

# A CLOSER LOOK ON THE PHILIPPINE ANTI-TERROR LAW

Written by *Christian Gonzales*

*Master of Arts in Philosophy; Juris Doctor; Instructor, Isabela State University - Cauayan  
Campus, Philippines*

---

## ABSTRACT

The Philippines has been plagued with terrorism for a number of decades. Countless of terror attacks took place. Lives of thousands of civilians, military, police, and terrorists are lost. Millions of families have been displaced. Billions worth of properties have been damaged or totally destroyed. In July 3, 2020, the Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA) of 2020 which repealed the Human Security Act of 2007 was signed into law. For the government, this is a big development as the country continues to curb terrorism. However, critics of the new anti-terror law are adamant and appalled that it shall only be used as a mechanism to silence the Duterte administration's political opponents, the activists, and the dissenters of the government. This research paper discussed the controversial ATA 2020, its alleged unconstitutionality as the detractors claim, the possible human rights violations that may be committed by law enforcers as the law is already in force, and the advantages of having ATA 2020 to combat terrorism and, to finally attain peace in the country so beleaguered for a long period of time.

**Keywords:** Terrorism, Terrorist Groups, Anti-Terrorism Act of 2020, human rights violations

## **INTRODUCTION**

For a number of decades, terrorism has been a horrendous menace in the Philippines. It has had a long history of terrorism whereby terrorists and their sympathizers have perpetrated a series of terror attacks across various installations within the country.<sup>[1]</sup> The Communist Party of the Philippines/New People's Army (CPP/NPA) has been battling for their ideology against, and is still posing a threat to the government since the latter part of the 1960's. The Abu Sayyaf Group (ASG) brought a lot of horror during the early part of 2000's prompting the then President Joseph Ejercito Estrada to declare an all-out war against them. The Moro National Liberation Front (MNLF) in 2013, accusing failure on the part of the government to fulfil with the peace agreement they signed with the Ramos Administration, staged a three-week brutal battle against the government troops in the infamous Zamboanga siege. The Jemaa Islamiyah alongside with the Maute Group, both linked to the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS), botched a raid on May 23, 2017 which triggered the start of the deadly and destructive Marawi Siege. In all of these, it is the civilian people that is most affected. Millions of innocent lives were disturbed and thousands of them were put to vain. Billions worth of properties were damaged or are totally destroyed just because of these decades of seemingly unending battles.

Up to this date, a number of terrorist groups still flourish and continue to pose tremendous threat to human security in the country. Terror attacks have not yet receded even in the midst of the Covid-19 pandemic. As a matter of fact, on April 21 of this year, the CPP/NPA attacked the troops who were securing Covid-19 aid distribution in Aurora Province, killing three and wounding two soldiers.<sup>[2]</sup> In addition, the twin bombing in Jolo City on August 24, 2020 was described as proof that terrorist groups choose no time or period to which they would bring extreme terror and unbridled fear to the populace.<sup>[3]</sup>

In the past, the country's main counter terrorism legislation includes the Human Security Act of 2007 (HSA) and the Terrorism Financing Prevention and Suppression Act of 2012 (TF Law).

With the persistent violent attacks made by the terrorist groups even while the country is preoccupied with the Covid-19 pandemic, the Philippine legislature hastily passed the controversial Anti-Terrorism Act of 2020 (ATA 2020) which repealed HSA. It was signed into

law by President Rodrigo R. Duterte on July 3, 2020 and became effective 15 days after its complete publication as required by the law. Given the difficulties in the Philippines of prosecuting individuals for terrorism-related offenses, the ATA 2020 now serves as a stronger legal tool-kit and mechanism to combat, counter, and curb the threat posed by the terrorist groups such as the Communist Party of the Philippines/New People's Army (CPP/NPA) as well as the ISIS-affiliated ASG and BIFF.

