



VICTORIA UNIVERSITY
MELBOURNE AUSTRALIA

Tapol bulletin no, 17, August 1976

This is the Published version of the following publication

UNSPECIFIED (1976) Tapol bulletin no, 17, August 1976. Tapol bulletin (17).
pp. 1-8. ISSN 1356-1154

The publisher's official version can be found at

Note that access to this version may require subscription.

Downloaded from VU Research Repository <https://vuir.vu.edu.au/26413/>



British Campaign for the

Release of Indonesian Political Prisoners

Bulletin No. 17

August, 1976

Editorials

Labour Camps Grow

For the third time this year, we report a statement by Admiral Sudomo, KOPKAMTIB Chief-of-Staff (page 7) pledging an early solution to the tapol question. This time, he has promised a final solution by the end of 1978 and says that newly arrested political prisoners will no longer be subjected to arbitrary procedures.

We have explained in earlier issues how the deepening economic crisis has affected Indonesia's attitude towards western countries where campaigning for tapols is strongest. The circumstances of Sudomo's latest statement only confirm this. It was made in a Dutch newspaper one day after the IGGI meeting in Amsterdam had concluded. This might be taken as proof that it was not intended to affect attitudes at the IGGI. But there is good reason to believe that the tapol question was raised at the IGGI meeting, even if only at an informal level and this was why the military authorities felt that a renewed pledge was needed to protect future aid.

Moreover, a Dutch journalist, Peter Schumacher, (NRC Handelsblad, 17 June, 1976) has suggested that the Indonesian delegation statement at the International Labour Conference repeating Sudomo's pledge (see page 4) was made not merely to prevent Indonesia from being blacklisted at the ILO but more particularly to impress the Dutch Government which is to review aid to Indonesia later this year, taking account among other things of progress made in human rights questions. He cites the "satisfaction" expressed by Dutch Overseas Development Minister, Jan Pronk, who headed the Dutch delegation to the ILO meeting in Geneva, as indicating that the Indonesians may have "scored a point".

Another aspect of these developments, however, needs to be spotlighted. While the release of some category B tapols does appear to be taking place, at the very same time, arrangements for the permanent imprisonment of a very large number of tapols in forced labour camps have been drastically stepped up. In particular, plans to expand the number of tapols in Buru from 10,000 to 20,000 are in full swing.

It is ironic that Sudomo's statement prevented Indonesia from being blacklisted at the ILO whereas

the very problem that has engaged the attention of ILO delegations since 1974, the utilisation of tapols as forced labour on Buru, is becoming more blatant than ever.

The only conclusion we can draw is that the current talk of a solution is being used as a smoke-screen behind which tens of thousands of tapols are being consigned to permanent forced labour prison camps.

BRITISH ARMS SALES TO INDONESIA?

A high-ranking Indonesian military mission headed by Major-General Yogi Supardi of the Army's General Staff was among the many foreign guests to come to England in June on the invitation of the British Government's Defence Sales Organisation to attend the British Arms Sales Festival in Aldershot from 21st-25th June.

The Festival was a major endeavour by the British Government to expand arms sales. The weapons on display included small arms, electronic equipment and various items of particular use in riot control and the suppression of internal opposition.

In view of Indonesia's high-powered presence at the 'Festival' it is very possible that Britain will soon become an important supplier of weapons to the repressive Indonesian Government. In Parliament on 13th July, Stan Newens MP asked the Secretary of State for Defence whether there was not a strong case for refusing to sell arms to countries where excessive repression exists, such as Indonesia, Iran and Brazil. But the Secretary of State refused to answer and referred the questioner to the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and claimed that "we take a moral stance on a far higher plane than any other country which has the capacity and does sell arms abroad."

'Tapol' is an Indonesian contraction for 'tahanan politik' meaning political prisoner. It is still widely used although it was banned in 1974 because the military authorities said that all the prisoners are 'criminals'.

Indonesia at the I.L.O.

Since 1974, workers and employers representatives at the annual conferences of the International Labour Office have strongly criticised Indonesia over the abuse of ILO Convention No. 29 on Forced Labour (ratified by Indonesia in 1950). The concern has been voiced with particular reference to the imposition of obligatory labour on tapols in Buru and in other labour camps. The Indonesian Government has been requested each year to submit a report on progress made to halt such practices. The matter has been on the agenda of the Committee on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations which annually undertakes a detailed investigation of contraventions in various countries of the many ILO Conventions.

