



Minerva Access is the Institutional Repository of The University of Melbourne

Author/s:

McGregor, K

Title:

The Making of a Global Activist: The Indonesian Human Rights Campaigner, Carmel Budiardjo

Date:

2018

Citation:

McGregor, K. (2018). The Making of a Global Activist: The Indonesian Human Rights Campaigner, Carmel Budiardjo. Edberg, S (Ed.). Scalmer, S (Ed.). The Transnational Activist: Transformations and Comparisons from the Anglo World since the Nineteenth Century, The Transnational Activist: Transformations and Comparisons from the Anglo World since the Nineteenth Century, (1), pp.165-192. Palgrave Macmillan.

Persistent Link:

<https://hdl.handle.net/11343/251932>

## **The Making of a Transnational Activist: The Indonesian Human Rights Campaigner Carmel Budiardjo<sup>1</sup>**

Katharine McGregor, The University of Melbourne

This chapter presents a biographical analysis of British born transnational activist Carmel Budiardjo, who is best known for her work in campaigning for the release of Indonesian political prisoners. Research in the field of social movements has increasingly recognized the insights that the lives of individual transnational activists provide into understanding what drives and sustains social movements and related political activism.<sup>2</sup> As Della Porta has suggested life histories highlight how ‘history is transformed in individual cognition, how public events intervene into private life, how perceptions of the world influence action.’<sup>3</sup> Through my analysis of Carmel’s life story I hope to complicate scholarly understandings of left political activism that took place in the context of the larger Cold War and to highlight how people to people connections across the Anglo and non-Anglo world have influenced political activism.

Carmel’s development of a cosmopolitan outlook crucially shaped her path to becoming a transnational political activist. I trace her early life as the child of Polish Jewish migrants in Britain, her increasing engagement with British society throughout high school and university as the war broke out, and then with people from different national backgrounds as a communist student activist in the post-war period. Carmel developed close relationships with Indonesians on the political left through her involvement with the International Union of Students (IUS). Through these contracts I argue Carmel developed a new critical awareness of the effects of imperialism. Her life story reinforces David Featherstone’s call for a reconsideration of how anti-colonial networks led to new connections across ‘deeply uneven geographies’.<sup>4</sup> In the 1940s and 1950s her activism with the IUS focused on global issues such as anti-fascism and anti-imperialism, and building international solidarity.

From the early 1950s following her marriage to an Indonesian and her migration to Indonesia Carmel focused on contributing to the development of a socialist society in Indonesia. I examine the consequences of that activism and of her subsequent

imprisonment in and Indonesian gaol along with fellow activists on the political Left following the violent anti-communist repression of 1965-1968. These experiences led her to found TAPOL a transnational advocacy organization for Indonesian political prisoners based in London. This was a targeted case of advocacy conducted primarily across the Anglo world due to very limited possibilities of activism inside Indonesia.

Carmel's life story fits in some ways with Sidney Tarrow's characterization of a 'rooted cosmopolitan' because she mobilized 'domestic and international resources and opportunities to advance claims on behalf of external actors, against external opponents'.<sup>5</sup> Yet the basis of her roots shifted over time. Throughout the chapter I consider how her position as both an insider and outsider informed her activism. The chapter also considers Carmel's position as a British activist on the political left in the broader context of the Cold War, which has shaped not only her fate but also enduring perceptions about left-wing activism.

### **Carmel's Early Life: The Making of a Cosmopolitan**

Carmel Brickman was born in 1925 in London to Jewish parents of Polish/ Russian background who had migrated as children to Britain. The Brickmans originally lived in the working-class East End, where the largest Jewish community in London was concentrated, with numerous kosher food shops and other retailers that catered to the exclusively Jewish clientele.<sup>6</sup> Later her father, who was just getting by as a clothes cutter, decided to open up a small shop in Greenwich, which is south of the East End and across the River Thames.<sup>7</sup> It was in Greenwich, where there were not many other Jewish families, that Carmel spent her childhood.

