1. Please provide background on the NPA and whether they extort people.

The New People’s Army (NPA) is the military arm of the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP). There have reportedly been a number of CCP-NPA splits since the 1980s, resulting in its fragmentation into a number of armed factions.1

The NPA was formed in 1969 and was added to the United States and European Union’s list of Foreign Terrorist Organisations in 2002. Its stated objective is to overthrow the Filipino government through protracted guerrilla warfare.2 The NPA states on its website that land reform is its ‘main democratic agenda’.3

The NPA is primarily a rural-based guerrilla force; however, it reportedly has an operational infrastructure in urban areas that supports terrorist activities at times, including city-based assassination squads.4 The group is reported to have a force of between 5000 and 9000 personnel5 and it claims to have 120 fronts6 spread across nearly every province in the Philippines archipelago.7 The US Department of State reports that the NPA operates in rural Luzon, the Visayas and parts of northern and eastern Mindanao, in addition to maintaining cells in Manila and other metropolitan centres.8

The NPAs strength peaked in the mid-1980s when its armed regulars numbered 12,000; however, the end of the Marcos regime saw the groups’ popularity decline and the first
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CCP-NPA splits, resulting in the internal purging of hundreds of cadres. The group has continued to cause problems under the administration of President Gloria Macapagal Arroyo. In 2006 Arroyo declared an ‘all out war’ against the NPA and gave the Armed Forces of the Philippines (AFP) two years to eliminate the insurgency. The deadline was extended to May 2010. The group continues to intermittently attack communication and transportation infrastructure throughout the Philippines.

The US Department of State reports the NPA primarily targets Philippine security forces, government officials, local infrastructure, and businesses that refuse to pay ‘revolutionary taxes’ (see below). Recent reports indicate that the NPA is still actively targeting both Philippine military and corporate targets.

**Extortion**

A range of media reports of the NPA extorting money in the form of ‘revolutionary taxes’ from businesses and politicians were located. Many of the reports also indicate that the NPA undertakes retaliatory action against businesses and/or individuals who refuse to pay the “taxes” that are demanded, including arson and the destruction of properties and communication facilities.

The Overseas Security Advisory Council, a US federal advisory body, states that NPA personnel have claimed the group’s designation as a Foreign Terrorist Organisation has made it difficult to obtain foreign funding and forced them to step up extortion of businesses and politicians in the Philippines. An interview with Ka Roger (spokesman of the CPP-NPA) posted on the Philippine Revolution website, however, claims that domestic ‘revolutionary taxes’, rather than overseas funding, has always been the primary source of funding for the NPA. Roger is reported to have stated that:

> The revolutionary movement primarily depends on livelihood and financial resources from within the country—contributions from the worker and peasant...
masses, help from allies, revolutionary taxes and its own production. We’re not saying we do not need outside help… but this is only to supplement our resources, and not as something to be dependent on.

The government is laboring under the illusion that the movement has been greatly affected by the freezing of its supposed bank deposits.17

In January 2010 the Philippine military claimed that the NPA has collected more than 1 billion pesos (US$22 million) in the past 13 years through extortion of mining, telecommunications, transportation and logging companies, as well as from farmers.18

The main targets of NPA extortion are reported to be agro-industrial firms, mining companies, bus operators, construction companies undertaking government projects, and small businesses such as neighbourhood grocery store owners.19

The NPA is also alleged to charge politicians running for office in NPA-influenced areas for “campaign permits”.20 Left-wing sources, however, claim that the “taxes” are used to fund the provision of security and social services including education, arts and culture, and health in poor, NPA-controlled areas.21

The CCP has responded to accusations of extortion made by the Philippines military by claiming that it is in fact military personnel and police, posing as NPA guerrillas, who are demanding money from local businesses and entrepreneurs. Filipino publication the Inquirer published an official CCP statement released in 2009, in which it is claimed that