The matter was considered for the third time this year at the International Labour Conference held in Geneva in June when the Committee of Experts once again regretted the failure of the Indonesian Government to report any progress.

At the session, the Indonesian Government presented a statement justifying the continued detention of tapols in terms of the security situation; it explained that there were difficulties in initiating court procedures because of the lack of professional lawyers and judges, and described the Buru labour camp as part of its endeavours "to create a maximum of productive activities for its people . . . including those detained or otherwise temporarily circumscribed in their freedom."

"Flagrant Violation"

Members of the Committee, however were not prepared to accept these explanations. According to the Provisional Record, Workers' members felt that Indonesia's ratification of No. 29 committed the Government to ensuring that its legislation and practice was in conformity with the Convention. "The Government has promised changes year after year but nothing had happened," says the Record. "This was a flagrant violation of the Convention. In its reply, the Government put forward the justification that these measures were of benefit to the detainees since many others in the country could not find work. But why were these detainees prevented from leaving the Island of Buru?"

Workers' members on the Committee raised many other questions, including asking what was the situation of detainees who were forced to work in other areas of Indonesia. The Workers' member from the USA spoke very harshly, stating that this was a "particularly flagrant case. It had been discussed in detail the two previous years. In 1975 paragraph 36 of the Report of the Committee had expressed its grave concern over the violation of Convention 29 as well as the wider issue of human rights involved. This Committee should strongly support the position which had been taken by the Committee of Experts. The Government was asked to supply details of the number of detainees who had been authorised to leave the Island of Buru and return to their place of choice, and on the situation of those still detained on Buru and those who were forced to work in other parts of Indonesia."

At this point in the discussions, it was clear that the Indonesian Government was facing a serious complaint and Workers' members declared that they would consider the application of

Criterion 7 appropriate. (This Criterion provides for the inclusion of a country onto a "blacklist" for non-application of an ILO convention.) But to prevent this from happening, the Indonesian Government delegation was able to obtain official confirmation from Jakarta of a statement made in a Dutch newspaper a couple of days previously by Admiral Sudomo, Chief-of-Staff of KOPKAMTIB, promising a "solution" by 1978. The pledge as presented in the Indonesian Government representative's statement to the Committee amounted to no more than reporting the release of 1,309 tapols in 1975 and promising the release of a further 2,500 during 1976. On Buru, the only pledge made was that a Red Cross team would visit the camp again during 1976, as it had done in 1975.

Under these circumstances, Criterion 7 was not applied, but the Workers' members "hoped for a full report on progress in the following year. In the circumstances, there should be a special paragraph in the Committee's report noting the gravity of the problem and expressing hope that the promises would be carried out within the announced delays."

The proceedings at the ILO Conference reflect the concern among trade unions over the plight of the tapols. It is to be regretted however that members of the ILO Committee allowed themselves to be deflected from their course by a statement which in actual fact made no promise at all about ending forced labour on Buru. On the contrary, there is a mass of evidence, as we have reported in earlier issues and report again in this issue, that the "final solution" continues to incorporate the maintenance and expansion of the Buru Camp.

Sharp Words in 1975

At the ILO Committee's meeting in 1975, the matter was very thoroughly discussed on the basis of a report by the Committee of Experts and a very long statement by the Indonesian Government on the legal basis for the continued detention of B Category prisoners and on the conditions at the Buru camp.

Although the discussions occurred one year ago, we feel it is important to report for the record the sentiments expressed at that ILO Session. Workers members felt that "the information supplied by the Government was ambiguous. It stated that there was no forced labour on Buru and that the detainees were free to choose to work or not to work. However, the Government also stated that everyone in Indonesia, whether free or in detention, was obliged to work within the institutions of society. Detainees were in a very special position in this respect. They had been brought to a vast virgin land. They were not free to leave . . . They either undertook the work provided them in Buru or starved. This was not work for which the workers had offered themselves voluntarily but forced labour. To observe the Convention, the Government should restore to the detainees their rights to freedom of movement and free choice to work." **)

Workers members also pointed out that the Government had only given information regarding Buru whereas "they were only part of the total number . . . and that detainees elsewhere in Indonesia had been forced to work on construction works . . ."

