

<b>Country/entity</b>	Philippines
<b>Region</b>	Asia and Pacific
<b>Agreement name</b>	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)
<b>Date</b>	14 Jun 1994
<b>Agreement status</b>	Multiparty signed/agreed
<b>Interim arrangement</b>	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

<b>Stage</b>	Pre-negotiation/process
<b>Conflict nature</b>	Government
<b>Peace process</b>	Philippines-NDF process
<b>Parties</b>	<p>GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES OF THE PHILIPPINES  Howard Q. Dee, Chairman, GRP Panel for Peace Talks with the CPP/NPA/NDF  Rep. Jose V.Yap, House of Representatives Member, GRP Panel  Silvestre H. Bello III, Member, GRP Panel  Rep. Jesus G. Dureza, House of Representatives, Advisor to the GRP Panel  Teresita L. de Castro, State Counsel, GRP Legal Consultant  Maria Lorenza G. Dalupan, Executive Director, GRP Panel Secretariat</p> <p>National Democratic Front of the Philippines  Luis Jalandoni, NDF Vice Chairperson for International Affairs &amp; Head of NDF Delegation  Asterio Palima, Member, NDF Delegation  Coni Ledesma, Member, NDF Delegation  Ruth de Leon, Member, NDF Delegation  Fidel Agcaoil, NDF Consultant  Jose Maria Sison, NDF Consultant</p>
<b>Third parties</b>	Atty. Romeo Capulong of the Philippine Peace Center also participated as Legal Consultant.
<b>Description</b>	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**

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

<b>Prisoner release</b>	<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>
<b>Vetting</b>	No specific mention.
<b>Victims</b>	<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>
<b>Missing persons</b>	<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>
<b>Reparations</b>	<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>
<b>Reconciliation</b>	<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](http://www.philippinerevolution.net)

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

---