These military, police and criminal extortionists pose as members of the NPA and send out crudely worded threat letters demanding money from small- and medium-sized businesses, entrepreneurs, and even rank-and-file employees and ordinary people without distinction.22

No reports were located to corroborate the CCP’s claims.
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Research Response *PHL31974* dated June 2007 provides a broad overview of the different ways in which the NPA ‘taxes’ different businesses and individuals of varying incomes. The response cites a 2005 study, produced for the Philippine Human Development Network (PHHDN) by Dr Noel Morada of the University of the Philippines, in which it is reported that the NPA only collects voluntary or minimal taxes from lower income groups and that in such cases, “there is no compulsory imposition and no punishment meted on those who do not pay taxes”. The US Department of State’s 2009 *Country Reports on Terrorism* states that the NPA carries out attacks against local businesses that have refused to pay ‘revolutionary taxes’.

2. **Can the police or other authorities provide protection?**

The Philippine National Police Force (PNP) and the Armed Forces of the Philippines (AFP) are both charged with the protection of the state and citizenry and have a counter-insurgency mandate. Reports indicate, however, that both bodies are largely considered ineffective, corrupt and characterised by a culture of impunity.

The PNP’s website states some of its primary functions as: enforcing laws relating to the protection of lives and properties; maintaining peace and order to ensure public safety; and investigation of crimes. The PNP also has a mobile unit, the Special Action Forces, which works with regional police units in counter-insurgency activities. The AFP states on its website that it ‘ably addresses its primordial mandate as protector of the people and the state’. The AFP shares responsibility for counterterrorism and counter-insurgency operations with the PNP.

Contrary to the PNP and AFP’s stated responsibility for the provision of protection to the citizenry, a number of media, government and NGO reports indicated that the Philippine security forces are failing to uphold this mandate. The US Department of State’s (USDoS) 2009 Human Rights Report on the Philippines describes the PNP thus:

> The 125,000-member PNP has deep-rooted institutional deficiencies and suffered from a widely held and accurate public perception that corruption remained a problem. The PNP’s Internal Affairs Service remained largely ineffective. Members of the PNP were regularly accused of torture, soliciting bribes, and other illegal acts.
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The US DoS report also notes that in 2009 the AFP ‘did not aggressively pursue internal investigations into alleged serious human rights abuses by some of its members’. Further, incidents of arbitrary arrest, use of torture in detention, a corrupt judicial system and AFP involvement in extrajudicial killings and disappearances are recorded. In 2009 the Asian Legal Resource Centre (ALRC), in a submission to the Philippines Human Rights Council (HRC), stated that:

As is the case with the spectrum of institutions and agencies in the Philippines, the PNP is effectively subservient to the military. Wherever it deems fit, the military usurps the police’s role and unilaterally conducts “investigations” or arrests and detains persons it suspects of having involvement in rebel activities. Furthermore, the PNP is colluding with the military and wilfully failing to carry out investigations into allegations of abuses by the military, in order to guarantee impunity for these acts.

The ALRC further reports that in its counter-insurgency efforts, the AFP abducts, detains, tortures and/or forcibly disappears civilians ‘as the result of arbitrary, questionable suspicions’.

In the aftermath of an inadequate government response to the killing of 57 persons, including 30 journalists in Mindanao in November 2009, the ALRC accused the Philippines of lacking ‘even a rudimentary protection mechanism’. While this incident did not involve an attack by the NPA but a local politically-affiliated militia group, it illustrates a failure of security forces protect its citizens from the threat of extra-state violence.

The culture of impunity pervading the armed forces has been compounded by Executive Order 546 issued in 2006 by President Arroyo, which permits the use of armed ‘force multipliers’ of Civilian Volunteer Organisations in counter-insurgency operations. This has legalised the use of private armies by local politicians or strongmen and supported the operation of paramilitary groups.

A number of human rights NGOs have reported on the lack of security and protection for victims and witnesses of criminal activities in the Philippines. Human Rights Solidarity,
for example, states that “protection is the duty of the police, but this institution is failing to effectively and promptly execute its functions….Police investigators are either being negligent about their duties to perform effective investigations, or are tacitly participating in the cycle of political murders and impunity.”

