

Country/entity	Philippines
Region	Asia and Pacific
Agreement name	Joint Statement of the Government of the Republic of the Philippines (GRP) and the Panel for Peace Talks with the CPP/NPA/NDF and the National Democratic Front (NDF Delegation (Breukelen Joint Statement)
Date	14 Jun 1994
Agreement status	Multiparty signed/agreed
Interim arrangement	Yes

Agreement/conflict level Intrastate/intrastate conflict

Philippine Insurgencies (1968 -)

The Maoist Insurgencies (1968 -)

Philippines-NDF

The Philippines have been defined by a series of center-periphery and often ideologically Maoist, separatist insurgencies. The Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP), began its war against the central Philippine government in 1968 through their armed wing – the New People’s Army (NPA). Further legitimacy was gained through the establishment of the National Democratic Front (NDF) in 1973. Grievances were predominantly opposed to the corruption and repression under the authoritarian Marcos regime.

Philippines-Cordillera

With the overthrow of Marcos’ regime in 1986, the CPP factionalized further to take on more localized characteristics. The Cordillera Peoples Liberation Army (CPLA) broke away from the NDF in 1986 to focus on the protection of the Cordilleran people and land in northern Luzon. Hostilities were formally ended in July 2011, with an agreement signed between the central government, the CPLA and the Cordillera Bodong Administration (CBA) that allowed for the absorption of CPLA fighters into the Philippine Army and the re-working of the CBA-CPLA into a socio-development organisation.

Philippines-RPM-P

Meanwhile, purge among the CPP in the early 1990s, encouraged the formation of a parallel party, the Revolutionary Workers Party (RPM-P). Their armed wing, the Alex Boncayao Brigade (ABB) which had carried out a number of assassinations during the 1980s at the bequest of the CPP, followed suit and allied themselves with the RPM-P in 1997 forming the (RPM-P-RPA-ABB). Severely weakened by the split with the CPP and with the arrest of several key figures, the RPM-P-RPA-ABB signed a peace agreement in December 2000, which encouraged the RPM-P’s branch in Mindanao to break away in 2001.

The CPP-NPA has only participated in intermittent talks with the government. Talks halted in 2004 when Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo’s administration sought closer ties with the U.S. in the war on terror and added the CPP-NPA to the list of terrorist organisations, renewing violence. Following the launch of a counter-insurgency by the Philippine government, negotiations have been further delayed due to suspected internal differences between the CPP ‘old guard’ and younger members.

The Moro Insurgency (1968 -)

Philippines-Mindanao

The Moro Insurgency began in 1968, in Mindanao and the Sulu archipelago after the killing of Moro Commandos, the so-called Jabidah Massacre, by the Philippine Army following a plot to invade Sabah province in Malaysia. The Moro National Liberation Front (MNLF) captured a swath of territory in the mid-1970s. In an attempt to stem the violence, the constitution was reformed and Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao (ARMM) was created 1990 granting a devolution of power to the provinces of Lanao del Sur, Maguindanao, Sulu and Tawi-Tawi. Following the establishment of the ARMM, the MNLF splintered into a range of smaller groups including Islamic factions such as the

Stage	Pre-negotiation/process
Conflict nature	Government
Peace process	Philippines-NDF process
Parties	<p>GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES OF THE PHILIPPINES</p> <p>Howard Q. Dee, Chairman, GRP Panel for Peace Talks with the CPP/NPA/NDF</p> <p>Rep. Jose V.Yap, House of Representatives Member, GRP Panel</p> <p>Silvestre H. Bello III, Member, GRP Panel</p> <p>Rep. Jesus G. Dureza, House of Representatives, Advisor to the GRP Panel</p> <p>Teresita L. de Castro, State Counsel, GRP Legal Consultant</p> <p>Maria Lorenza G. Dalupan, Executive Director, GRP Panel Secretariat</p> <p>National Democratic Front of the Philippines</p> <p>Luis Jalandoni, NDF Vice Chairperson for International Affairs & Head of NDF Delegation</p> <p>Asterio Palima, Member, NDF Delegation</p> <p>Coni Ledesma, Member, NDF Delegation</p> <p>Ruth de Leon, Member, NDF Delegation</p> <p>Fidel Agcaoil, NDF Consultant</p> <p>Jose Maria Sison, NDF Consultant</p>
Third parties	Atty. Romeo Capulong of the Philippine Peace Center also participated as Legal Consultant.
Description	Not an agreement, but an account of the first round of exploratory talks. It provides for future discussion on issues relating to the political status of prisoners, and nature of amnesty granted by GRP particularly contentious. Agreement regarding substance of next round of talks that will be held in the third quarter of 1994.

