FOREWORD

What does it mean to be *left behind*? The term *left behind* emerged and took on a sinister character when it was used to refer to families who lost loved ones from Rodrigo Duterte's war on drugs. Losing their loved ones, left behind families were left wanting for justice—a prospect that remains elusive to this day. Meanwhile, families were left to pick up the pieces and rebuild their shattered lives, if only to move on, albeit begrudgingly. The emergence of these families is not just marked by the murder of a loved one. It is also founded on lifetimes of being left behind by society that has relegated them as disposable, and its probable perpetuation in the future. Seen this way, being left behind is not only a result of the death of a loved one in the case of drug war victims. Being left behind is both a consummation of other forms of deaths (i.e. economic death, social death) and its continuation as they live their lives.

Being left behind, as in the case of victim families, is so profoundly grim, that experiencing different forms of deaths in a lifetime is, in many ways, unimaginable. And it provides no consolation that the families who suffered at the hands of Duterte were not the first, nor were they the last to endure these deaths. Elsewhere, beyond the victims of Duterte's war, we see urban poor communities, indigenous peoples, landless peasants, etcetera, either coerced, policed, confined and displaced; the consequences of which are tantamount to both literal and symbolic death. Yet, these deaths have been celebrated, justified, and legitimated or at the very least, ignored by society and state, all in the name of a vague sense of what is *good* for society—development.

It is in this vague sense of what is *good* for society, albeit at the expense of others, that we can begin to understand the cost of development. In the case of Duterte's war, development through peace, order, and discipline was paid for by the victims and their families. And it was the association with development that made the killings legible, if not

acceptable, to society. In many ways, killing a few for the benefit of many resembles a Manichean world where some lives are more valuable, while others are relegated to different forms of death, forgotten and left behind. Seeing development in these terms confronts us with reflection: On whose lives is *our* development built on top of?

The 17th volume of the Philippine Journal of Social Development takes on and explores this notion of being left behind in the context of the broader landscape of development. Specifically, the collection of five articles in this volume looks into peoples, communities, and sectors whose lives, experiences, histories, and political claims were *left behind* in favor of a normative and politically reinforced assertion of what is *good* for society—development. Inasmuch as the articles focus on the state of being left behind and experiencing various forms of deaths, this volume is also a celebration of life. The articles also focus on how peoples, communities and sectors exercise their agency to struggle against, deal with, navigate through and resist the prevailing development context which has cost them so much.

This volume aims to accomplish two things. First, by way of contributing to the already robust literature on social development in the Philippines, this volume offers a criticism of the development practices of both state and non-state actors by looking at how they are experienced by those who are on its receiving end. From this perspective, the collection of articles tries to peel off the enchanting veneer of development and shed light on the relations and subjectivities that development produces, the coercive practices and violent structures embedded within it, and the various ways that it was dealt with or addressed by those who are often left behind. Second, the volume aims to contribute to the ongoing political project of making visible what would otherwise be subjugated epistemes. This shows the "invisible" cost of development and, more importantly, those who paid the price.

In this way, the volume hopes to contribute to an important, albeit often neglected, conversation in development; that is, development for whom, how and their consequences.

This volume begins with an article by Cesar Allan C. Vera. In his article, Vera provides us with a survey and assessment of humanitarian work in the Philippines. Specifically, he looks at the different models of humanitarian work and their participatory claims. Vera argues that participation is an often invoked albeit neglected principle, leading to discombobulated responses that do not address the needs of people and communities in times of emergencies or worse, have disempowering effects. Vera ends his article by outlining how to bring people and communities in the entire process of humanitarian action through community organizing/community development (CO-CD).

Next is an article by Ma. Carla Michaela H. Batino, Kaye G. Cruz, Angelica Corazon P. Rayel & Mariane Joyce G. Robles (Batino et al. hereafter). In their article, Batino et al. describes the experiences of women in Magandang Lugar who have experienced different forms of violence. They describe how the inadequacies of formal mechanisms led the women of Magandang Lugar to create discrete albeit informal spaces within their community so that they could freely and safely share their experiences of violence and abuse through *chikahan*. Batino et al. render visible the discrete spaces created by women and argue that these may be used as a platform for feminist organizing or be harnessed to complement formal mechanisms designed to address violence against women (VAW).

The third article is by Benjamin B. Velasco. Velasco's subject is the controversial jeepney modernization program which has forced drivers and operators to, among other things, abandon their jeepneys and replace them with a modern and a much more environmentally friendly unit. Besides outlining the plight of jeepney drivers and operators against the state's unilateral imposition of regulations, Velasco highlights the injustice embedded within the policy framework and its securitized implementation. Velasco argues

that any form of jeepney modernization should abide by the principles of just transition; that is, modernization should not come at the cost of the lives and livelihoods of drivers and operators.

The fourth is by Danilo Valencia Elosendo Jr., Sarah Nelle F. Pasao, Perrie A. Rejuso, John Bryan R. Salamanca & Rafaella Justine Marie C. Villena (Elosendo Jr. et al. hereafter). In their article, Elosendo Jr. et al. describe how a community from the Ati tribe migrated from Panay to Rizal Province in the 1990s to escape poverty and discrimination, only to experience a similar situation in Rizal. Elosendo Jr. et al. situate the migration of the Ati tribe in the historical prevailing context of structural violence against indigenous peoples in the Philippines. And while the tribe's indigenous knowledge systems and practices (IKSPs) and social capital ensured their survival and kept them intact while in Rizal, these too are slowly eroding. In the end, Elosendo Jr. et al. explore how community organizing/community development (CO-CD) can facilitate the reinforcement of stronger community ties towards advocating for their rights.

This volume ends with an article by Rafael V. Dimalanta, Geo Kariz D. Cabaron & Bernard Joy G. Dones (Dimalanta et al. hereafter). Dimalanta et al. examines the case of Sitio San Roque—an embattled informal community at the center of what the local government aims to be Quezon City's business district. Specifically, Dimalanta et al. historicize the plight of the informal settlers and the various repertoires of resistance they employed to repel demolition attempts or resist repeated offers of relocation from the government and its partner corporation. They focus on KADAMAY's community development plan which serves as a basis for negotiating with the local government for humane and just housing arrangements. Despite community-led efforts, the KADAMAY's CDP is ultimately ignored due to the local government's neoliberal position.

Karl Arvin F. Hapal
Issue Editor