An Amnesty International report from November 2009 notes that the combination of lack of confidence in police impartiality, fear of reprisals and lack of an effective witness protection program contributes to the ineffectiveness of most police investigations.

Since 2007 the Philippines government has introduced a number of measures designed to address protection-related issues, including establishing a new Task Force for prosecution, better AFP-PNP coordination, stronger laws on witness protection and new human rights offices within the AFP and the PNP. The PNP has also been given more training, undertaken more community outreach activities and received pay increases in an effort to increase its professionalism. However, Human Rights Watch has accused the government of attempting to deflect domestic and international criticism with the measures and of accomplishing little in practice, with witness protection and coordination between the PNP and prosecutors remaining weak.

While reports indicate that AFP forces are deployed to protect at-risk foreign-owned companies and mining/works projects, no reports describing specific incidences of PNP or AFP protection of individuals threatened by the NPA were located.

3. Are there reports that the NPA and the Police act together, so that there is no one to lodge a complaint with?

No reports were located indicating that the NPA and the Filipino police act together. The PNP and AFP have a counter-insurgency mandate, and President Arroyo has demanded that the NPA be completely eradicated by the end of her term and general elections in May 2010.

The military and police are, however, widely reported to be affected by a pervasive culture of corruption and impunity (see Question 2), raising the possibility that collusion between the PNP and NPA could occur in the pursuit of specific political and/or economic outcomes. The Asian Legal Resource Centre notes that security forces often serve the interests of local political elites, and the NPA is alleged to charge politicians running for...
office in NPA-influenced areas for “campaign permits”. In this climate of corruption, extortion and bribery, isolated incidences of NPA-AFP/PNP collusion could occur.

Further, as noted in Question 1 the CCP has claimed that the AFP and PNP often pose as NPA guerrillas, and demand extortion money from local businesses and entrepreneurs. While no sources were found to corroborate the CCP’s claims, in this context the lodging of a complaint with authorities by a civilian could be problematic, if they were unsure who the real authorities were and in whose interests they were acting.

Amnesty International has expressed concern that members of Filipino security forces have been complicit in political killings connected to their counter-insurgency operations (killings the security forces often blame on NPA guerrillas). This further illustrates the potential distrust of the authorities a civilian wishing to seek protection might possess.

Defence and intelligence website GlobalSecurity.org states that AFP leadership has been accused of complicity with insurgent groups, even though its primary mission involves counter-insurgency. It does not, however, specify what insurgent groups the AFP has been accused of colluding with.

4. Would a person be able to move to other parts of the Philippines where NPA extortion is not a threat?

No information was located indicating that the NPA would seek to find a person if they relocated after refusing to pay revolutionary taxes.

The NPA claims to have 120 fronts operating across most Filipino provinces, including cells in metropolitan areas. As noted in Question 1, the NPA’s strength has significantly declined since a peak in the 1980s, with current numbers estimated at between 7000 and 9000. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that people could relocate to a large metropolitan area in the Philippines, such as Manila.

According to the website for the City of Manila (located at http://www.manila.gov.ph/), the country’s capital is a metropolis of 14 million people. Although the NPA is reported to maintain cells in metropolitan areas, activities are primarily focused at a local level in the countryside, aside from major operations such as political assassinations.

---
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multi-partner human rights group report published in the 2005, the NPA’s cell groups in Manila are known as ‘Sparrow Units’.51 The report notes that: “Sparrow Units were assigned to eliminate individuals identified by the NPA to have committed ‘crimes against the people’. Targets included common criminals such as robbers, military spies or ‘assets’ and abusive police officers”.52

No information was located indicating whether or not a provincial NPA unit would be likely to task a metropolitan cell with tracking down an individual who refused to pay their ‘revolutionary taxes’, or whether such a person would be considered to have committed “crimes against the people”.
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