Agreement document	PH_940614_Breukelen Joint Statement.pdf (opens in new tab) Download PDF
---------------------------	---

Groups

Children/youth	No specific mention.
Disabled persons	No specific mention.
Elderly/age	No specific mention.
Migrant workers	No specific mention.
Racial/ethnic/national group	No specific mention.

Religious groups No specific mention.

Indigenous people No specific mention.

Other groups No specific mention.

Refugees/displaced persons No specific mention.

Social class No specific mention.

Gender

Women, girls and gender No specific mention.

Men and boys No specific mention.

LGBTI No specific mention.

Family No specific mention.

State definition

Nature of state (general) No specific mention.

State configuration No specific mention.

Self determination No specific mention.

Referendum No specific mention.

State symbols No specific mention.

Independence/ secession No specific mention.

Accession/ unification No specific mention.

Border delimitation No specific mention.

Cross-border provision No specific mention.

Governance

Political institutions (new or reformed) No specific mention.

Elections No specific mention.

Electoral commission No specific mention.

Political parties reform No specific mention.

Civil society Participants in the in the discussions included the Philippine Peace Center (Att. Romeo Capulong, legal consultant).

Traditional/religious leaders No specific mention.

Public administration No specific mention.

Constitution No specific mention.

Power sharing

Political power sharing No specific mention.

Territorial power sharing No specific mention.

Economic power sharing No specific mention.

Military power sharing No specific mention.

Human rights and equality

Human rights/RoL general Page 2, II. ISSUES DISCUSSED,
4. The NDF favorably endorses the claims for indemnification of the victims of human rights violations during the Marcos dictatorship for at least 30 percent of the money to be recovered from the Swiss bank deposits of the Marcoses.

Page 2, II ISSUES DISCUSSED,
7. The GRP reaffirms its position that its commitment to constitutional processes and the rule of law as enunciated in Executive Order No. 125 does not violate The Hague Declaration, nor does it mean that it will cite the Constitution as a basis for rejecting what otherwise would be just and valid proposals for reforms in society. If it is shown in fact that certain provisions of the GRP Constitution hinder the attainment of genuine reforms, the GRP Panel is willing to recommend to GRP authorities amendments thereto. In this context, it is clear that GRP's adherence to constitutional processes does not constitute the imposition of the GRP Constitution as framework for the peace talks.

Bill of rights/similar No specific mention.

Treaty incorporation No specific mention.

Civil and political rights No specific mention.

Socio-economic rights No specific mention.

Rights related issues

Citizenship No specific mention.

Democracy No specific mention.

Detention procedures No specific mention.

Media and communication No specific mention.

Mobility/access No specific mention.

Protection measures No specific mention.

Other No specific mention.

Rights institutions

NHRI No specific mention.

Regional or international human rights institutions No specific mention.

Justice sector reform

Criminal justice and emergency law No specific mention.

State of emergency provisions No specific mention.

Judiciary and courts No specific mention.

Prisons and detention No specific mention.

Traditional Laws No specific mention.

Socio-economic reconstruction

Development or socio-economic reconstruction No specific mention.

National economic plan No specific mention.

Natural resources No specific mention.

International funds No specific mention.

Business No specific mention.

Taxation No specific mention.

Banks No specific mention.

Land, property and environment

Land reform/rights No specific mention.

**Pastoralist/
nomadism rights** No specific mention.

Cultural heritage No specific mention.

Environment No specific mention.

**Water or riparian
rights or access** No specific mention.

Security sector

**Security
Guarantees** No specific mention.

Ceasefire No specific mention.

Police Page 2, II. ISSUES DISCUSSED,
3. The GRP Panel acknowledges receipt of the NDF letter dated 10 June 1994 containing the findings of the NDF on the 30 missing military and police personnel of the GRP, and intends to respond to said letter appropriately.

Armed forces Page 2, II. ISSUES DISCUSSED,
3. The GRP Panel acknowledges receipt of the NDF letter dated 10 June 1994 containing the findings of the NDF on the 30 missing military and police personnel of the GRP, and intends to respond to said letter appropriately.

DDR No specific mention.

**Intelligence
services** No specific mention.

**Parastatal/rebel
and opposition
group forces** Page 1, II. ISSUES DISCUSSED,
6. The NDF asserts its vigorous objection to the adoption of Proclamation Nos. 347, 348 as amended by Proclamation No. 377, on the ground that these proclamations violate the letter and spirit of The Hague Declaration, more particularly, paragraph 4 and paragraph 5b which mandate that the subject matter covered by the proclamations properly belongs to the substantive agenda of the bilateral negotiations. Furthermore, such amnesty program, adopted while peace negotiations are being conducted impinges upon the organizational integrity of the NDF.

