Indonesia

ta . .

Indonesia presents a problem which is almost unique in its size and complexity.

In July 1969, Professor Julius Stone, accompanied by Miss Stephanie Grant, visited Diakarta as an Amnesty delegate to discuss with the Government its policy towards the 116,000 political detainees held without charge or trial since the change of government in 1965 and 1966. He was extremely well received. and was able to have full discussions with Cabinet Ministers and senior officials.

Although visits to prisoners and detention camps were not arranged, it was operally accepted in Diakarta that the country's chronic economic difficulties made it inevitable that medical and food provisions for the prisoners were often grossly inadequate. This point was underlined at the end of 1969 when foreign journalists were allowed to visit the first detainees' 'resettlement' area on Buru-an underpopulated island in the Moluccas over a thousand miles from Java-and reported the prevalence of illness among the prisoners. The Diarkarta press has also described the chronic malnutrition from which even criminal remand prisoners suffer.

In October 1969, the Indonesian Government made its first major policy statement on the future of the 116,000 individuals in prison, detention camps and under house arrest. Category C detainees, against whom no evidence of communist activities exists, would be released as soon as possible: these numbered at least 30,000. Category B, believed to have communist connections, will not be released, but will be sent to resettlement areas in remote parts of the archipelago where they will undertake agricultural work and will live in continued restriction. They number between 10,000 and 30,000. The first group of 2,500 has been taken to the island of Buru. Category A, which contains Indonesian Communist Party (PKI) officials and others believed to have been prominent on the left, will be detained until they are brought to trial at some unspecified date: they number between 5,000 and 10,000. Some Category C releases have been reported. New arrests, however, continue.

While welcoming the Government's decision to release 30,000 prisoners from Category C, Amnesty remains deeply concerned at the apparently permanent detention of the many thousands in categories A and B. All prisoners are held because of their alleged 'involvement' in the attempted coup of September 1965, but in the vast majority of cases, known or believed sympathy with the Indonesian Communist Party (PKI) has been taken as the sole proof of complicity. If it is remembered that in 1965 the PKI numbered some three million members, while the trade unions, youth and cultural associations believed to be affiliated to it claimed over fourteen million members, the judicial absurdity of equating membership of a mass movement with responsibility for the action of a small splinter group at the top becomes clear. As there is to be no legal review for those in categories A and B



(between 15,000 and 45,000), and as legal access is seldom allowed—even were enough lawyers available---a prisoner has no opportunity to question the category in which the army has placed him, and on which his whole future life depends.

Although some individual adoptions have been made, the size of the problem necessitates discussion based on general proposals rather than on a tinv fraction of individual cases. Amnesty recognises that the Indonesian Government has a responsibility to protect both the local communities to which released prisoners will return, and also the prisoners themselves, and that the memories of the civil disturbance and bloodshed of 1965 could make both forms of protection necessary. We have therefore proposed to the Indonesian Government the following three steps to ensure that the promises of release which have been made are adequately implemented and are extended to cover all untried detainees with a minimum of delay:----

- 1. The establishment of independent review commissions to consider all those detained without trial, in all three Categories, and including those detainees who have already been moved to Buru. The commissions should be authorised to order immediate release or, where *prima facie* evidence exists, trial by civilian court within a given period. Technical assistance could be requested from the United Nations and interested non-governmental organisations.
- Application to the United Nations for assistance in a rehabilitation programme: (a) to provide re-training for detainees awaiting release, and assist their full reintegration on release; where detainees returning to their homes might be in onysical danger, alternative localities should be made available;
- (b) for the welfare and training of children deprived of one or both parents since 1965;
- (c) for the development of existing government schemes to rehabilitate those widowed in 1965.
- 3. Immediately, and until such time as the commissions have ruled on release or trial, prisons, detention camps and resettlement areas should be open to visits. by the International Committee of the Red Cross (or other international organisations), who should be asked to take responsibility for the provision and distribution of medicines and essential foodstuffs.

Amnesty's comment on the situation in Indonesia must necessarily be a critical one, but this should not obscure our appreciation of the real humanitarian concern manifested by individual Ministers and officials with whom Professor Stone spoke in Diakarta.

Formosa

Since 1949, the Government of Chiang-Kai-Shek has remained in a state of war with mainland China. The island is under strict martial law, rigidly

۰. ۲.

> enforced, with the result that free discussion and criticism are effectively suppressed by an armoury of legislation which can interpret any political dissent as 'rebellion'. Amnesty has on its records a growing number of cases which suggest that violations of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights are constant and that the case of Chen Yu-hsi, which we quote in detail, is representative of very many more.

