in looking at how individuals and communities contend with the challenges of globalization, this research project centers on the daily lives of ordinary people in the municipality of Bilar, province of Bohol. For instance, some farmers in Bilar, Bohol have pioneered a particular response to one particular aspect of globalization. Others, however, do not take a very active role as regards the issue due to specific reasons. The study looks into: (1) how a perceived external process or system like globalization, primarily the patenting of plant varieties through the Plant Variety Protection (PVP) Act, impinges on personal being and community existence, and (2) how individuals and communities in Bilar apprehend such a system or process and negotiate their way through it in their daily routines. In addition, the “undercurrents of discontent and alternative aspirations” (Kerkvliet 2005, 3) as brought about by globalization and its attendant consequences are examined.

Not only does this research initiative attempt to contribute to the development of theory, knowledge and practice, it advances an alternative method in conceptualizing and investigating the phenomenon of globalization. It offers an ethnographic approach to understanding change in the international political economy that emphasizes the importance of debates, conflicts, decisions, and cooperation among individuals, groups, and organizations in a community. Furthermore, the study attempts to provide a “history from below” based on the narratives of ordinary people as they share how they have lived their lives and how and why their experiences and behavior have changed over time within the context of a globalizing environment. Although the use of everyday politics in analyzing Philippine society is not new (see for example E. Tadem 2009), this research contributes to scholarship because it offers an alternative approach in analyzing globalization as a political process and uses everyday politics and the locality in the context of the impact of globalization.
Concepts, Framework of Analysis and Methodology

Despite the growing literature on globalization, it is still understood in different ways. As Held et al. (1999, 1) suggested, “globalization is in danger of becoming, if it has not already become, the cliché of our times: the big idea which encompasses everything from global financial markets to the Internet but which delivers little substantive insight into the contemporary human condition.” Indeed, globalization has turned into a slippery and ambiguous term that is subject to misunderstanding and political manipulation (Helleiner 2001). Beyond the general approach is a tendency to understand globalization in its various and distinctive respects, depending largely on the disciplinary perspectives that are employed. This suggests that globalization encompasses a broad range of cultural, economic, political, and social aspects.

For this particular study, the term “globalization” is narrowed to the neoliberal project of economic globalization, which has four defining characteristics (Amoore et al. 2000, 15):

- protection of the interests of capital and expansion of the process of capital accumulation;
- tendency towards homogenization of state policies and even state forms towards the end of protecting capital and expanding the process of capital accumulation through a new economic orthodoxy, i.e. “market ideology”;
- addition and expansion of a layer of transnationalized institutional authority “above the states”; and
- exclusion of dissident social forces from the arena of state policy-making.

This definition of globalization is necessary in assessing resistance to (or accommodation of) it.

In conceptualizing resistance (or accommodation) to globalization, Chin and Mittleman (2002, 31) revisited the works of three theorists of resistance, “even if their writing was not explicitly directed at the contemporary phase of globalization.” These are Gramsci and his concept of counter hegemony, Polanyi’s notion of counter movements, and Scott’s infrapolitics. Using Gramsci’s analysis of social change, if the neoliberal project of economic globalization is in the process of establishing hegemony, resistance is then subsumed under the rubric of counter-hegemony through “wars of movement” and “wars of position” at the collective level. Although nascent forms of wars of movement and position can be easily discerned, the contraction of time and space has created new sites of collective resistance, which most often transcend national borders (Chin and Mittleman 2002, 31-34). On the other hand, the movement-countermovement framework of Polanyi allows us to conceptualize and recognize contemporary social movements as a form of resistance, although the level of analysis would have to be extended from the national to the global levels (Chin and Mittleman 2002, 35). Finally, based on the seminal work of Scott on what is called “infrapolitics,” resistance has to be read as the ways in which people live their everyday lives. Scott argues that in the context of increasingly complex societies, the absence of openly declared contestations should not be mistaken for acquiescence (Chin and Mittleman 2002, 37). In encapsulating the different perspectives on resistance, Chin and Mittleman (2002, 40) put forward this proposition:

Resistance conceptualized as infrapolitical activities offers a viable avenue for generating theoretically grounded studies of everyday responses to globalizing structures and processes.
If conducted with sensitivity to the complex interplay between or among multiple identities in the context of structural constraints, the study of public and hidden transcripts may reveal changing notions and practices of work, family, and politics, for example as people seek to **negotiate a semblance of social control over the expansion of market forces in diverse spheres of their lives.** (emphasis added)

Finally, political scientist Kerkvliet contests the idea that politics is restricted to activities within governments and to concerted efforts to influence them. People need not be organized and active in public to be political (Kerkvliet 2005). Hence, rather than look at the politics of globalization through the interests and activities of authorities, this study examines everyday activities that do not conform to the behavior required by authorities but may carry considerable political weight. Called *everyday politics*, this consists of:

- “the debates, conflicts, decisions, cooperation among individuals, groups, and organizations regarding the control, allocation, and use of resources and the values and ideas underlying those activities” (Kerkvliet 1992, 11); and
- “quiet, mundane, and subtle expressions and acts that indirectly and for the most part privately endorses, modify, or resist prevailing procedures, rules, regulations, or order” (Kerkvliet 2005, 22).

It “occurs where people live and work and involves people embracing, adjusting to, or contesting norms and rules regarding authority over, production of, or allocation of resources” (Kerkvliet 2005, 22). It involves no or little organization.

Thus, the concepts being studied are globalization, particularly manifested in policies of liberalization, and resistance or accommodation through “everyday politics”. The research is guided by the assumption that, as these policies impact on the main economic activity in the community positively or negatively, some form of resistance (or accommodation) takes place.