Though noble as the lawmakers and the President of the Philippines may think of the ATA 2020, a number of groups petitioned before the Supreme Court to declare the new anti-terror law as unconstitutional. These groups are anxious that ATA 2020 is a device that the government may use to curtail human rights which are guaranteed to the citizens by the 1987 Philippine Constitution itself. Criticisms and attacks in the television, radio and even in the social media were made against the government by the activists, human rights advocates, pro-life groups, legal experts and even ordinary people who fear of the powers of the new law. There were reports that activists and human rights groups caution that the present administration could just use ATA 2020 to bring into courts its political opponents.<sup>[4]</sup> The Catholic Church, through the Catholic Bishops Conference of the Philippines (CBCP), strongly contested the legality of the controversial ATA 2020 even as it is not a party to any group.<sup>[5]</sup> The National Union of People's Lawyers (NUPL) prayed to the Supreme Court to overturn the law on the grounds that it is overly broad and it essentially criminalizes intent (McCarthy, 2020).<sup>[6]</sup> In fact, a human rights group urged the government to defer the execution of the implementing rules and regulations (IRR) that were drafted by the Department of Justice (DOJ) for ATA 2020.<sup>[7]</sup> In October 23, 2020 there are currently 37 petitions pending before the Supreme Court with still two more from Mindanao that the Court has yet to receive. With 37 petitions pending before the Supreme Court, the Anti-Terrorism Act is now the most highly contested since the Cybercrime Prevention Act.<sup>[8]</sup>

This study is aimed to take a closer look on the Philippine anti-terror law. The following subtopics are discussed: [1] an overview of the controversial provisions contained in the ATA 2020; [2] their non-conformity with the Constitution, case laws and other existing special laws as alleged by the petitioners seeking its nullification; [3] the human rights violations in the past that the detractors of ATA 2020 fear might happen once more with the effectivity of ATA

2020; and [4] the advantages of having ATA 2020 and its IRR as means to curb terrorism in the Philippines.

## **THE CONTROVERSIAL PROVISIONS OF THE ATA 2020**

At the end part of 2019, the United Department of State – Bureau of Counterterrorism [UDSBoC] (2020) already reported that amendments to bolster the HSA by covering preparatory acts and reducing administrative barriers to prosecutions of terrorists were proposed and already pending in the Philippine Congress.<sup>[9]</sup> It was in June 1, 2020 when President Duterte certified as urgent the proposed tougher law against terrorism, clearing the way for Congress to fast-track the passage of the controversial ATA 2020.<sup>[10]</sup>

Under the ATA 2020, a terrorist individual shall refer to any natural person who commits any of the acts defined and penalized under Sections 4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11 and 12 of the said law. Section 4 of the ATA 2020 provides that terrorism is committed by any person who shall commit the following prohibited acts, within or outside the Philippines, regardless of the stage of execution:

- a. Engage in acts intended to cause death or serious physical injury to any person, or endangers a person's life;
- b. engage in acts intended to cause extensive damage or destruction to a government or public facility, public place, or private property;
- c. engage in acts intended to cause extensive interference with, damage, or destruction to critical infrastructure;
- d. develop, manufacture, possess, acquire, transport, supply, or use weapons explosives or of biological, nuclear, radiological or chemical weapons; and
- e. release of dangerous substances, or causing fire, floods or explosions.

HSA defined terrorism as any act perpetrated by any person, who commits a predicate crime, which creates a condition of widespread and extraordinary fear and panic among the populace in order to

coerce the government to give in to an unlawful demand. The predicate crimes of terrorism such as piracy, highway robbery, hijacking, *coup d'état*, murder, kidnapping, arson, and crimes involving unlicensed (loose) firearms and explosives. Further, it also includes, violation of Toxic Substances and Hazardous and Nuclear Waste Control Act and violation of Atomic Energy Regulatory and Liability Act.<sup>[11]</sup>

