

INDONESIA

@Labour Activists Under Fire

Introduction

More than 100 workers and labour activists were arrested during and immediately after a week of massive strikes and demonstrations in the vicinity of Medan, North Sumatra in mid-April. The demonstrations marked a peak in a rising tide of labour unrest in Medan and throughout Indonesia over the past two years. Unlike most recent protests, those in Medan degenerated into anti-Chinese violence, resulting in the death of one Indonesian businessman of Chinese descent, the injury of several others, and the widespread destruction of property.

Amnesty International does not condone the acts of violence committed during the recent demonstrations in Medan. It deplores the murder of a businessman on 15 April, and recognizes the Indonesian Government's right to bring the perpetrators of such violence to justice. However, it is concerned that the authorities may be using the unrest in Medan as a pretext for a broader crackdown on peaceful labour activism, and to silence the advocates of workers' rights.

It is particularly concerned by the arrest of several officials of the Indonesian Prosperous Workers Union (*Serikat Buruh Sejahtera Indonesia* - SBSI), an independent trade union not recognized by the government. Notwithstanding allegations by the authorities that SBSI officials incited the violence in Medan, Amnesty International believes that at least five of those arrested may be prisoners of conscience, held solely for their non-violent political or trade union activities.

The organization is also concerned that some of those detained, whether prisoners of conscience or not, may have been or may be ill-treated while under interrogation. Ill-treatment and torture of both criminal and political suspects is routine in Indonesia; and at least one of those recently detained in Medan is said to have been badly beaten. Amnesty International is therefore calling upon the authorities to ensure that the detainees are accompanied at all stages of investigation by a lawyer of their choice, as guaranteed by the Indonesian Code of Criminal Procedure, and that a regularly updated public register of all those detained is maintained.

Finally, Amnesty International is concerned by a broad and persistent pattern of military and police intervention in labour disputes in Indonesia, which has resulted in workers and activists facing ill-treatment, imprisonment, torture, rape, and even death. past

year: **Marsinah**, a young woman and labour activist raped and killed in May 1993 in East Java; and **Rusli**, a 22-year-old worker, whose body was found floating in a river on 13 March 1994, a few days after he took part in a strike at a factory near Medan. Given strong indications of military and police responsibility in both deaths, Amnesty International is urging that those responsible be brought promptly to justice before a civilian court.

1. Restrictions on Labour: The Context

The Indonesian Government imposes heavy restrictions, both in law and in practice, on the right to strike and to organize. Only one trade union federation is recognized, the government-sponsored All Indonesia Workers Union (*Serikat Pekerja Seluruh Indonesia - SPSI*). Despite government assurances in the past year that restrictions on freedom to organize would be loosened, a recent Ministry of Manpower Decree (No.1/1994) continues to define SPSI as the sole recognized trade union.

In addition, the government has used various methods, including intimidation and arrest, to undermine independent unions such as the SBSI, established in June 1992. In February 1994, for example, at least 19 members of the SBSI - including the union's national chairman, **Muchtar Pakpahan**, a member of its national executive council, **Sunarty**, and the chairman of its executive council for Central Java, **Trisjanto** - were detained on the eve of a national strike called for 11 February. Amnesty International believes that their arrests were designed to prevent them from organizing the strike, and to intimidate others from taking part in it. Though all were released within a few days, the three named above were charged with incitement and expressing feelings of hostility toward the government.¹ Military surveillance, intimidation and arrest of SBSI officials and their families has increased since the April unrest.

In addition to such legal obstacles, direct military and police intervention is routine in Indonesia, even in the most peaceful labour disputes. In some cases, military authorities resort to ill-treatment, torture, rape and even killing, in order to intimidate or silence workers and labour activists. The tragic consequences of routine military intervention in labour disputes are highlighted by the death within the past year of two young labour activists, **Marsinah** and **Rusli**, whose cases are outlined in Section 5 of this report.