**Withdrawal of
foreign forces** No specific mention.

Corruption	No specific mention.
Crime/organised crime	No specific mention.
Drugs	No specific mention.
Terrorism	No specific mention.

Transitional justice

Transitional justice general No specific mention.

Amnesty/pardon Transitional justice→Amnesty/pardon→Amnesty/pardon proper
Page 1, II. ISSUES DISCUSSED,
6. The NDF asserts its vigorous objection to the adoption of Proclamation Nos. 347, 348 as amended by Proclamation No. 377, on the ground that these proclamations violate the letter and spirit of The Hague Declaration, more particularly, paragraph 4 and paragraph 5b which mandate that the subject matter covered by the proclamations properly belongs to the substantive agenda of the bilateral negotiations. Furthermore, such amnesty program, adopted while peace negotiations are being conducted impinges upon the organizational integrity of the NDF.
The GRP Panel reasserts its firm position that the issuance of the aforesaid amnesty proclamations, without prejudice to any other amnesty that may result from peace negotiations, does not violate the letter and spirit of The Hague Declaration, including paragraph 4 and 5b thereof. The GRP takes the position that the said proclamations respond to expressed desires of former rebels for amnesty so that they may live normal lives in peace, and the need to strike an equitable balance through amnesty for agents of the state to promote a climate of national reconciliation.

Courts No specific mention.

Mechanism No specific mention.

Prisoner release	<p>Page 1-2, I. CONFIDENCE BUILDING AND GOODWILL MEASURES</p> <p>1. The NDF asserts that the rights of political prisoners be respected. The NDF further asserts that political prisoners should not be treated, charged, prosecuted or convicted as common criminals. Finally, the NDF asserts that the GRP should stop its policy and practice of treating and prosecuting political prisoners as common criminals. In response, the GRP Panel denies that there are political prisoners. Further, the GRP Panel reiterates GRP's policy that offenders who may have committed crimes in pursuit of political ends are to be charged with said "political" crimes as may be warranted by the evidence.</p> <p>Page 2, I. CONFIDENCE BUILDING AND GOODWILL MEASURES</p> <p>2. The GRP Panel shall transmit to its principal the NDF proposal for the expeditious release of offenders who are found to have committed crimes in pursuit of political objectives. The GRP Panel shall transmit to its principal the NDF proposal for the expeditious release of offenders who are found to have committed crimes in pursuit of political objectives, including those charged and/or convicted of common crimes committed in the pursuit of political objectives. The NDF shall furnish a nonbinding list of said prisoners/detainees, irrespective of their political affiliations.</p>
Vetting	No specific mention.
Victims	<p>Page 2, I. CONFIDENCE BUILDING AND GOODWILL MEASURES,</p> <p>4. The NDF favorably endorses the claims for indemnification of the victims of human rights violations during the Marcos dictatorship for at least 30 percent of the money to be recovered from the Swiss bank deposits of the Marcoses.</p>
Missing persons	<p>Page 2, II. ISSUES DISCUSSED,</p> <p>3. The GRP Panel acknowledges receipt of the NDF letter dated 10 June 1994 containing the findings of the NDF on the 30 missing military and police personnel of the GRP, and intends to respond to said letter appropriately.</p>
Reparations	<p>Transitional justice→Reparations→Material reparations</p> <p>Page 2, II. ISSUES DISCUSSED,</p> <p>4. The NDF favorably endorses the claims for indemnification of the victims of human rights violations during the Marcos dictatorship for at least 30 percent of the money to be recovered from the Swiss bank deposits of the Marcoses.</p>
Reconciliation	<p>Page 2, II. ISSUES DISCUSSED,</p> <p>6. ... The GRP Panel reasserts its firm position that the issuance of the aforesaid amnesty proclamations, without prejudice to any other amnesty that may result from peace negotiations, does not violate the letter and spirit of The Hague Declaration, including paragraph 4 and 5b thereof. The GRP takes the position that the said proclamations respond to expressed desires of former rebels for amnesty so that they may live normal lives in peace, and the need to strike an equitable balance through amnesty for agents of the state to promote a climate of national reconciliation.</p>

Implementation

UN signatory No specific mention.

Other international signatory No specific mention.

Referendum for agreement No specific mention.

International mission/force/similar No specific mention.

Enforcement mechanism 10. agreed agenda for next round of talks

Related cases No specific mention.

Source www.philippinerevolution.net

UN Peacemaker [<http://peacemaker.un.org/philippines-breukelen-statement94>]