Much of the data for this research came from interviews with farmer-leaders, representatives from nongovernment organizations (NGOs), personnel from Bilar’s Municipal Agriculture Office, and the former Chair of the Committee on Agriculture of Bilar’s Municipal Council, as well as focus group discussions (FGDs) attended by organized and non-organized farmers in four barangays (communities or villages with corresponding governments — the lowest level local government unit in the Philippines) in Bilar as well as one barangay in the nearby town of Batuan, and field visits in farmers’ meetings and communities. The data gathered are validated and complemented by primary and secondary written documents. Field work was conducted from October 2008 to April 2010.

**Bilar before 2002**

Bilar got its name during the Spanish period. Through a royal decree, the name Bilar was adopted as the official name of the municipality when it was organized in 1830. A plausible source of the name is Bilar (or Elvillar in Spanish) in Alava province, Basque Country, Spain. It is common during the Spanish period to name places in the Philippines with names of places in Spain. Interestingly, both Bilers share the same patron saint, Saint Isidore, the patron saint of farmers.
Bilar is an interior town in the island province of Bohol, situated in the Visayas group of islands, the tenth largest island in the country, and a prime eco-cultural tourist destination and agro-industrial province. (See Figure 1 for Bohol’s location in the Philippines, Figure 2 for the province’s political map.) This town used to occupy a big area that included what are now known as the municipalities of Sevilla, Batuan and Carmen. Based on the official websites of the municipality and the province, in 2000, Bilar has a population of 16,628. It is composed of 19 barangays and the total land area is 13,315 has. Its’ poblacion (city center) is located about 28 kms. northeast of Tagbilaran City (the provincial capital). The travel time from the capital to Bilar is about 50 minutes. The municipality can be reached by an all-weather road.

Bilar is a fifth class municipality in terms of income classification (on a scale of 1 to 6 with 1 being the richest). The municipality was once the rice bowl of the province of Bohol, producing a great volume of rice. However, the area for rice is declining due to insufficient reliable water source to irrigate the fields.

Bilar farmers plant traditional varieties of rice and some of them engage in rice breeding plus organic farming and seed selection. From their harvest, they save the best seeds for the next cropping season, which they also share and exchange with other farmers within and outside barangays through a barter system. Like other farmers, Bilar farmers have no problem using a plant variety in whatever way they desire. When farmers notice that other farmers have rice varieties performing well, it is natural to ask for some of these varieties’ seeds for use in the next cropping season. Some do not rely on seeds from the government. For those into organic farming, they have limited use of pesticides. Others use commercial fertilizers.

This traditional process of breeding, conserving, and exchanging seeds sometimes confuses the naming process of rice varieties. According to some farmers in Barangay Rizal, unless the source farmer specifies its original name designated by the original breeder, the acquired variety would usually bear the name of one of the intermediate sources, i.e. either the name of the source farmer outside the community or the name of the farmer in the community to whom through trade the other farmer secures his or her seeds. Thus, the names of some varieties are Kaimpas, Carabantos and Ka-islaw. But some varieties still retained the numbers in their original names like 77 for IR-77.

This does not mean that farmers never used modern rice varieties or commercial fertilizers. As farmers in Barangay Campagao explained, from the 1970s to the 1980s, commercial fertilizers and modern varieties were introduced to farmers by the government. However, these resulted to genetic erosion because the modern varieties are not suited to the soil of the area. The rice yield eventually declined while expenses for the seeds and fertilizers increased. By the 1990s, four barangays were re-introduced to organic farming, development of rice varieties through rice breeding and selection, and use of organic fertilizers that are less expensive by the non-government organization (NGO) Southeast Asia Regional Initiatives for Community Empowerment (SEARICE), which has a central office in Metro Manila but set up an office in Bohol in 1996. It was only when farmers experienced drought for two seasons, hence having a shortage of rice seeds, that some Zamora farmers recall using seeds distributed by the municipal government again. However, these seeds were not well-suited for the land and thus, farmers had to spend much on fertilizers to make them grow. There are also other instances when the Municipal Agriculture Office (MAO) gave free seeds in limited quantities.
Farmers also observe the bayanihan or ajon-ajon system, a Filipino tradition where people help neighbors for free, in this case, farmers pooling and exchanging free labor with their neighbors when needed. Farmers use manual operation in farming like using carabaos or water buffaloes for plowing. But for those who have some money, they can rent a tractor.

In terms of organizing, there were already organizations before 2002. Some of these organizations were organized by the Catholic Church, like the Basic Ecclesiastical Communities and the Birhen sa Barangay groups, and the Department of Agriculture (DA) through the MAO. The later ones were organized by NGOs. In 1996 when SEARICE entered Bohol, it began to organize farmers’ organizations in four barangays. However, few farmers actively joined farmers’ groups, whether government-organized or NGO-organized.

It is also interesting that while the province of Bohol had a history of millenarian movements and more recently, entry by communist insurgents, farmers interviewed as well as those who attended the FGDs did not mention any influence by radical forces or the insurgents. This failure on the part of communist insurgents to organize local farmers and gain sympathizers may be partly due to the non-existence of large tracts of lands or haciendas owned by a single family (ISDS 2009, 105), unlike in some provinces, like neighboring Leyte and Negros or in Central Luzon, where “class wars” can more easily be instigated and a more egalitarian society envisioned because poor people can clearly see the differences between rich land-holding families and poor tenants in agricultural settings. Bohol’s terrain is also hilly and mountainous; thus, large-scale farming is impossible. Most farmers are either sharecroppers or smallholders who still work on the farms and are still clearly part of the community.

Some farmers also disclosed that when the New People’s Army (NPA) was active in Bilar, the insurgents would normally require farmers to “donate” or give up their carabaos and food, which are very precious to farmers and their families. This practice left a negative impression on the farmers. Thus, even if Bohol as a province is now considered a peace zone, Bilar farmers are wary of newcomers associated with the insurgents. According to Retchel Sasing, a former staff of SEARICE, when she first came to Bohol with fellow new Agriculture graduates from the University of the Philippines – Los Baños who were newly-hired by SEARICE, farmers asked them first, “NPA ba kayo?” (Are you a member of the NPA?) When they said no and explained that they were there to train farmers to improve their farming, the farmers welcomed them. This aversion to insurgents will be supported by the experience of one barangay who associated the activities of another NGO with that of the NPA.