The ATA 2020 has repealed the definition provided for by the HSA and expanded its own definition of terrorism. It provides that terrorism may now be made by any person who commits any act, purposely, by its nature and context, to intimidate the general public or a segment thereof, to create an atmosphere or to spread a message of fear, to provoke or to influence by intimidation the government or any international organization, or to seriously destabilize or destroy the fundamental, political, economic, or social structures of the country, or to create a public emergency or to seriously undermine public safety. Furthermore, the following acts are also punishable under the said law: conspiracy to commit terrorism; recruitment to and membership to a terrorist organization; planning, training, preparing, and facilitating the commission of terrorism (including possessing objects or collecting or making documents connected with the preparation of terrorism); and proposal or inciting to commit terrorism.

Other salient provisions under the law which are now in hot water pertain to warrantless arrest, surveillance and interception of communication, waiver of bank secrecy, extra-territorial application of the law, the removal of award for damages in case of acquittal of the suspects, and the creation of the Anti-Terror Council (ATC).

Critics of the controversial law question the extensive and unclear offenses and it punishes such as engaging in acts intended to endanger a person's life, to damage public property or to interfere with critical infrastructure, where the purpose is to intimidate the government.<sup>[12]</sup>

However, Senate President Vicente Sotto III, one of the principal authors of the law, said that the ATA 2020 is filled with safeguards against abuse, but strong against the terrorists. He furthered that when the country is threatened, the law shall be used as a means to protect the people from ruthless ideologies and to stop unrepentant criminals from sowing chaos and disorder.<sup>[13]</sup> As support, Senator Panfilo Lacson, one of the principal sponsors of the measure, assured that he would make extra effort to protect ATA 2020's implementation against

potential abuse. Just as Senator Sotto, Lacson maintained that there are enough safeguards which are incorporated in the anti-terror law.<sup>[14]</sup> President Duterte himself sincerely promised that the country's law-abiding citizens has nothing to be afraid of if they are not terrorists.<sup>[15]</sup>

## **ATA 2020 AS AGAINST THE CONSTITUTION, CASE LAWS AND OTHER EXISTING LAWS**

Several petitions filed before the Supreme Court move to strike down the law in its entirety while some seek to nullify specific provisions only, the most common of which is that the definition of terrorism or the acts that constitute terrorism.<sup>[15]</sup> Unlike the HSA that enumerates predicate crimes for terrorism, the acts constituting terrorism under the new law are said to be very broad like its enforcers will have unbridled discretion to pick out the targets including those from among the critics and also the opposition.

One of the petitioners who ask the Supreme Court to nullify the ATA 2020 is the powerhouse group of the University of the Philippines legal luminaries led by the previous Supreme Court Senior Associate Justice Antonio Carpio and the former Ombudsman Conchita Carpio-Morales. They claim that the law is incredibly defective and contains many unconstitutional provisions that which will place the Philippines in a situation worse than martial law. The group questions the mired vagueness (void for vagueness principle) and overbreadth (void for overbreadth/overbroad principle) that repress protected speech which justifies its facial invalidation (facial challenge), the creation of the ATC and its conferment of powers greater than what the Constitution gives to the President even in exceptional circumstances in times of invasion and rebellion.<sup>[16]</sup>

As an established rule, a party can question the validity of a statute only if, as applied to him, it is unconstitutional. The exception to this rule is termed a *facial challenge*. The only time that a *facial challenge* to a statute is allowed is when it operates within the area of freedom of expression. Justice Mendoza opined, in his concurring opinion in the landmark case of Cruz vs. DENR (G.R. No. 135385, December 6, 2000), that invalidation of the statute on its face



rather than as applied is permitted in the interest of preventing a chilling effect on freedom of expression.