Employers' members had also felt that the Government's explanation was insufficient and pointed to inconsistencies in the statement.

After further discussion during which the Indonesian representative took the position that this was an internal matter, Workers members replied that when a country had freely ratified a Convention, its implementation was no longer purely an internal question. It was apparent, they felt, "that the rule of law did not exist . . . It was unacceptable that thousands of prisoners were deprived of their liberty for lengthy periods without trial. Many such prisoners, including trade unionists, had been arrested on mere suspicion."

Although Workers members decided not on that occasion to include Indonesia in the special list under Criterion 7, they hoped far reaching changes would have occurred by 1976. Employers' members hoped that the Government would report in detail on the matter.

*) **Provisional Record**, International Labour Conference, Sixty-First Session (1976). All subsequent quotations from the 1976 meeting are also taken from this source.

) **Provisional Record International Labour Conference, Sixtieth Session (1975).

BURU: SOME FACTS

Behind the facade of promising a "final solution" to the tapol problem by the end of 1978 stands the reality of permanent exile and imprisonment of tens of thousands of prisoners to labour camps in many parts of Indonesia. The model of this "solution" is the Buru Island labour camp where already 11,000 tapols have been transferred, with another 2,500 scheduled for transfer by the end of this year. The total number of prisoners will have reached 20,000 by the end of 1978.

To glean facts about the present conditions of the tapols on Buru and the practice of forced labour is virtually impossible as the island is tightly sealed off from contact with the outside world and all communication between tapols and their families elsewhere is heavily censored.

The only outside institution that is occasionally permitted entry is the International Red Cross which never publishes reports of its findings.*/ In fact, the military authorities have discovered that they can make capital out of Red Cross visits simply by saying that they take place, in the certainty that nothing of what these teams discover will ever come to light.

But although information on the actual practice of imprisonment and forced labour is difficult to come by, there is however enough documentation available on the principles underlying the project. In particular, the Attorney-General's Office which has been granted authority by KOPKAMTIB to run the Buru project, prepares periodic reports. The latest is a report drawn up in 1975 and translated this year for restricted circulation.

Under the second chapter heading, "Finalisation Policy", the Main Task is stipulated in full as follows:

"To establish and maintain suitabled facilities on Buru Island for the detention, care and utilization of Group B G30S/PKI prisoners, within the framework of solving the problem of G30S/PKI prisoners in general."

In other words, the "detention, care and utilisation" of tapols on Buru is part of the final solution. Nothing could be clearer than that.

Under "Details of the Task", we read that the tasks include "drawing up of timetable and plans for the transfer of prisoners to Buru



Entrance to Unit II of Buru Camp

Island" and also "scrutiny and development of the prisoners" as well as "scrutiny and development of the prisoner's families who are brought to the island".

Further "details of the task" are specified as follows:

"Preparations for the return of prisoners to society include the following activities:

- a. unification of families
- b. development of village communities
- c. family guidance, including education of children
- d. social organisation and other things."

Much space in the document is devoted to "mental guidance" which is "designed to alter the mentality and thinking of the prisoners from the communist ideology to Pancasila". Then the paragraph on Mental Guidance continues as follows:

"Particularly in relation to those prisoners held on Buru Island, the Government is of the opinion that, in principle, they should not be detained permanently. The prisoners were transported to Buru Island in order to enjoy a new life and also to enable them to participate actively and directly in the Government's development programme."

Here it is quite clear that "not being detained permanently" and "returning to society" means "enjoying the new life on Buru" and being utilised for "the Government's development programme."

BURU...

Further, it is not only the prisoners who are subjected to "mental guidance" but also "members of prisoners' families" and "persons living within the area of the INREHAB" **), in other words the native inhabitants of Buru Island.