The Plant Variety Protection Act and Initial Impact for Farmers in Bilar

As a predominantly agricultural community, Bilar is also affected by globalization. However, in interviews and FGDs with farmers, people are not familiar with the term “globalization”. Some of them disclose that they only feel that the outside economy and politics affect them when prices of fuel (and hence transportation) and goods like seeds, fertilizers and anti-pest chemicals increase. However, what is real and concrete to SEARICE-organized farmers is the term “PVP”. As one farmer-leader explained, the farmers’ attitude is this: “okay lang basta walang gumagalaw sa kanila” (“everything is okay as long as they are...
not affected”). Their priority is their livelihood. Once their livelihood is affected, that is when they will act.

The PVP Act (Republic Act No. 9168), signed by President Gloria Macapagal Arroyo on June 7, 2002, is one expression of the Philippine government’s commitment to the World Trade Organization (WTO), in this case the Agreement on Trade Related Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS). The PVP’s enactment was justified mainly as the country’s compliance to Article 27.3 (b) of the TRIPS stating, “... members shall provide for the protection of plant varieties either by patents or by effective sui generis system or by any combination thereof.” The law was passed despite contrary arguments raised by groups representing small farmers in various parts of the country. The law did not undergo broad consultations with stakeholders and public hearings were conducted only in Metro Manila and participated only by very few representatives from civil society and farmers’ groups (SEARICE 2005).

The PVP Act espouses the first-to-file rule. It also contains provisions on the rights of the breeder, as well as infringement of the rights of a breeder with a PVP certificate.

While there are some sectors like seed companies that can appreciate applying for PVP certification, the PVP law is not without criticisms. First, the PVP Act was criticized to be essentially adopted from the UPOV, which used to govern plant variety protection before the WTO, instead of developing a sui generis system of plant variety protection. Interestingly, the Philippines is not a signatory to the UPOV, which is criticized for protecting the intellectual property rights of the “old boys club” of industrial plant breeders in industrialized countries (Cabilo 2008).

Second, the PVP Act, while recognizing the role of the private sector in contributing to agricultural research and development as well as food security, is silent regarding the role of farmers and farming communities. It seems that they are not considered as “breeders”. This non-recognition is contrary to the tradition in Southeast Asia where farmers are automatically plant breeders as well. This is reflected not only in Section 2 of the Act but also in its definition of who may be considered a breeder. The law is also implicit in its preference for individuals as PVP certificate holders (see Sections 3c, 18, and 19). There is no provision for community-based farmers’ organizations as holders of PVP certificates. In addition, the composition of the National Plant Variety Protection Board shows a token recognition of the role of farmers’ organizations in the decision-making process. (Cabilo 2008)

Furthermore, the law denies the farmers the right over their seeds and at the same time threatens the farmers’ seed system — the traditional practice of using, selling, and saving/conserving seeds (Salces 2003). Moreover, “patenting” of plant varieties is said to be against the concept of farmers’ customary rights, as articulated in the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (ITPGRFA). The threat to farmers’ rights
over their seeds is also a threat to their livelihood system. Farmers are placed by the PVP law under the threat of criminalization for exercising their traditional rights.3

This concern for the impact of the PVP law on Philippine farmers has already been sounded off by the South Centre (1997) even before the law was enacted in the Philippines. The South Centre noted that the impact of protecting plant varieties is more direct on small farmers. There are four reasons why small farmers resist the patenting of plants, including plant varieties (South Centre 1997, 42):

(1) This new system substantially changes processes in developing countries where farmers save seeds for the next planting season. Under a patent system, “the patentee would be authorized, in principle, to prohibit the re-use of saved seeds by farmers, with the consequence that farmers’ costs would rise, and the dominance of large seed companies would be strengthened”.

(2) Breeding of protected varieties will be prohibited and patent protection will hinder farm-level innovations.

(3) Monopoly rights for production and marketing of essential crops and their corresponding traits will be the name of the game.

(4) Patenting and plant variety protection will erode biodiversity as it promotes standardization of plant variety. This will result in “increased concentration in farm ownership and in the seeds industry, with small and medium farmers and breeders likely to suffer the worst impact”.

In the case of farmers in Bilar, most of them initially did not know about the PVP law. According to the president of the Owac Irrigators Association during one FGD, “Karon pa ko makahibawo nga naa diay nang balaora.” (It is only now that I know about the existence of such law.) Farmers said that even the local governments, particularly the MAO, were not familiar with the law. It was only after information campaigns conducted by SEARICE that many farmers — but only in areas with SEARICE presence and if they happen to be active in SEARICE-organized groups — came to know the law. Upon knowing the contents of this law, these farmers felt their livelihood threatened. They feared that they will no longer have rights to their seeds as others, including individual farmers, can apply or claim patents for them. They were also worried that they might be imprisoned should they be caught saving certified seeds for the next planting season. In addition, hybrid varieties patented by seed companies are very expensive. Since the law does not allow them to use their own seeds nor store seeds of the hybrid varieties for the next planting season, poor farmers will have difficulty buying seeds every planting season. The culture of the barter system will then fade away.

For his part, Ireneo Macalolot, the Municipal Agriculturist who started working for the DA since 1976 as technician, admitted that he himself as well as his staff have not read the PVP Act. He explained that before devolution (1992), the DA conducted regular monthly meetings where all local counterparts were required to attend. But since devolution as a result of the Local Government Code, the devolved agriculture workers are now directly accountable to local chief executives instead of the Secretary of Agriculture. Hence, not all agriculture officers in local areas are aware of national laws and other developments affecting

3 However, the PVP law does have some exceptions. Sec. 43 d) states as one exception to the PVP “The traditional right of small farmers to save, use, exchange, share or sell their farm produce of a variety protected under this Act, except when a sale is for the purpose of reproduction under a commercial marketing agreement. The Board shall determine the condition under which this exception shall apply …”
their area of responsibility, the PVP law included. The PVP law is therefore not implemented fully in local areas like Bilar. Even now, there are very few meetings where the DA and their local counterparts meet.