In most cases, however, military intervention is less overt. In the course of a labour dispute, particularly active or vocal workers are routinely summoned to the local or district military headquarters, where they are accused of communist sympathies, and threatened with imprisonment or physical violence, including death, unless they agree to resign "voluntarily"

¹ See Amnesty International report, *Indonesia: Labour Activists Detained* (ASA 21/06/94)

from their job. Whether they "resign" or not, the names of such workers are recorded on a black-list, compiled by military intelligence authorities, and distributed on a regular basis to all factories within the command area. As a consequence, once dismissed, active or vocal usually workers find it difficult, if not impossible, to find a new job.

Despite such dangers and restrictions, Indonesian workers have carried out strike actions and demonstrations with increasing frequency in recent years. Most of these strikes have occurred in the major industrial centres near the capital city of Jakarta, in Surabaya, East Java, and in Medan, North Sumatra. On the whole, strikers have called for improvements in working conditions, and wages which, at the equivalent of about US\$1.50 per day, are among the lowest in Asia. However, like those in Medan in March and April, some strikers have also demanded freedom to organize, an end to military intervention in labour disputes, and proper investigations into past human rights abuses against workers.

These concerns have been echoed by the office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR) which, in June 1993, warned that tariff benefits granted to Indonesian exports under the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) programme might be suspended unless there were significant improvements in the protection of internationally-recognized labour rights. The USTR was due to announce its decision in February 1994 but chose instead to extend its period of review for a further six months to August 1994. In the months prior to that decision, the Indonesian Government took some initiatives aimed at answering both domestic and international criticism. In January 1994 it announced the repeal of Ministry of Manpower Decree No 342 of 1986, which explicitly authorized military intervention in the settlement of labour disputes. While a welcome step, the repeal of this decree did not put an end to military intervention in labour disputes in practice.

2. The April Demonstrations

Beginning on 14 April, and continuing for more than one week, the demonstrations in the Medan area involved tens of thousands of workers from most of the factories in the area. At the outset, the demonstrations were orderly and peaceful, and the demands of the protesters related solely to working conditions, wages and labour rights. However, toward the end of the first day, and accelerating in the following days, they began to degenerate into violence, providing opportunities for the articulation of anti-Chinese sentiments, the destruction of property, and the killing of a Chinese-Indonesian businessman, **Yuli Kristianto (Kok Joe Lip)**.

Stirred by long-standing grievances over low wages and poor labour conditions, and sparked by the suspicious death of a fellow-worker, **Rusli**, between 20,000 and 30,000

workers from dozens of factories gathered at the office of the Provincial Governor in Medan on the morning of 14 April to demand, among other things:

- an increase in the daily minimum wage from Rp 3,100 (about US\$ 1.50) to Rp 7,000 (about US\$ 3.50),
- the repeal of Ministry of Manpower Decree No.1/1994 that defines the government-backed SPSI as the sole trade union; and official recognition of the independent SBSI;
 - a prompt and impartial investigation into Rusli's death;
- the reinstatement of some 389 workers dismissed after a strike at the factory PT Korek Api Deli in March 1994.

After negotiations between 23 workers and the government authorities failed to produce any concrete response to their demands, some of the assembled workers grew restive. Government reports said that troops were called in to quell rioting which erupted after protesters began to throw rocks at shops along the road from Medan to Belawan. Some non-governmental sources claimed that the worst violence was triggered by the heavy-handed intervention of the security forces. As the demonstrators returned to their homes in various industrial areas on the outskirts of the city, they were confronted by hundreds of armed riot police and soldiers. According to one report, at about 4:30pm, as the protesters reached the Jalan Glugur By-pass, riot police moved in, firing tear-gas and attacking the crowd with batons. Protesters responded by throwing stones and other projectiles. In the course of the confrontation, several protesters were arrested. Later the same night, at about 2am, police arrested an SBSI official, **Riswan Lubis**, at his home in Medan.

Open clashes erupted again the following morning, Friday 15 April, as thousands of workers from the industrial centres outside Medan were prevented by security forces from entering the city to meet the Governor. They were met by thousands of fully-armed troops of the Police Mobile Brigade, soldiers from the District Military Command (KODIM), as well as crack airforce troops (LINUD), military police (POM), and regular police units. At least nine armoured vehicles were deployed nearby and helicopters patrolled overhead. An estimated 25,000 workers, unable to enter Medan, gathered and continued their protests in the surrounding industrial areas. At about 11.30 am, in an attempt to disperse the crowd, troops fired their weapons over the heads of protesters, who sought cover within the walls of nearby factories. According to one report, still unconfirmed, one factory, PT OCI, which closed its gates to the protesters, became the focus of the crowd's anger; the glass walls of the company's office were smashed, company property was destroyed and several vehicles were burned.