This principle that a facial challenge to a statute is allowed only when it operates in the area of freedom of expression may have been modified in the case of *Imbong vs. Ochoa* (G.R. No. 204819, April 8, 2014). In this case, the Office of the Solicitor General (OSG) posited that the Reproductive Health (RH) Law cannot be challenged on its face because it is not a speech-regulating measure. The Supreme Court said that in United States constitutional law, a facial challenge, also known as First Amendment Challenge, is one that is launched to assail the validity of statutes concerning not only protected speech, but also other rights in the First Amendment. These include religious freedom, freedom of the press, and the right of the people to peaceably assemble and petition the government for redress of grievances. While the Court has withheld the application of the facial challenges to strictly penal statutes, it has expanded its scope to cover statutes not only regulating free speech, but also those involving religious freedom and other fundamental rights.<sup>[17]</sup>

The *overbreadth doctrine* permits a party to challenge the validity of a statute even though, as applied to him, it is not unconstitutional but it might be applied to other not before the Court whose activities are constitutionally protected. Related to it, the Court emphasized, in the case of *David vs. Macapagal-Arroyo*, cited in *Romualdez vs. COMELEC*, G.R. No. 167011, April 30, 2008, that the *void for vagueness doctrine* holds that a law is facially invalid if men of common intelligence must necessarily guess at its meaning and differ as to its application. The test to determine whether a criminal statute is void for uncertainty is whether the language conveys a sufficiently definite warning as to the proscribed conduct when measured by common understanding and practice.<sup>[18]</sup> On the other hand, the *void for overbreadth or overbroad doctrine* holds that a penal statute is overbroad where it operates to inhibit the exercise of individual freedom guaranteed by the Constitution, such as the freedom of religion or speech and when it includes within its coverage not only unprotected activity but also activity protected by the Constitution.<sup>[19]</sup> However, an act will be declared by the Court as void and inoperative on the ground of vagueness and uncertainty only upon a showing that the defects is such that the courts are unable to determine, within any reasonable degree of certainty as what the legislature intended.

The creation of the ATC which is composed of the members of the Executive branch of the government and the conferment of powers greater than what the Constitution gives to the President even in exceptional circumstances in times of invasion and rebellion is also questioned by the petitioners.<sup>[20]</sup> The ATA 2020 also confers the ATC the power to issue written authorization for the arrest of persons merely suspected of committing terrorist acts in violation of the principle of separation of powers of the three branches of the government as it allows the ATC to circumvent the issuance of warrants of arrest that are the exclusive prerogative of the judiciary. The persons whom the ATC has authorized to take custody of the persons suspected of committing acts of terrorism. The period of detention to suspected terrorists by the authorized persons of the ATC without incurring judicial charges is also very questionable as it is significantly changed from the HSA's three-day non-extendible period in compliance with the mandate of the Constitution to the ATA 2020's maximum of 24-day period. Further, the provision in the HSA wherein, upon acquittal, any person who is accused of terrorism shall be entitled to damages in the amount of five hundred thousand pesos (Php 500,000.00) for each day that he or she has been detained or arrested had been stricken off.<sup>[21]</sup>

## **ATA 2020 AS A MECHANISM TO HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS**

During the regime of the late dictator Ferdinand E. Marcos, statistics on the extent of human rights violations were hair-raising. A West Point-trained Navy Captain turned activist, Danilo Vizmanos, gave an estimation as to the extent of suffering under martial law: 7,000 torture victims, 2,000 salvaged or summarily executed, and 1,000 people missing. His estimate was closely alike to the number of legal claimants of human rights violations against the Marcos family in the Hawaii case numbering to 9539. Amnesty International gave a not so conservative estimates in the whole Martial Law years: 70,000 were imprisoned, 34,000 were tortured, 3,240 were killed.<sup>[22]</sup>

The data in an anti-Marcos book, *Rebellion and Repression in the Philippines*, published in 1987 at the Yale University by the academic Richard Kessler, presented that human rights abuses during the time of President Corazon Aquino was just as bad as Marcos' record. Kessler's data confirmed that extrajudicial killings continued heavily. Nothing changed at all



even though Aquino had the image of a “squeakyclean” and “saintly” compared with the demonized Marcos.<sup>[23]</sup>

The number may vary. More violations were believed to have not been reported because of the fear of the victims’ family for their lives. But even there are differences in numbers and statistics, the fact remains that thousands of families were destroyed. The human rights violations happened in the past, and up to this very moment, they are still happening and a real threat to all.