In August 1968, Chen was tried before an open military court and sentenced to seven years' imprisonment for 'repeatedly spreading propaganda in writing in favour of the Chinese Communists', as the result of articles allegedly written by him and published in a Tokyo newspaper.

Until August 1967. Chen was a student in the East-West Centre of the University of Hawaii, where he obtained a MSc in Economics. He planned to continue his studies at Brown University, Rhode Island, where he had been given an assistantship to work for a PhD. But in August 1967, he was asked to return to Formosa and left Hawaii. He broke his journey in Tokyo where he obtained a temporary visa, and enrolled at Hosei University, On 8th February 1968, Chen was summoned to the Immigration Service Division Office in Tokyo. The next day he was flown to Taipeh, apparently against his will, where he was immediately arrested.

In court, Chen was charged on three main counts: reading communist writingssuch as Mao Tse Tung's Thoughts-in the Oriental Section of the East-West Centre Library in Hawaii; writing articles for an allegedly communist newspaper, Ta Ti Pao. while in Japan; planning to defect to communist China.

In defence. Chen agreed that he had looked at books by communists, out of curiosity but said he had paid little attention to them as they appeared to be propaganda. The evidence brought to support the charge of intended defection amounted to no more than Chen's one time acquaintance with a student who had later defected. Chen denied that Ta Ti Pao was a communist paper. Evidence that he was in fact the author of articles consisted of a statement by a police handwriting expert, who did not appear in court, that certain lines of brush calligraphy by Chen could be equated with calligraphy headings in the paper. Chen agreed, saying that he had been asked to copy the headings by the police, and so the example meant nothing. The Prosecution case rested on Chen's confession, which he repudiated in court, saying it had been made after interrogations during which threats on his life were made Amnesty accepts Chen's defence in the absence of substantiated

prosecution evidence.

Korea

Since 1953 Korea has been a divided country in which a left-wing government in the north faces a right wing government in the south and in which the armed hostilities of war have been replaced by bitter propaganda campaigns and sporadic border raids. This fact is fundamental to any understanding of domestic politics in either country. Each government feels itself threatened by the existence of the other, each regards itself as the sole legitimate ruler. and unifier, of the entire country, and each regards the total suppression of effective opposition as essential to its security. There is no real contact between North and South.

In theory, South Korea is a democratic country with the customary con-

stitutional guarantees for freedom of speech, action and belief. In practice, the Government rules on a platform of adamant anti-communism enforcing stringent limitations on freedom of speech and political activity. Under the Anti-Communist and the National Security Laws the legal definition of communism is so broad that almost all shades of left, liberal and independent thought can be branded subversion, while contact with the North, even at the level of uniting divided families, may be punishable as espionage.

In the last year, Amnesty's sparse knowledge has been increased by Professor Ivan Morris's visit to Seoul. From his report it is clear that there are fewer prisoners of conscience than the harsh provisions of the law would lead one to suspect. The reasons for this appear to be twofold: on the one hand it is widely accepted that to dissent is to court arrest, while on the other individuals known for their independent views will be subject to much official pressure to remain silent. Thus an editor or professor may be asked to dismiss a particular employee; should they not co-operate, the Government may then cut newsprint supplies or prevent the university from bookbuying abroad. Understandably this has the intended effect of reducing active political dissent to a minimum.

Four recent arrests, clear prisoners of conscience, took place in June when a poet, a publisher, an editor and a journalist were detained under the Anti-Communist Law after publishing an ironic and apparently elegant, poem criticising public corruption. The poem was called 'Five Bandits' and commented on the luxury lives of a businessman, a member of Parliament, a civil servant, a general and a minister. The arrests took place shortly before the 37th international P.E.N. Congress in Seoul, which was due to discuss as its main theme, 'Humour in modern societies'.

Turkey

Amnesty's Annual Report for 1968-9 described in detail the case of Sadi Alkilic. In many ways a 'classic' prisoner of conscience, Alkilic had been sentenced to six years' imprisonment on a charge of 'praising communism' in contravention of Article 141 of the Penal Code; the charge arose from a 1961 newspaper article in which he had argued, in rather utopian terms, that socialism was the only answer to Turkey's social problems. The appeal dragged out for several years, and it was only in late 1968—seven years after the article was published-that Alkilic finally went to prison, despite chronic ill health.

It is with considerable pleasure that we are able to report Mr Alkilic's release early in 1970; officially, he is free for an initial period of six months so he can undergo medical treatment. But we hope that he will not be made to return to prison.

Iran Since the beginning of 1969, Amnesty has been in discussion with the Iranian