By 16 April, the military authorities had deployed an additional four battalions, or about 2,600 troops, in the Medan area. In spite of the heavy military and police presence, and an official ban on all public gatherings announced by North Sumatra Regional Military Commander, Major General Pranowo, strikes and demonstrations continued in the industrial areas around Medan. At a demonstration on 16 April in Pematang Siantar, about 120 kilometres south of Medan, a number of women workers were reportedly injured during clashes with security forces. Demonstrations and strikes continued in the satellite towns of Belawan, Delitua, Tanjung Morawa, Lubuk Pakam, and in Pematang Siantar until 22 April, resulting in further violence and scores more arrests. Riots were also reported in various parts of Jakarta. By Monday 25 April most demonstrations had ceased, and the situation appeared at least superficially to have returned to normal. However, arrests of SBSI officials continued.

3. Assessing Responsibility for the Violence

Military and government authorities were quick to blame the SBSI leadership for the violence, and thereby to justify a crackdown on the organization and on demonstrating workers. At a press conference on 20 April, the Armed Forces (ABRI) Chief of General Staff, Lt General H.B.L. Mantiri, told journalists that the authorities had "...data indicating that SBSI...masterminded the violent worker rallies".² The Regional Military Commander for North Sumatra, Major General A. Pranowo, accused the SBSI of using tactics and methods similar to those of the banned Indonesian Communist Party (PKI).³ The Regional Military Commander for Central Java went further, suggesting that SBSI leader, Muchtar Pakpahan, was personally responsible for inciting the demonstrations, and alleging that his father had been a member of the PKI-affiliated peasant organization (*Barisan Tani Indonesia* - BTI).⁴

On 25 April 1994, the Ministry of the Interior went beyond its refusal to recognize the SBSI and declared that it was "illegal" and "banned from carrying out any kind of activity."⁵ One day before the official ban, a meeting at the SBSI headquarters in Jakarta was raided by armed police and soldiers. In the following weeks, local SBSI officials throughout the country - and in particular those in Tangerang - were summoned for questioning by military authorities, and warned to cease their activities. According to reports, local military authorities also approached the parents of SBSI officials at their homes with similar warnings. As a consequence, many resigned from the organization, or ceased their activities.

² *Jakarta Post*, 21.4.94.

³ *Tempo*, 30.4.94.

⁴ *Tempo*, 30.4.94.

⁵ *AP*, 24.4.94.

Non-governmental organizations, including Indonesia's prestigious Legal Aid Institute (*Lembaga Bantuan Hukum - LBH*), offered a different assessment of the causes of the unrest. They accused security forces of provoking the violence by employing excessive force in dealing with the legitimate demands of workers. They also expressed concern that the military authorities had deliberately diverted attention from the underlying social and economic issues by focusing on the racial dimension of the unrest, and had used this to justify heavy-handed intervention.⁶

Some observers went further and suggested that the violence and the anti-Chinese rhetoric may have been deliberately stimulated by *agents provocateurs* with close links to the armed forces intelligence services. The evidence remains difficult to verify, but SBSI officials claim that local thugs in Medan have admitted they were paid to provoke violence and anti-Chinese sentiment.⁷ In an interview with an Indonesian newspaper, published on 22 April, two middle-ranking military officers reportedly admitted that they had infiltrated the demonstration.⁸ Labour activists also claim that a video recording of an earlier demonstration in Medan, on 13 March 1994, revealed an army lieutenant in civilian clothes shouting "Dismiss Suharto!" apparently in an attempt to stimulate anti-government sentiment.

Also cited as evidence of deliberate provocation were the pamphlets and banners bearing overtly anti-Chinese slogans which appeared mysteriously toward the end of the first day of the demonstration. In unusually blunt language, one of the pamphlets said:

Annihilate the Chinese, who are colonialists... rapists, and thieves of the national wealth belonging to native Indonesians...Send the Chinese back home because Indonesia is not their land.