Responses of SEARICE Areas to the Law

Recognizing the threats posed by the law to farmers, the Community Biodiversity Development and Conservation Project of SEARICE carried out a localization campaign on the PVP issue. The effort included information and education campaigns, discussions and analysis of the PVP law with farmer-partners in the barangays of Campagao, Zamora, Riverside, and Cansumbol in the municipality of Bilar. After a series of consultations, the four barangays came up with responses to the threats posed by the PVP Act.

A proactive measure pursued by the Campagao Farmers’ Production and Research Association (CFPRA) to protect agricultural genetic resources is through a community registry. The first such registry in the country, it lists the names, kinds and basic characteristics of rice varieties that farmers use. There is also a seed bank and a backup inventory kept under refrigeration at the research department of the Central Visayas State College of Agriculture, Forestry and Technology. At first, the members had a joint affidavit stating that they owned the seeds in the list. The Campagao affidavit declares that all rice varieties maintained in the community shall be protected from the PVP Act and seeds of these varieties shall remain freely accessible to farmers to use, sell, save and exchange with other farmers. The CFPRA joint affidavit partly reads: “...these varieties should not be registered by any person [because] these are ours, and that our co-farmers through seed exchange can freely use these materials without any conditions and restrictions on its utilization...”

Campagao farmer-leaders Cecenio Salces and Bonifacio Tejada narrated their experience of setting up the community registry. They acknowledge the support of SEARICE to their initiative. According to Tejada: “Kung wala ang SEARICE, wala kami, eh.” (“If SEARICE has not been here, we will not be here now.”) They learned from SEARICE that the PVP law allows the process of coming up with a community inventory or registry of locally-bred varieties in order for farmers to protect their own interests, particularly the rice varieties that they bred and developed. Section 72 of the law states that farming “communities and bona fide farmers’ organizations are encouraged to build an inventory of locally bred varieties as an option to protect these resources from misappropriation and unfair monopolization”. However, the PVP law is silent on the legal value of such an inventory vis-à-vis plant variety protection.

Members of CFPRA then met and deliberated on setting up the community registry. When they agreed to set up the registry, they already made an inventory of all rice varieties, whether from farmers or from government institutions, available in the barangay. The inventory required the cooperation of each CFPRA member assigned in his or her own sub-village to do inventory. They were assisted by SEARICE. However, the informants disclosed that CFPRA only has less than thirty members, with active members even fewer.

The list of all rice varieties developed and “owned” by the farmers were included in the list that they then submitted to the Sangguniang Pambaring or Barangay Council (the legislative body at the barangay level). According to the two farmer-leaders and FGD
participants in the barangay, while it took some time to explain to officials the PVP law and its implications, they found it easy to convince Campagao’s officials to pass a resolution recognizing the community registry in 2003. Councilors are friends and farmers as well, even if not everyone are members of CFPR. These local officials also use rice varieties developed by CFPR. CFPR’s relationship with the barangay government remains cooperative today, especially since Salces is now an elected councilor himself and in charge of the Committee on Agriculture.

As a result of setting up a community registry, the farmers in Campagao can now conduct trials on different varieties of rice. Then, they conduct their own experiments in cross-breeding until they come up with a new variety. They get capability training support from SEARICE. While few farmers are formally organized in the barangay until now, once the community registry has been recognized, CFPR members share the rice varieties with all the farmers in the area and continue with the old barter system of exchanging seeds and storing seeds for the next planting season. However, they now have a legal right to their seeds which is also in accordance with national law. Non-members also replicate CFPR’s system.

Being the first barangay to establish the community registry, Campagao became a model barangay that other SEARICE pilot areas soon followed.

In another barangay, the Zamora Organic Farmers’ Research Association (ZOFRA) which was also organized with SEARICE’s help basically followed Campagao’s lead. Assisted by SEARICE. Members conducted an inventory of the different rice varieties in the barangay. They also kept samples of seeds in a seed bank as evidence that they are indeed available in the community. In effect, they also established their own community registry. Then, ZOFRA lobbied the barangay council for a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the two groups regarding the ownership of the seeds. At first, according to ZOFRA members who participated in the FGD in Zamora, the council did not agree because the councilors were not familiar with issues related with the PVP. But after the farmers’ group explained the issues, the councilors realized the importance of the MOA and thus, the MOA was drafted and signed, thus recognizing Zamora’s community registry. However, unlike the smooth relations between the Campagao farmers’ group and the barangay government, Zamora farmers explained that they have difficulty talking to the councilors because the latter underestimate the farmers’ capacities.

As in the case of Campagao, only members of ZOFRA were active in lobbying at the barangay level. This is because some farmers in the community have the mentality of “to see is to believe”. However, with the community registry, Zamora farmers can use their seeds in whatever way they want. They can breed new varieties and freely exchange their seeds with their neighbors or even outside the community.

Two other barangays in Bilar, Riverside and Cansumbol which are also SEARICE areas set up their own community registries. In Riverside, farmers were able to get a barangay resolution recognizing the registry. In Cansumbol, a barangay ordinance supported the registry.

At the municipal level, the local government has also recognized the efforts of farmers in plant genetic resources management. This is also a result of the lobbying of four farmers’ organizations in Bilar, with CFPR and ZOFRA included, and backed up by SEARICE. These are basically the farmers’ organizations in the four SEARICE barangays.
In June 2004, Municipal Resolution No. 81 was passed unanimously by Bilar’s Municipal Council recognizing the rice community registry of farmers’ organizations in the community. The resolution recognizes farmers’ efforts in research and breeding initiatives, as well as initiatives against the PVP Act. But this resolution only recognized the actions of the farmers, including the registry. The Council did not approve or accredit the farmers’ specific rice varieties as the local body does not have expertise or jurisdiction in this matter.