NORMAL FAMILY LIFE

Now, what about the prisoners families? On page 8 of the Attorney General Office's document, we read: "In the case of the families, emphasis is placed upon the restoration of normal family life. Furthermore, opportunities are provided for the development of the family in the direction of Indonesia Pancasila society." But under a later heading, Special Problems, we read, on the topic of Education of Children, the following prospect of "normal family life":

"In this new community, education is of vital significance in order to prevent the development of a new generation of communists out of the old communist environment. Attention needs to be given to devising a system that could minimise contact/relationships between the children and their families. This could be achieved by placing the children in boarding-houses during their school years and only allowing them to return to their families during vacation."

What are the principles guiding the control enforced over the activities of the tapols? We read on this topic about "Physical guidance activities designed to alter the attitudes and life styles of the prisoners from consumption-oriented to being production-oriented". This, be it noted, about "consumption-oriented" people who have been suffering the severe deprivations of food and clothing during more than ten years of detention without trial. But further enlightenment about this "re-direction" of tapols activities is obtained from another document prepared recently by the Centre for Strategic and International studies ***), which states that those Buru tapols who so wish are being given facilities to develop artistic skills such as writing, painting and sculpture, and that they are being given the opportunity to change professions. As an example of a person who is being encouraged to "change his profession", the document mentions Pramudya Ananta Tur, Indonesia's most outstanding writer and novelist!

THE NATIVE INHABITANTS OF BURU ISLAND

In its attempts to prove that Buru tapols are being well treated, the military authorities repeatedly state that the native inhabitants of the island are strongly resentful because they see the tapols being much better cared for than themselves. Most recently, the CSIS Director, General Ali Murtopo, referred publicly to an incident which occurred in 1972 when he was on a visit to the island with the Governor of the Maluku Province and the Military Commander of the region. "We were greeted with anger by the masses of the people", he said, "who threatened with knives and arrows." He said his two companions had been afraid to alight from the vehicle they were travelling in because of the tension. (Merdeka, 11th June, 1976). He describes how he was attacked with a series of complaints about the facilities being granted to the tapols.

There are two points to make about this. Firstly, that it is quite understandable for local inhabitants who have been neglected for so long by the central authorities to be resentful when they see funds being spent on housing, albeit prison bar-

racks, for newcomers, and agricultural facilities being installed for the purpose of exploiting tapol labour. Second, the Attorney-General's report published in 1975 reveals for the first time that native Buru inhabitants are restive over the expropriation of their lands. Under the heading, Special Problems, we read: "The only problematic aspect of the establishment of the INREHAB, as far as the local adat leaders * * * *) and their people are concerned, concerns payment for their land." Nothing further is stated about how this problem has been resolved, but we are left with the strong impression that the knives and arrows that scared General Ali Murtopo and his companions out of their wits were to do with much more than envy.

5,000 TAPOLS "SIGN ON" AS TRANSMIGRANTS?

According to one source, senior officials in the military hierarchy are now claiming that 5,000 of the tapols in Buru have signed statements declaring they wish to remain on Buru as "transmigrants". This is presumably in preparation for the next stage of proclaiming that the tapols have "voluntarily" agreed to be confined to the island permanently.

*) According to Red Cross statutes, no report of a mission may be published without the approval of the host government.

**) INREHAB: "Rehabilitation Institution", the term used when KOPKAMTIB decided to rename prisons where tapols are held.

***) *Centre for Strategic and International Studies*, a private body set up by the military, under General Ali Murtopo, to carry out academic study of foreign policy questions. The Centre now appears to be playing an active role in handling international aspects of the tapol question.

****) *adat* leaders are those responsible for customary law in ethnic groups. This includes land ownership and inheritance.

26,000 PURGED

No fewer than 26,000 government employees who were classified as Category C2 and C3 were dismissed up to July 1975 in the purge ordered against Category C people by KOPKAMTIB at the end of 1973.

The figure was given in a statement by Mr Manihuruk, Head of the Government Employees' Administrative Unit and reported in Sinar Harapan (28th June, 1975), a report which has only now come to our attention.

On the same occasion, it was announced that further dismissals would henceforth only be applicable to those classified as C1 and that C2 and C3 people would be subjected "only" to "special supervision and guidance" and "administrative measures".

However, those C2 and C3 people who had already been dismissed could not be reinstated. Their only compensation was that the dismissal would now be termed 'honourable' instead of 'dishonourable'.

The report did not specify how many people of the C1 category had been dismissed.