As preparing for the 2016 Presidential Elections, reports said that the then Davao City mayor Rodrigo R. Duterte warned during his campaign that if he becomes the president, he advises the people to put up several funeral parlor businesses because he is against illegal drugs and that he might kill someone because of it.<sup>[24]</sup> Despite of these pronouncements during the campaign period, Duterte was elected the 15th president of the Philippines, marking the end of the post-Marcos democracy. Since then, Duterte’s anti-drug campaign has claimed more than 12,000 lives mostly urban poor, in what the Human Rights Watch concludes as amounting to “crimes against humanity.”<sup>[25]</sup>

While the Philippines has a long-standing and robust tradition of human rights advocacy and activism, with more than 60,000 registered Non-Government Organizations (NGOs), it was reported, just a month before the passing of the ATA 2020, that human rights defenders have been subject to verbal and physical attacks, threats and legal harassment for nearly 20 years. The vilification of dissent and attacks against perceived critics are being “increasingly institutionalized and normalized in ways that will be very difficult to reverse.” The phenomenon of “red-tagging” otherwise known as the labelling of individuals or groups (including human rights defenders and NGOs) as communists or terrorists has posed a serious threat to civil society and freedom of expression. It noted how in some cases, those who have been red-tagged were subsequently killed. Others told that they had received death threats or sexually-charged comments in private messages or even on social media.<sup>[26]</sup>

It was also detailed that ongoing threats to freedom of expression, with legal charges and prosecutions being brought against journalists and senior politicians who are staunch critics of

the Duterte administration, as well as actions to shut down media outlets. It pointed out that there are concerns that counter-insurgency policies have given rise to patterns resembling those that characterize the government's anti-illegal drugs campaign, remarkably a presumption of guilt and non-observance of due process – this time against those suspected of supporting the communist rebels. This report is based on 893 written submissions, substantial input from the Philippine government, analysis of legislation, police investigations, pertinent documents of various courts, videos, photos and other open and reliable sources, as well as testimonies of the victims and the witnesses. It is yet to be discussed in the session of the UN Human Rights Council in Geneva, Switzerland.<sup>[27]</sup>

With the passing of the ATA 2020 in July 2020, Ratcliffe (2020) reported that many fears that the law's sweeping definitions will provide a new tool to silence those who are calling for accountability for the abuses perpetrated under the leadership of the fierce President Duterte, including the extrajudicial killings carried out during an anti-drug campaign launched after his election in 2016.<sup>[28]</sup> Edre Olalia of the NUPL fears that the law would have consequences not just for journalists, activists and opposition, but also to the members of the public who express their opinions or air grievances against the government using various online platforms. Some human rights groups and members of the media argue that ATA 2020 would encourage self-censorship out of fear of being prosecuted for social media posts that are critical of the government if the ATC vaguely interprets them as inciting terrorism as defined in the ATA 2020.<sup>[29]</sup> Journalists are also concerned that they could be held liable if their (independent) reporting falls into the category of inciting terrorism as determined by the law enforcers.