Then, in October 2006, Municipal Ordinance No. 2006-21 (“An Ordinance Declaring the Municipality of Bilar as Rice Heritage and Conservation Site”) was passed unanimously by the Council. It recognizes that protection mechanisms should be established to support rice genetic resources and agro-biodiversity conservation. It also establishes the need for an “economic push for farmers to sustain and scale-up institutions’ and farmers’ conservation efforts through consumers and eco-tourists”.

For the advocacy at the municipal level, farmers were initially hesitant to go to the municipal hall lest they may be branded as philosophers and ideologues. However, they sent their position papers to the Mayor and municipal councilors who are also farmers and friends. They approached each official one-by-one and it was easy to explain their situation and for the local officials to empathize with them. According to former Municipal Councilor Reynaldo Tabel who sponsored the ordinance, both the resolution and ordinance were passed unanimously because councilors agreed that the intentions of farmers and SEARICE were good and not against any government program. On a more personal level, businessman Tabel pushed for the enactment of the ordinance based on two personal experiences. First, during the previous planting season, he planted modern rice varieties but the harvest was not good. However, Tabel is not sure if it was the quality of the seeds that was questionable or whether the farmers working in his farm were not able to follow the necessary procedures for planting hybrid rice varieties. Second, based on a conversation with the MAO, Tabel learned that the yield of modern varieties is not anymore suitable for replanting, thus necessitating further purchases of seedlings from seed producers. He felt that only the commercial seed producers would benefit under the scheme.

There are, however, some tensions between CFPRA and the technician from the MAO. Because many Campagao farmers produce their own traditional, organic, sustainable and cheaper rice varieties, give or exchange the seeds, most farmers no longer buy the seedlings of modern rice varieties from the DA. Tejada and Salces mentioned that while they know personally the MAO technician, they now have a “colder” relationship. The MAO does not send representatives to meetings of farmers in the village. Naturally, the MAO technician promotes national government programs with funding support from the provincial government while CFPRA promotes its own programs. It is thus difficult for the MAO technician in Bilar to make the government’s agricultural programs, like promotion of hybrid and certified seeds subsidized by the provincial government, penetrate and succeed in Campagao where farmers’ seed varieties are given for free. Government seeds are being sold for PhP 2,010 (or roughly US$40) per fifty kilos.

Interestingly, Zamora farmers who attended the FGD claimed to have a good relationship with the MAO. However, they pointed out that most farmers practice organic farming and no longer rely on modern varieties from the MAO or private seed stores. They explained that if they use modern varieties, they will spend between PhP 10,000 to 11,000 (roughly US$ 200) for the entire farming process. Using traditional rice varieties and organic farming methods only cost them about PhP 5,000 (roughly US$ 100).
However, Bilar’s Municipal Agriculturist and the Agriculture Technician have a
different take about the relationship between farmers, their office and SEARICE. Macalolot
disclosed that SEARICE does not coordinate much with them, even when setting up the
community registries. He feels that perhaps, SEARICE may be bad-mouthing or discrediting
all government programs to the farmers they organized. Perhaps, the government’s hybrid
seeds are being placed in a bad light compared to rice varieties bred by farmers and
encouraged by SEARICE when in fact, according to the Municipal Agriculturist, the hybrid
seeds are better and bigger than the local varieties. However, Macalolot added that they let
farmers decide on what varieties they will use. Eulalia Mutia, the MAO technician
responsible for Campagao and two other non-SEARICE barangays, also explained that the
MAO is no match for SEARICE when it comes to getting the loyalty of farmers in their areas
of operation. SEARICE is able to send farmer-leaders to national and international
conferences and exposure trips with all expenses paid. The government has no such support
or other incentives for farmer-leaders. Mutia added, “Mao nga mapugos ug adopt anang
ilang humay bisag dili gajud lami. Napasubo na ba.” (That is why they have no choice but to
adopt SEARICE’s rice varieties even if they are not good varieties.) Furthermore, Macalolot
doubts the technical capability of SEARICE and other farmers’ groups to really successfully
breed rice, because rice is the most difficult plant to breed.

Following the success of the four barangays in Bilar in setting up community
registries as well as having the system recognized at the municipal level, the process began to
be replicated in other parts of Bohol mainly through the efforts of SEARICE. One such case
is the barangay of Poblacion Vieja in the nearby municipality of Batuan, which used to be
part of Bilar. The process undergone by the Poblacion Vieja Sustainable Farmers’
Association (PVSA) in setting up the community registry is basically similar with that of
CFPRA and ZOFRA. PVSA members knew about the PVP and the community registry idea
through SEARICE. They then did an inventory of their seeds and requested their
barangay council to recognize it.

According to Domingo Limpot, PVSA president, it was easy convincing the council
to recognize the community registry through a resolution. One member of PVSA is a
barangay councilor and most of the other councilors are also farmers. They then went to the
municipal government of Batuan. The process of passing a municipal resolution recognizing
the community registry system was also easy because municipal councilors are also farmers
who can understand the issues involved. However, some farmers continue getting seeds from
the MAO of Batuan. In the Poblacion Vieja FGD, farmers disclosed that in all these
advocacies, only PVSA members were active.