MALARI EVENT : WHO'S GUILTY ?

Within days after releasing the last of the untried Malari tapols, the Attorney General, Ali Said said (Merdeka, 11th May, 1976), that the "mastermind" of the Malari incident had not yet been found. Investigations are still proceeding, he said, in the interests of national security.

Malari (meaning January catastrophe) refers to the student demonstration in January 1974, protesting against the visit to Jakarta of the Japanese Prime Minister. The demonstration ended in violence after arson became widespread and troops opened fire killing eleven people.

It is widely believed in Indonesia that the arson occurred as a result of provocations by the General Ali Murtopo group which was in rivalry with General Sumitro, the general who was encouraging the students at the time.

Reacting to Ali Said's statement, the lawyer Buyung Nasution who himself spent 20 months in prison as a Malari tapol, said (Sinar Harapan, 12 May, 1976) this proved that those held for so long as suspects were in fact not responsible. "The Attorney General should specify what he means by the 'Malari Incident' In my opinion, it means the acts of arson. The people who planned these are the ones who should be brought to justice," said Buyung.

Buyung also explained that the Malari tapols had been divided into three groups : one, referred to in code as 'kelinci' consisted of the students and intellectuals (including himself); the second, called 'geladak', consisted of political leaders, mostly of the former PNI (nationalist) party; the third, called 'kembang sepatu' were the ones held responsible for the arson. The latter group had been held only briefly, and including Ramadi. *)

*) Ramadi died mysteriously while at a hospital during his detention. One tried Malari tapol, Aini Chalid, said in court that Ramadi had told him before his death that he had been given large sums by a senior officer to commit arson during the students demonstration.

TO SUE FOR COMPENSATION?

Meanwhile, there are hints that some released Malari tapols may soon sue the government for unlawful arrest and detention. Ali Said, in his statement referred to above, said people were within their rights to sue but his Office would reply. He upheld that the length of detention to which the Malari prisoners had been subjected was lawful, and they had been released unconditionally.

Buyung Nasution has made it known that he is considering suing the government. "I am not after material benefit," he said, "but a precedent should be established; the government should be declared to have been at fault and should be duly penalised."

Another former Malari tapol who is likely to sue the government is H.J. Princen, chairman of the Human Rights Institute who spent over two years in detention and was released in May this year. He said that the question of arbitrary arrest was a central theme in the history of human rights. A court verdict should be sought regarding officials who had abused their powers.

MALARI SENTENCES REDUCED

Two Malari tapols who have been tried have had their sentences reduced. Hariman Siregar, student leader, had his sentence reduced from six years to 4½ years. He has appealed against this decision, asking for the sentence to be squashed altogether. His lawyers have also submitted a request that he be allowed to return home and complete his studies.

Aini Chalid, a student leader from Jogjakarta, who was sentenced to four years, was granted on appeal a reduction of one year and nine months and is expected to be released shortly.

It is also understood that the third tried tapol, Drs. Syahrir who was sentenced to 4½ years has also been granted a reduction on appeal.

Reader's Letter

Kompas, 3rd May, 1976

The Kompas editorial of 21 April entitled "Release of Prisoners" was very interesting indeed. It spoke among other things about the G30S/PKI prisoners who cannot be tried because there is insufficient basis to bring them to court.

A relative of mine whose name is Soerisno, employed on the staff of the Third Assistant of Diponegoro (VIIth Military Division) Command, was arrested around the end of 1971. Initially he was held at the **Satgasin** (Special Intelligence Unit), Semarang and was released though obliged to report regularly. Then he was arrested again and held as a tapol in Mlaten Prison, Semarang, and subsequently transferred to Pekalongan. From there he was transferred again to the Teperda/Laksus KOPKAMTIBDA Central Java (Special Regional KOPKAMTIB Investigation Team) where he has been held ever since. Things are slightly better for him there as he is used for administration duties.

The fact that he has been in detention since 1971 has caused many difficulties for his wife who has had to make tremendous efforts to care for their five small children — the oldest 11 years and the youngest only 5.

I really don't know very much about these matters but I occasionally hear news about the B category tapols. If all that is true about the B category tapols, why has he not been released yet? Others have been released, why not him?