In marked contrast to the hand-painted banners carried by workers earlier in the day, bearing demands for improved working conditions, the anti-Chinese pamphlets were professionally (if hastily) printed. While it is not possible to confirm that they were the work of officially-sponsored *agents provocateurs*, the openly inflammatory and racist character of the pamphlets, their relative sophistication of production, the timing of their release, and the marked inconsistency of their content with the expressed demands of the demonstrating workers, tend to support the view that they were not produced by those who organized the original labour demonstrations.

⁶ "Siaran Pers Yayasan Lembaga Bantuan Hukum Indonesia tentang Pemogokan dan Unjuk Rasa di Medan", 18.4.94.

⁷ *Jakarta Post*, 19.4.94.

⁸ *Sinar Harapan*, 22.4.94.

Such allegations have inevitably led to comparisons between the Medan unrest and the Malari (*Malapetaka 15 Januari*) affair of 1974. In the latter case, it is widely believed that hired thugs, backed by a key military figure, transformed a peaceful student protest against the visit of Japanese Prime Minister Tanaka into an anti-Chinese riot, resulting in widespread destruction of property and eleven deaths. The authorities used the violence as a justification for the arrest and imprisonment of key opposition figures. The memory of Malari has heightened concern that the Medan unrest may ultimately lead to the trial and imprisonment of SBSI officials.

4. The Prisoners

More than 100 workers and activists were detained in connection with the labour unrest in Medan. As of early May, at least 50 remained in police custody, 37 of them at Medan Police headquarters (Poltabes Medan) and 13 at the police station (Polsek) of nearby Tanjung Morawa (See Appendix I). Most of those still detained were understood to have been charged with criminal offences, such as destruction of property, and assault. However, at least five officials of SBSI-Medan were reportedly being held for their role in organizing the demonstrations. Although they have yet to be formally charged, Amnesty International believes they may have been detained solely for their non-violent labour activism. This concern has been heightened by military allegations that the SBSI was responsible for the anti-Chinese violence, and that it has links with the PKI, allegations which could be used as a justification for bringing its officials to trial for subversion or other political crimes.

Among the five whom Amnesty International believes may be prisoners of conscience is **Riswan Lubis**, the Secretary of SBSI's Medan branch, who was arrested by police at his home at about 2am on 15 April 1994. Colleagues who saw him in detention at Poltabes Medan several days later, said it appeared that he had been beaten by his captors. Riswan Lubis has been detained by military authorities on a number of occasions in recent years because of his work on behalf of workers but, to Amnesty International's knowledge, he has never before been formally charged. Indonesian human rights lawyers report that he may now be charged with incitement, and possibly with subversion. If he is found guilty of incitement, he faces a maximum term of six years in prison, while if convicted of subversion he faces a maximum penalty of death.

Hayati, the Treasurer of SBSI-Medan and an employee of PT Otani, was detained by police on 16 April. He was still being held at Medan Police headquarters (Poltabes) as of early May, but had yet to be charged. Amnesty International believes he may be a prisoner of conscience.

Three other SBSI officials were arrested on 29 April, and remained in detention at Poltabes Medan as of early May. They were **Amosi Telaumbanua**, the Chairman of SBSI-Medan, **Soniman Lafao**, the Vice-Chairman, and **Fatiwanolo Zega**, the Deputy-Secretary. All three had been sought by military and police authorities for their role in organizing the April demonstrations and a series of strikes in March. As of 7 May they had yet to be charged, but human rights lawyers and SBSI officials believed they might be charged with inciting the demonstrations. All three are believed to be possible prisoners of conscience.

High ranking military officers had reportedly demanded that the three be handed over to the military authorities, rather than the police, on the grounds that they were wanted on political charges.⁹ Human rights lawyers and SBSI officials insisted that they should be detained by the police, not the military, in accordance with the law. In addition to concern about the legality of arrest procedures they feared that, if the three were turned over to the military, they might be held incommunicado and subjected to torture or ill-treatment. Following discussions with military authorities in Jakarta on 28 April, the three were handed over to police in Medan on 29 April.