Right now, advocacy to support farmers’ initiatives to meet the challenges of the PVP
Act at the provincial level is still being pursued with the organized Bilar farmers as the core.
The Bohol Initiators for Sustainable Agriculture and Development (BISAD), a multisectoral
alliance of development NGOs and people’s organizations, is leading the campaign. But
despite the spread of the community registry concept in some parts of Bohol and the
advocacy of NGOs and farmers’ groups for the provincial government to adopt a provincial
ordinance recognizing the rice community registry practice or even have a provincial registry,
it has not yet met with success. “Matagal-tagal na din. Kaming mga magsasaka ay
malayong-malayo. Hindi rin kami makapunta doon” (It is taking a long time. We farmers are
very far away. We also cannot go there.), says Tejada.
The only concrete actions done by the provincial government in relation to lobbying of farmers in reaction to the PVP are the issuance of certificates (by the Provincial Agriculture Office or PAO) to farmers’ groups like CFPRA and ZOFRA as farmer breeders and the occasional invitation to farmer-leaders as speakers in conferences, seminars and trainings attended by other farmers in the province. Farmers’ groups are also part of the PAO’s Participatory Plant Breeding Program. According to some farmers from Zamora, the province is slow to act on passing an ordinance recognizing the community registry concept because it has other priorities. In addition, only 7 out of a total of 47 municipalities in Bohol are into rice breeding.

Tejada and Salces compared their earlier advocacy at the barangay and municipal levels with the current advocacy at the provincial government level. According to them, it is easy to lobby and work with barangay and municipal government officials, particularly councilors, because most of them are farmers themselves. They also know each other. However, the problem is in dealing with the Provincial Government, Congressional Representatives, and Senators. As the level of government goes higher, the harder it is for farmers to bring their issues across and find allies.

Most of the farmers have negative experiences and perceptions about politicians at the provincial and national levels. They feel that there are many laws passed without consultation. This is because provincial and national politicians are not farmers and thus, cannot represent them. Tejada said, “Alam mo naman ang mga politicians. Mahilig silang magsabi. Lahat puro pangako, kami ang napapako.” (You know politicians. They like to talk and make promises. In the end, we are left to fend for ourselves.)

Salces also had a bad experience when he attended Senate public hearings when the PVP was still being deliberated in the two Houses of Congress. He was the president of CFPRA at that time and together with a handful of other leaders of farmers’ groups, he appealed to the Senators that farmers be recognized as breeders. Senator Sergio Osmeña III shouted at him and humiliated him, saying that farmers cannot be rice breeders. Because of this experience, Tejada disclosed, organized farmers never voted for this legislator again.

As for their Congressman or district representative in the House of Representatives, farmers interviewed and those who attended the FGDs feel that at best, all these legislators do is to meet with them. They do not know if congressmen really understand the PVP or care about its impact on farmers. According to some farmers from Zamora, their current Congressman is a neophyte and might not even be aware of issues related to the PVP. However, he provides assistance to farmers through the provision of organic fertilizers and seed dryers as well as scholarships for their children. In the case of farmers from Poblacion Vieja, they have never tried approaching their congressman for assistance.

However, they are hopeful that slowly, with the help of various organizations, farmers’ issues will reach the higher levels of government. Farmers who attended the FGDs believe that local governments and congressmen are capable of articulating the interests of local communities and influence national decision-making if only they will communicate properly with farmers. After all, farmers produce the basic food supply of the country; the responsibility of politicians and governments is to assist them. For Campagao farmers, it is important for farmers to bring their issues to politicians, and since elections are getting closer, they might get better results soon. But Zamora farmers are also realistic because if they
cannot always rely on government, the farmers should double their efforts to survive on their
own.

The farmers also rely on their partnership with NGOs like SEARICE and BISAD to
bring their advocacy at the provincial and national levels. CFPRA is also part of a network of
other farmers’ groups around the country. However, Tejada noted that not all parts of the
Philippines have active farmers’ organizations. For some Campagao and Zamora farmers,
farmers need to be united to take actions related to the PVP law and bring it up to higher
levels like the provincial and national levels. For Poblacion Vieja farmers, they have never
attempted bringing their issues to national level agencies and offices. They cannot imagine
themselves going that far.

Non-SEARICE Areas in Bilar: Any Effects of the PVP?

In Owac and Rizal, barangays not entered by SEARICE, farmers are not aware of the
PVP Act. When the contents of the law are explained to them, they agree that if the law is
actually followed, it will really threaten their livelihood. But so far, they have not felt any
impact of the law. They continue the traditional system of planting, exchanging and storing
seeds without any threat from government or private entities.

There are, however, no plant breeders in the two barangays. In Rizal, this is because
there has not been any training on plant breeding conducted in the area. In Owac, there are no
plant breeders because farmers here believe that plant breeding needs big tracts of land and
capital. Alfredo Dapar, the president of the Owac Irrigators Association (OIA), explains that
a farmer should own a large tract of land so that the same variety would be planted, thus
ensuring the purity of the resultant breed. In the case of farmers in the sitio, they own small
plots and they usually have different preferred varieties. The different varieties in the adjacent
plots would breed with the varieties being bred in the farmer-breeders’ plot, thus wrecking
havoc on the breeding process. The intended outcome will not be attained.

Some FGD participants in Owac and Rizal vaguely heard about SEARICE but they
are not aware of its nature nor its activities. Some Rizal farmers even joked whether it is a
rice variety that grows in the sea. Dapar seems to equate SEARICE with rice-breeding. For
instance, he said that SEARICE needs big land and capital and that he knows someone who
did “SEARICE” but was not successful.

Another NGO, the Participatory, Research, Organization of Communities and
Education towards Struggle for Self-Reliance (PROCESS) – Bohol, entered Rizal and some
siti os in Owac. However, the focus is on potable water resources rather than rice farming.
The NGO entered and successfully set up a waterworks system in Owac. But the Rizal
community’s experience with the NGO has not been pleasant. Since locating water sources
entailed mapping the underground water system, the NGO proposed the mapping of the
barangay’s caves. A farmer who underwent training in the underground armed movement
during its height in the area in the 1980s found the proposed cave-mapping exercise similar to
his previous training. This scared the other farmers that nobody further participated in the
NGO’s seminars, prompting the latter to withdraw from the barangay.