I would like to appeal to the authorities to reconsider his case.

F. X. Soediyon BA,
Jalan Jangli 276 b,
Semarang

Sudomo's New Pledges

KOPKAMTIB Chief-of-Staff, **Admiral Sudomo** has now promised that the problem of Indonesia's political prisoners will be solved before the end of 1978. He declared that those who had not been tried by that time would be released. He also said that all camps would soon be open to inspection by the International Red Cross and Amnesty International. Indiscriminate arrests would "no longer occur" he said, and promised that in the case of new arrests, cases would be transferred to the Attorney General's Office after an initial detention period of twenty days. He did not say whether the cases of those already in detention for more than ten-and-a-half years would be treated likewise.

These statements were made in an interview with the Dutch daily, **De Telegraaf** (11th June, 1976), the day after the IGGI meeting of countries who give economic aid to Indonesia had concluded in Amsterdam.

It is known that several governments represented at the meeting including the British, West German and Dutch Governments, informally raised the tapol issue with the Indonesian representatives. The Sudomo interview is seen as a response to these approaches and an attempt to persuade IGGI member governments not to allow the issue to affect their aid commitments to Indonesia.

He gave various figures, saying that 1,309 B category tapols had been released in 1975 and that another 2,500 would be freed in 1976. There were 29,425 B tapols still in detention, of whom 10,974 were in Buru. All these would be released, he said. But in a latter part of the interview, Sudomo returned to the Buru tapols, saying that the stories about extremely bad conditions on the island were "nonsense". The prisoners there have their

families with them *), and produced 200 tons of surplus rice last year. "The only thing is that they are not allowed to leave the island."

Asked about the 1965-66 massacres, the Admiral admitted that between 450,000 and 500,000 communists had been killed. "But," he added, "they were not liquidated by the Army. The killings were the result of unrestrained revenge of the people in Java and Sumatra, particularly Islamic youngsters."

Asked about the arrest of journalist Mochtar Lubis and the banning of his paper, **Indonesia Raya**, Sudomo said that he had been arrested on false grounds and had been released after a few weeks. As for freedom of the press, "we are a developing country," he said. "We have a heterogeneous society and cannot allow periodicals that incite the public to continue to appear."

*)

He failed to specify that this applied only to a few hundred of the Buru tapols.



Admiral Sudomo, Chief-of-Staff of KOPKAMTIB

LABOUR PARTY ON TAPOLS

The British Labour Party has for the first time publicly declared its opposition to political imprisonment in Indonesia and called for a review of British aid. The declaration is included in the Party's **Programme 1976** which was published on 28th May and will be formally presented for adoption at this year's Labour Party Conference at the end of September in Blackpool.

The section headed Indonesia in the Programme reads as follows:

"In the last 10 years there has been a big increase in British investment in, trade with, and aid to, Indonesia. Since the military coup of 1965, aid to Indonesia has risen to the level that Indonesia now receives more aid from Britain than any country outside the Commonwealth. "The military coup of 1965 resulted in wholesale massacre and the imprisonment of tens of thousands of people in Indonesia. Many of the latter have remained in detention, without trial, since 1965. Some of these detainees have been tortured, and many of them are kept in appalling conditions. The Labour Party has made known its opposition to the continued imprisonment without trial of detainees. It has also called for the British commitment to aid to be reviewed unless progress is made in this field and unless Indonesia withdraws its forces from East Timor."

One hundred thousand political prisoners
held for more than ten years without trial

more than a million years

A film which portrays for the first time
the true facts of political imprisonment in **INDONESIA**

Produced by Amnesty International, German Section

Narrated by ALBERT FINNEY

Rental fee: £5.00 excluding postage and VAT
available from:

Concord Films Council Ltd
Nacton
Ipswich
Suffolk IP10 0JZ

or

Contemporary Films Ltd
55 Greek Street
London W1V 6DB

Severe Sentences Continue

The trials of A category tapols continue to produce severe sentences. Four trial verdicts reported during the past few months have included two death sentences, one life imprisonment and a 20-year sentence.