Over the past few months before ATA 2020 was passed into law, an action was made against one of the country's most prominent media outlets as Rappler's executive director, Maria Ressa, a critic of the President, was found guilty by a regional trial court (RTC) of cyber libel over a story she claimed did not write, and under a law that did not yet exist when the said article was published. Further, one of the country's largest media network, ABS-CBN, has been denied of its application for franchise renewal by the lower house of Congress. Thereafter, President Duterte has washed his hands as he asserted that neither of these cases were politically motivated.<sup>[30]</sup>

## **THE ADVANTAGES OF ATA 2020 IN CURBING TERRORISM IN THE PHILIPPINES**

In 2019, the Philippines ranked ninth (9<sup>th</sup>) in the Global Terrorism Index. In the same year, the Bureau of Counterterrorism (BoC) of the U.S. Department of State reported incidents of terrorists-related attacks particularly in the southern part of the Philippines. These include the complex suicide attack made by an Indonesian couple linked to the ASG and the ISIS during a Mass at the Jolo Cathedral in Sulu on January 27, killing 23 people and wounding 102; the improvised explosive device (IED) attacks on civilian targets made by the Bangsamoro Islamic Freedom Fighters (BIFF) that wounded a dozen in Sultan Kudarat; and the kidnapping of two British citizens in Zamboanga del Sur in October 4 of that year by the members of the ASG. They targeted the military and police forces as well as the civilians.<sup>[31]</sup>

Before the passing of the ATA 2020, the HSA is the primary anti-terrorism mechanism that the Philippines has. However, Senator Panfilo Lacson, one of the principal sponsors of the ATA 2020, said that HSA is a “dead letter law” because it has been severely underutilized.<sup>i</sup> He added that the attention of the Philippines has long ago been called by the United Nations and other neighboring countries. He argued that most of the provisions of ATA 2020 have been adopted from the Anti-Terrorism Act of Australia. Reiterating that HSA is a dead letter law, he pointed out that it took the Philippine government ten long years before a conviction has been finally meted out, citing that because law enforcement agents were hesitant to file cases under the HSA. Out of the 735 suspect or respondents undergoing trial were all captured in the Marawi Siege but not one of them is being tried for violation of the HSA. Further, Lacson said that out of 86 Abu Sayyaf members who were caught and tried before a court, 66 were convicted and 20 were acquitted. Of the 66, none of them had been convicted for violations of the HSA since most of them were convicted of kidnapping.<sup>[32]</sup>

In its declaration of policy, the ATA 2020 provides that State shall protect life, liberty and property of the people from terrorism, condemn terrorism as inimical and dangerous to the national security of the country and the welfare of the people and make terrorism as a crime against the Filipino people, against humanity, and against the Law of Nations. While it is true that the fight against terrorism requires a comprehensive approach, comprising political,

economic, diplomatic, military, and legal means and measures that the government shall use include conflict management and post-conflict peacebuilding, it is to be understood that in the exercise of the executive department of the powers given by the ATA 2020, it shall not prejudice respect for human rights as they shall be absolutely protected at all times (Section 2).<sup>[33]</sup>

To combat terrorism effectively, Senator Lacson said that the provisions of ATA 2020 was based on the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1373, a counter-terrorism measure calling on all UN members to criminalize the provision of funds to all terrorists, effectively denying terrorists safe financial haven anywhere. In this way, ATA 2020 would be able to have more teeth compare to HAS.<sup>[34]</sup>

## **CONCLUSION**

The Duterte administration promised that the ATA 2020 is an effective means to curb terrorism in the country. It guaranteed the people that the new law shall not be used against political opponents, activists, protesters, and people who air their grievances against the government. It also assured that no human rights violations shall be committed in relation to the law.

While the assurances of the government are sweet to the ears, critics of the ATA 2020 are still not convinced. They fear that the words of the defenders of the new law are just empty promises. As they lament with the passing of the anti-terror law, they also urge the Court to nullify it as much as possible. 37 petitions are yet to be acted upon by the Supreme Court.

But unless and until the Supreme Court annuls ATA 2020, as Associate Justice Marvic Leonen penned in his separate opinion in a landmark case, it shall remain valid and in force by virtue of the presumption of constitutionality which is rooted in the respect that the judiciary must accord to the legislature.