A long-time labour activist, Amosi Telaumbanua has been arrested by the military on at least three occasions in the past twelve years, and twice ill-treated or tortured while in custody. In 1982, military authorities reportedly abducted him from his home, and took him to the KODIM headquarters in Medan, where he was accused of being a communist and beaten. He was released without charge, but subsequently dismissed from his job at PT Korek Api Deli. In March 1992, he was again arrested by the military, together with Riswan Lubis and a number of others, and accused of organizing a strike at PT Rotanindo. On that occasion, he was held at the KODIM for five days, during which time he was reportedly tortured. In August 1992, Amosi Telaumbanua was appointed chairman of the Medan branch of the newly formed SBSI. In May 1993, he was arrested by the military and held at the KODIM for eight days, accused of organizing a strike at PT Tambaksari Jalmorejo. He was released without charge, and subsequently dismissed from his job.

The authorities have reportedly also interfered with Amosi Telaumbanua's relatives. Three days before his arrest, police detained a woman who had been asked to care for two of Amosi's children while he was in hiding. She was released after questioning but, on her return home, discovered that the children, aged 9 and 10, had disappeared. Their whereabouts remained unknown for three days but, following Amosi Telaumbanua's arrest on 29 April, they reappeared.

⁹ Although Indonesia's Code of Criminal Procedure stipulates that sole authority for the arrest and interrogation of criminal suspects rests with the police, the military routinely assumes these functions in political cases.

5. Other Violations Against Labour Activists

The unrest in Medan took place against a background of rising labour unrest in Indonesia, and increasing concern about the government's use of repressive measures to deal with it. Military and police intervention has not always entailed the actual use of physical violence. More often, arbitrary detention and the threat of violence or imprisonment have been sufficient to silence the voices of workers and activists, at least temporarily. However, where these methods have proved ineffective, and workers have continued to strike or voice their concerns, the resort to overt violence by the military and police has been swift. The serious consequences of this approach are highlighted by the death of two young labour activists within the past year, Marsinah and Rusli.

Marsinah

Marsinah, a factory worker aged 25, was "disappeared", tortured, raped and killed in East Java in early May 1993 because of her role as a labour activist. The circumstances of her "disappearance" and death, and of the official investigation into her death, strongly suggest that the murder was planned and carried out with the knowledge and acquiescence of military authorities. Answering insistent demands that the perpetrators be brought to justice, the authorities brought murder charges against nine company executives and staff, while charging an Army Captain with disciplinary offences.

Marsinah was found dead in a small shack at the edge of a field about 200 kilometres from her home in Porong, East Java, on 8 May. Her body was bloodied and covered in bruises, and her neck bore the marks of strangulation. An autopsy revealed that her attackers had thrust a blunt instrument into her vagina causing severe bleeding.

In the days before her death, Marsinah had been actively involved in a strike at the watch factory where she worked. Military authorities, including the Commanders of the District Military Command (KODIM) and the Sub-District Military Command (KORAMIL), had intervened directly in the dispute, and interrogated the workers about their role in the strike. On 5 May, 13 workers were summoned by the military and forced to resign or face charges for holding "illegal meetings" or "inciting" others to strike. During the interrogations, some workers were beaten and one was threatened with death. That evening Marsinah went to the local military headquarters to look for her colleagues. She subsequently "disappeared" and her body was found three days later.

Pressure from labour activists and human rights groups forced the police to open an investigation, but it was swiftly taken over by military intelligence authorities. At the outset the authorities strenuously denied that Marsinah's death was related to the labour dispute, and attempted to underplay all evidence of military involvement. However, in November 1993,

nine civilians, all of them company staff or executives, and one military officer, the KORAMIL Commander, were charged in connection with the murder and brought to trial. Extreme irregularities in the arrest, investigation and trial procedures - which violated both international law and Indonesia's Code of Criminal Procedure - suggested that the trials were intended primarily to obscure the role of the military in the killing. One prominent Indonesian human rights activist, T. Mulya Lubis, commented:

*"The killing of Marsinah already represents an example of the wrongful and sickening use of authority...Now the investigation of her death is being conducted by means of abuse of authority that is even more sickening."*¹⁰

Several of the accused, including one woman, were kidnapped by military intelligence officers in early October, held incommunicado for up to three weeks, and forced to confess to the murder, some of them under torture. During the trials, all nine civilian defendants retracted their interrogation statements saying that they had been extracted under duress or torture. In March, the National Human Rights Commission confirmed that some of the defendants had been tortured, physically and mentally, and that their basic rights had been violated by the military authorities. Despite this evidence, the court proceeded with the trials, and by April 1994, four of the defendants had been convicted, three of them receiving sentences of 12 years. The sole military officer arrested, the KORAMIL Commander, was said to have been charged only with a disciplinary offence for failing to report a crime, and will not be tried in a civilian court.