The farmers’ organizations in the two barangays are slightly different in their
orientations about how to address their issues. The Farmers’ Association of Rizal was
organized by the MAO. According to Crispin Raotraot, the association’s president, the MAO technician said that the group would serve as a conduit of aid intended for farmers in the barangay. The association is only waiting for aid from the MAO. Thus, they are not very active in seeking aid from concerned agencies and other groups. They even seldom meet. According to the Barangay Chair and member of the association, “Gahuwat ra ug unsay mga kaayuhan nga ihatag sa barangay.” (We are just waiting for aid that would be given to the barangay.) According to Raotraot, “Gapaabot laman mi og nay ihatag sa labaw kay nay wa man mohimo ug lakang nga mangayo mi ug kaayuhan didto. Og naay ihatag nila, maayo. Og wa pud, maayo gihapon.” (We are just waiting if something will be given from above. We did not do any initiative to ask for aid from higher authorities. If they will give us aid, fine with us. If they won’t give any, it is still fine.)

In the case of Owac, the association is pro-active. OIA started in 1996. The founder, who has an agriculture degree from a local college and is the current president of the association, owned a small plot within the sitio. During those years when the rice fields were not yet irrigated, they were not able to harvest because of a long dry season. He happened to have a conversation with a schoolmate who was working with the National Irrigation Authority (NIA) where he learned of the Gintong Ani Program. He related to his schoolmate the situation of the rice fields in the sitio, especially its lack of irrigation. His friend then shared with him the Agriculture Promotions Center (APC)-NIA program that loans water pumps to farmers. He was asked to come up with a resolution. His friend gave him a sample resolution from another barangay in an adjacent town. According to him, he simply replaced the name of the place and forwarded it to the MAO which in turned helped him in applying to the APC-NIA program.

They were able to get one unit of water pump for irrigation costing PhP 91,000. They asked the assistance of then municipal vice mayor Cadeliña to use one of his trucks in transporting the machine since they do not have funds to transport the machine from the capital city to their sitio (around 44 km). Before commissioning the machine in the second half of 1996, they built a dam in the nearby river and made irrigation canals.

OIA started with thirty members who are owners of plots in the sitio regardless of their residence. They have a common need which is irrigation water that is met by the machine pumping water from the nearby river. To maintain the machine, each member contributes twenty percent of their harvest to defray the maintenance costs and to service the debts. They also help each other in maintaining the dirt canals through which the water pumped from the river flows. Every time they meet to clean the canals, they would contribute PhP 25 and raffle the aggregate amount to one lucky member. Those who already won were not included in subsequent raffles. However, they do not have mutual aid arrangements in cultivating their fields.

Since then, they were able to pay their debts and acquired a second machine that expanded the reach of the irrigation water. However, this made them vulnerable to losses due to increases in fuel prices since the machines are diesel-powered. According to their president, they need one barrel (approximately 200 liters) a week to keep the two machines working especially when rain is scarce. There were even times when their association almost went bankrupt due to high fuel expenses caused by a prolonged dry season that almost dried the river. Luckily, they always sell their rice (from the twenty percent contribution) to the municipal mayor (also a rice trader) who lent them money to cover for the losses.
It appears that in the case of Owac, the farmers’ organization has a good relationship with the barangay officials, the mayor, and the MAO. The MAO provides the farmers with insecticides for their farms. An agriculture technician also coordinates with the association president. As far as other politicians are concerned, according to one of the members of the association, “Depende lagi sa kuan ning atong politician, dili ng didto dunay babag pero kung ato tanan way problema ang among mga reklamo.” (It depends on the politician, if they are not with us, then there is a hindrance but if they are all with us then there is no problem regarding our requests). But the president contradicted the member, “Wa mi mopasud ug politician ini kay kini mang gong politician lain-lain man gud ay angay angay sa tawo. Naningkamot mi sa among kaugalingon. Ang naay motabang namo, amo, ang di motabang, di gud pud amo.” (We did not allow politicians to influence us because in politics we have different preferences. We strive on our own. Those who will help us are with us, those who will not help, is not with us).

The association sent resolutions signed by the president and the barangay captain to politicians requesting for aid. For instance, they requested from former Representative Eladio Jala water pump accessories and the multi-purpose pavement. They even sent a resolution to the then DA Secretary (now newly-elected representative of the third district) Arthur Yap requesting funds for the concreting of their dirt canals. According to them, this will free labor time that they spent every week in cleaning and clearing the canal. They also requested then Third District Board Member Ester Corazon Galbreath funds for the repair of their barn/shade where they store their contributions.

Some Observations and Lessons from the Bilar Experience

Based on the above narratives, we see two different experiences of farming communities in Bilar. According to the experience of SEARICE-organized areas (Campagao and Zamora in Bilar and validated by Poblacion Vieja in a nearby municipality), farming communities’ livelihood and traditional systems have been apparently threatened by the PVP law. Farmers’ economic, personal and community security has been threatened. However, with assistance from SEARICE, the organized farmers set up community registries to protect their rights to the seed varieties they use and develop. They were also able to protect the traditional system of bartering and storing seeds. They have succeeded in their advocacy to get recognition at the barangay and municipal levels. However, there is not much success in bringing their issues to the provincial and higher levels of government. The PVP law definitely brought in new problems for farmers but new opportunities were available as well.

For these barangays where organized farmers react to a national law that serves to further globalization, it is important to point out the crucial role played by NGOs, particularly SEARICE, and civil society alliances at the provincial level like BISAD. These civil society organizations were crucial in providing information, capability-building through trainings, organizing, and advocacy in order to mobilize interested farmers to react to the law and think of ways to resist and/or accommodate this change. If not for SEARICE, in particular, farmers will have no idea about the PVP. It also appears that SEARICE has more loyal believers among farmer-leaders in the NGO’s pilot areas compared to that of the local agricultural office.

One other opportunity is the fact that the PVP law somehow allows the community inventory concept, though its’ standing vis-à-vis the national plant registry system is unclear.
in the PVP law. It is precisely this vagueness in the law that created an opening for farmers to protect their traditional varieties and farming systems.