## ENDNOTES

- [1] Mears, Paul Keith. (2017). Philippines: War on Terror. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/318445834\\_Philippines\\_The\\_War\\_On\\_Terror](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/318445834_Philippines_The_War_On_Terror)
- [2] Galang, Armand. (2020). NPA attack on troops securing COVID-19 aid distribution kills 2 soldiers. *Inquirer.Net*, 22 April 2020. <https://newsinfo.inquirer.net/1262803/npa-attack-on-troops-securing-covid-19-aid-distribution-kills-2-soldiers>
- [3] Singh, Jasminder and Jani, Muhammad Haziq. (2012). COVID-19 and Terrorism in the Southern Philippines: More Trouble Ahead. *The Diplomat*, 26 August 2012. <https://thediplomat.com/2020/08/covid-19-and-terrorism-in-the-southern-philippines-more-trouble-ahead/>
- [4] McCarthy, Julie. (2020). Why Rights Groups Worry About the Philippines' New Anti-Terrorism Law. *NPR*, 21 July 2020. <https://www.npr.org/2020/07/21/893019057/why-rights-groups-worry-about-the-philippines-new-anti-terrorism-law>
- [5] Depasupil, William. (2020). Church: Anti-terror law 'morally wrong'. *The Manila Times*, 19 July 2020. <https://www.manilatimes.net/2020/07/19/news/headlines/church-anti-terror-law-morally-wrong/743308/>
- [6] McCarthy, *Why Rights Groups Worry About the Philippines' New Anti-Terrorism Law*. 2020.
- [7] Damicog, Jeffrey. (2020). Gov't urged to defer AntiTerrorism Law IRR due to pending SC petitions. *Manila Bulletin*, 14 October 2020. <https://mb.com.ph/2020/10/14/govt-urged-to-defer-anti-terrorism-law-irr-due-to-pending-sc-petitions/>
- [8] Torres-Tupas, Tetch. (2020). 37 petitions vs Anti-Terrorism Act now pending before Supreme Court. *INQUIRER.NET*, 23 October 2020. <https://newsinfo.inquirer.net/1351678/37-petitions-vs-anti-terrorism-act-now-pending-before-supreme-court#ixzz6dRozbB00>
- [9] United Department of State – Bureau of Counterterrorism [UDSBoc]. (2020, June 24). Country Reports on Terrorism 2019: Philippines <https://www.state.gov/reports/country-reports-on-terrorism-2019/philippines/>
- [10] Tomacruz, Sofia. (2020). Duterte certifies as urgent antiterrorism bill feared to clamp down on basic rights. *Rappler*, 1 June 2020. <https://www.rappler.com/nation/duterte-certifies-urgent-tougher-anti-terrorism-bill>
- [11] Campanilla, Marlo B. (2019). *Criminal Law Reviewer Volume II*. Rex Printing Company, Inc.
- [12] McCarthy, *Why Rights Groups Worry About the Philippines' New Anti-Terrorism Law*. 2020.
- [13] Dollanganger, Coco. (2020). What Do Critics and Supporters of the Philippines Anti-Terrorism Bill Say? *The News Lens*, 21 July 2020. <https://international.thenewslens.com/article/138072>
- [14] Magsino, Donna. (2020). Sotto, Lacson laud Duterte's approval of anti-terror law. *GMA News*, 3 July 2020. <https://www.msn.com/en-ph/news/national/sotto-lacson-laud-dutertes-approval-of-anti-terror-law/ar-BB16ilAL>
- [15] Aspinwall, Nick (2020, July 10). After Signing Anti-Terrorism Law, Duterte Names His Targets. *Foreign Policy Insider Access*, 10, July 2020 <https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/07/10/philippines-law-terrorism-duterte/>
- [15] Sy, Felix. (2020, August 11). Philippine New Anti-Terrorism Law Enacted. *ZICO LAW*. <https://www.zicolaw.com/resources/alerts/philippine-new-anti-terrorism-law-enacted/>