Meanwhile some new conflicting figures on the number of A category tapols have emerged. **Admiral Sudomo**, Chief-of-Staff of KOPKAMTIB, in an interview with the Dutch daily, **De Telegraph** (11th June, 1976) said that altogether 810 trials had been held since 1965, and that another 1,944 A prisoners were awaiting trial. In 1976, 220 would be tried, he said, and the remainder would be tried before the end of 1978. But according to another "senior official", quoted by the Australian journalist Hamish McDonald in **Far Eastern Economic Review** (28th May, 1976), there are 1,745 A category prisoners, of whom only 745 will actually be brought to trial; the remaining 1,000 will be reclassified.

Recent Trials

Sukarman, 56 years old, who was secretary of the PKI East Java Provincial Committee and also secretary of the PKI underground organisation in South Blitar after the party had been outlawed, was tried before the Malang Court and sentenced to death on 6th June. He was found guilty of engaging in plots to overthrow the government and of subversion.

After sentence had been passed, Sukarman told the court that he would not appeal against the sentence, that he had no regrets whatever about what he had done and that he continued to believe firmly in the need to establish a People's Democracy in Indonesia.

The death sentence was also passed in April this year against **Soma**, (46) who was tried before the Surabaya Court. Soma who was described as chairman of the PKI Special Bureau in East Java, was found guilty of engaging in criminal conspiracy against the government. He was alleged to have ordered the dissemination of an announcement about the Revolutionary Council in East Java immediately after the coup attempt on 1st October 1965, and also to have given "guidance" to members of the Armed Forces. Press reports described Soma's defence as "vilifying the government" and said that the court, in passing sentence, had found no extenuating circumstances in the defendant's favour.

A sentence of life imprisonment was passed by the Bandung court against **Haryana**, known also as **Lie Tun Tjong**. He is said to have been chairman of the PKI Special Bureau in West Java and was alleged to have held meetings to plan the kidnapping of military officers in West Java. After the PKI was banned in March 1966, he continued to work for the PKI. He was also accused of having given "guidance" to members of the Armed Forces. In his defence, Haryana refuted all the charges; his activities to lead others had been completely in conformity with the laws governing party activity at the time.

A harsh sentence was passed against a woman called **Napsiah** (55) who was accused of PKI activity prior to, during and after the October 1965 events. After the events, she went into hiding and became active in illegal PKI work. The prosecutor demanded life imprisonment, but the court, in passing sentence of 20 years, said in the defendant's favour that she had never before been sentenced and that she had spoken with frankness and clarity during the trial.

Sample of Past Verdicts

A report in **Kompas** (22nd April, 1976) states that the Jakarta Special Court (which hears appeals against sentence) had completed its investigation of 15 of the 29 political cases before it. The paper then gave a list of tried persons with sentences passed, presumably the 15 cases already investigated. The list gives some idea of the severity of the sentences passed:

Sardjono	10 years
Suharto Rebo	12 years
Adi Sumarto	12 years
Sukatno	death
Cugito	life sentence
Rewang	life sentence
Mardjoko	death
Iskandar Subekti	death
Moh Munir	death
Abdullah Sumarto	life sentence
Djadi Wirosbroto	15 years
Ruslan Widjajasastra	death
Sulami	20 years
Asep Suryaman	death
Oei Tju Tat	13 years



"LACK OF FIRMNESS" = 13 YEARS

The 13-year sentence passed against Oei Tju Tat (TAPOL Bulletin, No. 16) was based on the Court's judgement that the defendant had not "reacted strongly enough" to the Partindo statement of 4th October 1965. In so saying, the Court appears in fact to have accepted the argument of the defence that Oei Tju Tat could not be held responsible for the statement yet it nevertheless passed a heavy sentence for his lack of firmness.

The 4th October statement was seen as being in line with the standpoint of the PKI in that it described the 1965 events as "an internal affair of the Army". The defence argued, with considerable documentary evidence, that Oei Tju Tat had not taken an active part in the discussions about the statement and had sought to check the situation with President Sukarno before a Partindo statement was issued. But without waiting for this, another Partindo leader went ahead and published the statement.

According to a report in **Berita Yudha** (31 March, 1976), the Court did actually recognise that Oei had made efforts to check but argued that "the lack of a firm stand was deliberately used by the accused as a prop, in the hope that if the G30S succeeded, he would be safe, and if it was not successful, he would also be safe." For which "crime", he got 13 years.