There are other issues here as well, including the search for possible alternatives to the farmers’ registry since the latter is actually a mechanism recognized by the PVP Act. Up to now, SEARICE is at the forefront of scrapping the PVP Act and advocating for exclusion list of food crops, unconditional recognition of farmers’ rights to seeds, recognition of farmers’ varieties, co-equal legal recognition of a system of community registry with the national plant variety registry. However, farmers may actually be engaging in a politics of accommodation. Knowing that the law is already there and may be difficult to amend, the important thing for them is that the law itself has an opening (lusot) available. Upon learning that the community inventory is possible, organized farmers have used the mechanism to protect themselves. This shows how farmers adapted to the changes, recognizing and going through legal processes to gain recognition, without giving up their traditions and culture as farmers.

At the same time, farmers and SEARICE representatives interviewed also pointed out that while most farmers follow organic farming practices promoted by farmers’ organizations, many farmers are not joiners of these organizations or if they are, not active members of the organizations. Apparently, non-joiners and inactives do not have time for or are not interested in organizational work. This can be seen as failure of collective action. Most farmers are naturally hesitant to join formal organizations. This is pointed out as one reason why it is difficult to further organize and engage in advocacy beyond the immediate levels of local governments. At the same time, for farmer-leaders that have exposure to national as well as Southeast Asian networks of advocacies focusing on farmers’ rights, while they have noted that such alliances exist, they are not strong enough to make changes at the policy level.

However, “infrapolitics” or everyday politics as discussed by Scott and Kerkvliet involves no or little organization. Thus, while farmers’ organizations have difficulty recruiting members, organized as well as non-organized farmers usually work together within the traditional farming system. At least up to the municipal level where there are a sizeable number of farmers, there is an element of solidarity among farmers on issues that affect them. There are also instances when some of the farmer-leaders have been elected to barangay- and municipal-level government positions. Farmers in general and not just the organized ones share in the benefits from successful advocacies. At the same time, farmers silently but steadily resist the use of modern hybrid rice varieties and expensive farm inputs like commercial pesticides and fertilizers even if the government is promoting them. In a way, farmers are seeking to negotiate some “semblance of social control over the expansion of market forces” (Chin and Mittleman 2002, 40) in their lives.

At the same time, noticeable among organized farmers that were informants in this study are what Kerkvliet (2005, 3) calls “undercurrents of discontent and alternative aspirations”. They show displeasure and frustration with how their interests and ideas are not prioritized by politicians and the national government. However, they still aspire to have a better standing in both local and national policy-making. Some farmers have shown that small efforts in creating a community registry are forms of empowerment that are being replicated in other areas.
Farmer-leaders in Bilar are also gaining more leadership experience and exposure as they get invited as speakers and participants in local, national, Asian and even South American gatherings or exposure trips to share their experiences or learn from other farmers. According to Tejada, he gets exposed to new ideas from other farmers as well as new experiences that he did not imagine a farmer like him will experience, e.g. living in hotels for a few days, eating different types of food, etc. Current and past SEARICE staff noted the development of confidence and leadership skills of a number of farmer-leaders they assisted. For instance, SEARICE staff Mahinay and former staff Sasing noted that Salces used to be shy and quiet. Now, he is very articulate about farmers’ issues and even got elected as a barangay councilor.

Finally, noticeable among these farmers is they frame the problem of the PVP mainly as a national concern and think that should there be far-reaching changes, the national government and leaders should address problems with the law and recognize farmers’ rights. However, we have yet to find out if farmers can make stronger changes in national policies supporting globalization.

On the other hand, we see in non-SEARICE barangays (Owac and Rizal) non-awareness of the PVP law but also a continuation of the traditional seed system. Even in the absence of an NGO like SEARICE, farmers continue with their usual system of farming mainly because of the state’s weakness to implement at the lowest level of government what is supposed to be a radical shift in the plant protection system to comply with global commitments. Farmers in these areas only think about the national or even the global when prices of oil and other farm supplies increase. Some are so dependent on government agencies for help while some have actively organized to address local issues that directly affect their agricultural way of life. If politicians offer help, they welcome them. However, if the politicians are not giving assistance to farmers, the farmers rely on themselves.

One can also ask, based on the experience of the non-SEARICE areas: had SEARICE not influenced and agitated some farmers and given the current weak implementation of the PVP law by the state, will the traditional seed system of farmers continue? It appears at present that in the case of farming communities in Bilar, it will continue.

Thus, this research that uses “everyday politics” as a framework of analysis has shown that in paying attention to the stories of farming communities in Bilar, we get insights about the relationship of globalization and local communities that are quite different from the official views of the national government and even NGOs. The relationship is not even straightforward. In the case of Bilar, globalization through the PVP Act only has an indirect impact on Bilar farmers. In SEARICE areas, it was the NGO that familiarized the farmers with the PVP law and organized them to resist it. In a way, we see here expressions of Gramsci’s counter hegemony and Polanyi’s counter movements against globalization in the form of farmers’ actions to preserve traditional farming systems — with some prodding from an NGO — in the face of commercialization and market forces. In the case of the non-SEARICE areas, farmers continue with their traditional farming practices mainly because the weak Philippine state structures are unable to implement the law effectively at the local level. This finding is interesting as weak state implementation of a law promoting globalization gives farmers some opening to continue their old practices. In both cases and beyond overt collective actions, we see evidence of Scott’s “infrapolitics” at work as farmers try to deal with structural constraints and changing practices through public and hidden “transcripts” through debates, conflicts and tensions expressed even in jokes and biases, decisions and
cooperation (or non-cooperation) between organizations and among individuals as they try to control the allocation and use of resources in agriculture.
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Figure 3. A typical farm in Campagao, Bilar

Figure 4. Members of the Campagao Farmers’ Production and Research Association (CFPRA)

Farmer leaders Bonifacio Tejada (far left) and Cecenio Salces (far right)