- [16] Nonato, Vince. (2020). Unlimited Warrantless Arrests: Carpio, Morales, UP Law Ask SC To Nullify Anti-Terrorism Act. *One news*, 23 July 2020 <https://www.onenews.ph/unlimited-warrantless-arrests-carpio-morales-up-law-ask-sc-to-nullify-anti-terrorism-act>
- [17] Nachura, Antonio E.B. (2016). Outline/Reviewer in Political Law. VJ Graphics Arts, Inc.
- [18] Nachura, *Outline/Reviewer in Political Law*. 2016.
- [19] Batas Natin (n.d.) Constitutional Defenses. <https://batasnatin.com/law-library/criminal-law/general-provisions/1047-constitutional-defenses.html>
- [20] Nonato, *Unlimited Warrantless Arrests: Carpio, Morales, UP Law Ask SC to Nullify Anti-Terrorism Act*. 2020.
- [21] Sy, *Philippine New Anti-Terrorism Law Enacted*. 2020.
- [22] Chua, Michael Charlestone B. (2012, June 11). TORTYUR: Human Rights Violations During the Marcos Regime. *Academia*. [https://www.academia.edu/7968581/TORTYUR\\_Human\\_Rights\\_Violations\\_During\\_The\\_Marcos\\_Regime](https://www.academia.edu/7968581/TORTYUR_Human_Rights_Violations_During_The_Marcos_Regime)
- [23] Tiglao, Rigoberto (2019). Human rights abuses under Marcos and Cory: Same. *Manila Times*, 27 September 2019. <https://www.manilatimes.net/2019/09/27/opinion/columnists/topanalysis/human-rights-abuses-under-marcos-and-cory-same/622367/>
- [24] Santos, Rudy. (2015). Duterte: If I win, better put up more funeral parlors. *Philippine Star*, 26 November 2015. <https://www.philstar.com/headlines/2015/11/26/1526317/duterte-if-i-win-better-put-more-funeral-parlors>
- [25] Abuso, Ma. Rhea Gretchen A. (2019). Narrating Human Rights in the Philippines: Collective Memories of the Filipino Youth on the Marcos Regime. *Journal of Southeast Asian Human Rights*. PDF ahead of print June 1, 2019. <https://jurnal.unej.ac.id/index.php/JSEAHR/article/view/8411>. doi: <https://doi.org/10.19184/jseahr.v3i1.8411>
- [26] United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner. [UNHRO] (2020, June 4). *Philippines: UN report details widespread human rights violations and persistent impunity*. <https://www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=25924&LangID=E>
- [27] UNHRO, *Philippines: UN report details widespread human rights violations and persistent impunity*. 2020.
- [28] Ratcliffe, Rebecca. (2020). Duterte's anti-terror law a dark new chapter for Philippines, experts warn. *The Guardian*, 9 July 2020. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/jul/09/dutertes-anti-terror-law-a-dark-new-chapter-for-philippines-experts-warn>
- [29] Santamaria, Carlos. (2020). Why do Duterte's critics fear his new anti-terror law? *Gzero Media*, 7 July 2020. <https://www.gzeromedia.com/why-do-dutertes-critics-fear-his-new-anti-terror-law>
- [30] Ratcliffe, *Philippines: UN report details widespread human rights violations and persistent impunity*. 2020.
- [31] UDSBoc, *Country Reports on Terrorism 2019: Philippines 2020*.
- [32] Moaje, Marita. (2020). Lacson, Esperon cite weaknesses of Human Security Act. *Philippine News Agency*, 17 June 2020. <https://www.pna.gov.ph/articles/1106241>
- [33] The Official Gazette. (2020, July 5). *Republic Act No. 11479 otherwise known as the Anti-Terrorism Act of 2020*. <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/downloads/2020/06jun/20200703-RA-11479-RRD.pdf>



---

<sup>[34]</sup> Moaje, Lacson, Esperon cite weaknesses of Human Security Act.2020.