Following months of independent investigation together with other non-governmental organizations, the LBH concluded in March 1994 that there was a strong possibility that Marsinah had been killed in the KODIM headquarters, and that ultimate responsibility for the murder rested with higher ranking military authorities. Even the National Human Rights Commission suggested that the rights of the defendants had been abused and that "other parties" may have been involved in Marsinah's murder. However, neither the LBH nor the Human Rights Commission have the authority to bring criminal charges against the suspected perpetrators, so the sham trials have continued and those believed responsible have remained beyond the reach of the law.

Amnesty International urges the Indonesian authorities to consider seriously the findings of both the LBH and the National Human Rights Commission, and to act promptly to ensure that those responsible for Marsinah's murder be brought promptly to justice in a civilian court. It also calls upon the authorities to ensure that those responsible for the illegal detention, ill-treatment and torture of the civilians currently on trial, or already sentenced, be brought promptly to justice in a civilian court.

¹⁰ *Asiaweek*, 5 January 1994

Rusli

The body of **Rusli**, aged 22, was found floating in the Deli River on 13 March 1994 behind PT Industri Karet Deli (PT IKD), the rubber-goods factory where he worked. Two days earlier, he had taken part in a strike that had been broken up by soldiers and Police Mobile Brigades.¹¹ According to SBSI officials, the strike began peacefully, but when a company manager and security guards from PT IKD punched and shouted abuse at two workers, other workers reportedly reacted by throwing stones and attacking factory property. Shortly thereafter, scores of armed soldiers and Police Mobile Brigades confronted the workers, using batons and tear gas. Hundreds of workers fled, several of them seeking refuge by jumping or wading across the Deli River behind the factory.

Police detained 29 workers and activists during and after the strike. Most had been released by the end of March, but police announced that some might be brought to trial. A number of those detained claimed that they had been beaten while under interrogation by police. They included **Sukiman** (alias **Yusuf**), a worker at PT IKD and father of two, who was detained by police in plainclothes near his home on the afternoon of the strike. According to reports, Sukiman was put into a vehicle owned by PT IKD and driven to a warehouse in the direction of a nearby plantation (PTP IX), where he was tortured. He was then taken to Poltabes Medan. Relatives reported that, when they visited him in custody there a few days later, he had open wounds on his body and his face and legs were severely bruised. Another worker, identified as **Smt** (possibly a PT IKD worker named **Sumartono**), was also said to have been beaten while in custody at Poltabes Medan.¹² North Sumatra police authorities denied that any of the detainees had been ill-treated.¹³

Police authorities in Medan said that Rusli had fallen into the river during the commotion at the factory, and drowned. Rusli's relatives, co-workers and human rights organizations expressed doubt about the official version of events, and demanded a thorough investigation. They said that an autopsy had revealed a wound on his forehead, possibly caused by a blow with a blunt instrument.¹⁴ According to these sources, Rusli had been beaten by security forces before either falling or being pushed into the river. Relatives pointed out that, as a proficient swimmer, Rusli would have been unlikely to drown in the relatively shallow waters of the Deli River. In view of this evidence, and indications that other workers arrested during the strike were ill-treated or tortured, Amnesty International believes that official responsibility for Rusli's death cannot be ruled out.

¹¹ The strike involved several thousands of workers from three neighbouring factories.

¹² *Kompas*, 17.3.94.

¹³ *Suara Pembaruan*, 18.3.94.

¹⁴ The autopsy was conducted at Dr Pirngadi General Hospital in Medan on 13 March 1994.