Incidentally, the Partindo leader, Adi Sumarto who acknowledged that he had drafted and published the statement received a 12-year sentence some years ago for his role in this affair.

TAPOL campaigns for the release of Indonesian political prisoners and is a humanitarian organisation. It is not associated with any political groups, either in Indonesia or abroad, and is supported by individuals and organisations of many shades of opinion.

East Timor: "Integration"

Indonesia's plans for the annexation of East Timor were taken a step further in May with the decision on 31st May by a "People's Assembly of East Timor" to petition Indonesia for integration. The twenty-eight members, mostly appointed by "traditional consensus and consent" also decided that a referendum was "unnecessary".

A group of foreign ambassadors and foreign as well as Indonesian journalists were in the East Timor capital of Dilli for the occasion. *Tempo* reports (12th June, 1976) that the journalists were prevented from speaking to anyone in the streets. "As soon as we took a step down the stairs, officials in civilian clothing told us to get back. We were not allowed to approach Assembly members who wandered into the vicinity where we were." Later, the journal said, when the journalists were taken on a tour of the capital, the streets were quiet and deserted.

Several weeks later on 23rd June, the Indonesian Government sent a fact-finding mission to Dilli to determine its attitude on the integration request, but plans for the mission to visit other towns including Bacau had to be abandoned "because of bad weather". This explanation seems unlikely because Bacau has an international airport and it was in the middle of the dry season. Fretilin-controlled Radio Maubere said that the Indonesian jet had been unable to land at Bacau because of Fretilin mortar fire. This was subsequently confirmed by the Australian journalist, Hamish McDonald, quoting Indonesian sources (*Sydney Morning Herald*, 28th June). The same sources also confirmed reports that Indonesian troops in Dilli are unable to leave their garrison after dark because Fretilin troops are still operating within ten kilometres of the capital.

While the Indonesian mission appears to have had such difficulty moving around East Timor, the Fretilin reports that it was able successfully to convene its Second Plenary Conference in the areas under its control. The Conference held between 15 May and 2nd June was reported to have been well-attended, and a number of sporting events and night-long celebrations were held.

The Indonesian Government seeks to convince world opinion that all resistance by the Fretilin has ended and that East Timor is firmly under the control of pro-Indonesian forces. But in Indonesia itself, reports — never published in the press — are rife that Indonesian casualties have been very heavy and that troops and equipment are still being moved to the area.

To conceal the scale of operations, relatives of soldiers killed in action are prohibited from making public their bereavements. Many feel offended because men who gave their lives in the venture are not being bestowed special honours as would normally be the case. One Fretilin spokesman abroad, Mari Alcatiri, speaking in Naputo, Mozambique, reported that several thousand widows of soldiers killed in East Timor had demonstrated in Indonesia. The precise nature of the demonstration was not clear, nor is it easy to imagine that Army wives would have taken such a step, but there is no doubt that resentment among the families of East Timor casualties is widespread in Indonesia.

Indonesia: THE PRISON STATE

TAPOL's pamphlet, fully revised.
20 pp, 4 pages of photographs. Still only 10p.

Notes to Readers

SUBSCRIPTION DRIVE

It is more than a decade now since the first mass arrests took place in Indonesia, but the problem is still as far as ever from solution.

TAPOL's campaign may have helped to compel the military leaders to at least speak of releases, but clearly that is not enough. We must reach out to more people with the facts.

For this, we need your help!

Please send us the name of at least one possible new subscriber and we will send them two issues free of charge.

Please also send us the names of journalists, educational or research institutions, libraries, organisations or other bodies who you think should receive TAPOL Bulletin.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES

The new annual rates (six issues) are:

UK and Europe	£2.50 (5.50 US dollars)
Overseas	£3.00 (6.75 US dollars)

TAPOL Bank Account No. 40987493, Wandsworth Common Branch, National Westminster Bank, 27 Bellevue Road, London S.W.17 7EF. All foreign currency cheques should be endorsed on the reverse side with the words:

As made payable to on the front.

Please address all correspondence and subscriptions to:

TAPOL, 103 Tilehurst Road, Wandsworth Common,
London S.W.18, United Kingdom.