In mid-April, following pressure from local human rights groups, company officials provided compensation (Rp. 10 million, or about US \$4,830) to Rusli's wife. However, despite uncertainty about the cause of his death, and strong indications of official responsibility, no official investigation was known to have been conducted, thereby fuelling suspicion of an official cover-up and prompting demands by workers and activists, as well as the National Human Rights Commission, for justice to be done.¹⁵ Amnesty International supports these demands and calls on the Indonesian authorities to conduct a thorough investigation to determine the precise circumstances of Rusli's death, to make the results of the investigation public and to bring those who may be found responsible promptly to justice in a civilian court.

¹⁵ In a letter dated 11 April 1994 the Chairman of the National Human Rights Commission urged the Chief of Police for North Sumatra to conduct a prompt and thorough investigation into Rusli's death. He also urged the Minister of Manpower to examine the case.

APPENDIX I

Workers and labour activists detained in Medan as of early May 1994 (Names in bold are possible prisoners of conscience)

Name, Age (Place of Employment)	Place of Detention (Date of Detention)
Amosi Telaumbanua (Chairman, SBSI-Medan)	Poltabes Medan (29.4.94)
Fatiwanolo Zega (Deputy Secretary, SBSI-Medan)	Poltabes Medan (29.4.94)
Hayati , 21, (Treasurer, SBSI-Medan)	Poltabes Medan (16.4.94)
Riswan Lubis (Secretary, SBSI-Medan)	Poltabes Medan (15.4.94)
Soniman Lafao (Vice-Chairman, SBSI-Medan)	Poltabes Medan (29.4.94)
Andar Pasaribu, 26 (PT Cipta Rimba Jaya)	Poltabes Medan
Ardin Zega, 25 (PT Gunung Gahapi Sakti)	Poltabes Medan (20.4.94)
Aries Hia, 27 (PT Juta Jelita)	Poltabes Medan
Arifin, 18 (PT Ganda Seribu)	Poltabes Medan (17.4.94)
Arozidu Zega (PT Larissa)	Poltabes Medan (20.4.94)
Budiman Sahri (PT Perindoni)	Poltabes Medan
Effendi Tarigan (PT Growth Sumatra)	Poltabes Medan
Hanafi, 21 (PT Ganda Seribu)	Poltabes Medan (17.4.94)
Irawadi, 24 (PT Growth Asia)	Poltabes Medan
Jafar Siddik, 26 (PT Irom)	Poltabes Medan
Jamian Marpaung, 36 (PT Golgon)	Poltabes Medan (16.4.94)
Juman, 17 (PT Deni Works or PT IKD)	Poltabes Medan
Marzuki Siregar, 20 (PT Bintang Cemara)	Poltabes Medan
Mohammad Ali, 19 (PT Perindoni)	Poltabes Medan
Mulyadi, 24 (PT Ganda Seribu)	Poltabes Medan (18.4.94)
Nobel Samosir, 22 (PD Romas)	Poltabes Medan

Nurlela Manalu, 24 (PT Unibis)	Poltabes Medan
Poniman, 20 (PT Musi Mas)	Poltabes Medan
Ramli, 42 (PT Growth Asia)	Poltabes Medan (16.4.94)
Rianto, 25 (PT Unibis)	Poltabes Medan
Ridwan, 22 (PT Unibis)	Poltabes Medan
Ridwan, 42 (PT Golgon)	Poltabes Medan (16.4.94)
Robert Sitompul, 21 (PT Perindoni)	Poltabes Medan
Sudiaman Zega (PT Larissa)	Poltabes Medan (20.4.94)
Sugiono, 24 (PT Mosply)	Poltabes Medan (16.4.94)
Suyatno, 23 (Construction worker)	Poltabes Medan
Syahril, 28 (Bus Conductor)	Poltabes Medan
Syamsudin Lubis, 22 (PT Golgon)	Poltabes Medan (16.4.94)
Syamsul Bahri, 18 (Auto shop, Glugur)	Poltabes Medan
Tehnik Menalu, 21 (unemployed)	Poltabes Medan
Usahanta Ginting, 22 (PT Ganda Seribu)	Poltabes Medan
Zulkifli Sipahutar, 30 (PT Growth Asia)	Poltabes Medan (16.4.94)