Despite the fact that she lived in a non-Jewish neighborhood Carmel described her parents as quite insular. Their lives revolved around Jewish rituals and they expected their children to socialize within the Jewish community.<sup>8</sup> As Jewish migrants in the late 19<sup>th</sup> to early 20<sup>th</sup> century, her parents' families fled from a climate of strong anti-Semitism and economic discrimination in Poland.<sup>9</sup> Carmel felt a sense of gratitude to Britain for giving her parents sanctuary. In Britain, however, many Jewish migrants were subject to further discrimination. Most members of the Jewish community

supported the Labor Party, with only a small number supporting the conservatives or the British Communist Party. Although Carmel's parents never joined a political party, she described her family as fiercely anti-fascist.<sup>10</sup> This is a position consistent with the politics of more radical sections of the Jewish community in the East End. In 1936, for example, a number of Jewish East Enders organized a street blockade on Cable Street to protest against the anti-Semitic British Union of Fascists headed by Sir Oswald Ernald Mosley.<sup>11</sup> In the 1930s anti-semitism was on the rise across many countries in Europe. Her peers at the Catholic school which she attended teased her for being Jewish.

Her later years in high school overlapped with the outbreak of the Second World War. Living in London meant that Carmel and her family experienced war close up during the bombing campaigns from September 1940 onwards. Due to the bombings Carmel's school was forced to relocate to a small village called Crowhurst near Sussex, and from there to the seaside resort of Bexhill, and then to Ammanford in South Wales where the students stayed for a couple of years. Because her family was strict about kosher food and it was not available in South Wales, they would only make day visits to see Carmel. During evacuations the availability of kosher food became a major issue for Jewish communities, thus restricting their ability to relocate.<sup>12</sup> Carmel was billeted out to local families during this time. Lipman notes that one effect of this common practice was to 'plunge Jewish children, used to the routines of life in a more or less traditional Jewish environment into a non-Jewish home life'.<sup>13</sup> During the war Carmel thus had even more exposure beyond her Catholic school environment to people of different backgrounds.

Anti-Semitism in Britain escalated during the war. This included attacks on small shop owners who were accused of taking advantage of war-time shortages to sell goods at higher prices.<sup>14</sup> Such attitudes may have affected her father as a small shop owner. At the same time, as members of the Jewish community, Carmel and her parents would have been aware of the increasing persecution of Jews by the Nazis in continental Europe. The British press, for example, reported as early as 1939 of German plans to exterminate the Jews.<sup>15</sup> At the end of the war, the press published photographs of the Nazi crematoria and death camps.<sup>16</sup> Despite relatively open reporting on the Holocaust in Britain, Carmel stated in an interview that, although she

heard stories about what was happening, she did not remember talking about it much. It is likely, however, that her Jewish background and life experiences made her sensitive to the persecution of minorities.

In 1942 at age 18, Carmel began a university degree majoring in sociology and economics at the London School of Economics. By 1938 Lipman reports that only 2% of the entire British population attended schooling at age 19 or above and of those people only 2% were Jewish.<sup>17</sup> She would have been one of only a few Jewish women attending university at this time to attend university. Through the experiences of moving outside her family's culture Carmel was forming an increasingly cosmopolitan identity. Following Stuart Hall's definition of a cosmopolitan, she by now already had the 'ability to stand outside having one's life scripted by any one community'.<sup>18</sup> She continued to follow this trend into the 1950s, expanding her connections and experiences.

### **Carmel's Student Activism: Becoming an Internationalist**

During her time as a student at the London School of Economics, Carmel became active in the British National Union of Students (NUS). The Union was established in 1922 to represent the interests of British students abroad. Originally, the NUS was politically neutral and only concerned with issues that affected 'students as such'. During the war, however, their President Brian Simon pushed for the NUS to provide more support for students during the conflict whereas other members wanted to disband the organization. Some in the NUS mistrusted Simon and the NUS executive because they were Communists.<sup>19</sup> Carmel, who was working in international section of the NUS, was also a member of the British Communist Party at this time.<sup>20</sup> She was attracted to the party because of its strong opposition to rising anti-Semitism in Britain and abroad during the war.<sup>21</sup> Although she rarely talked about her membership of the party in an interview in the 1990s she stated 'my left wing politics had a lot to do with my Jewish background'.<sup>22</sup> Yet the party's emphasis on greater equality amongst people may have equally appealed to her as a person whose parents were originally of working class background and committed anti-fascists.

The NUS had a strong internationalist outlook, but working in the international department of the Union also gave Carmel further exposure to students from diverse countries. England was the centre of student activism in Europe, due to the German occupation on the continent, and the fact many students from the occupied countries had fled to England as political refugees.<sup>23</sup> Experiences of war including bombings, losing family members and homes, fighting at the front and/or resisting the Nazis Occupation crucially shaped their activism.

In November 1945, Carmel attended the World Youth Conference in London as an NUS official. The conference brought together over four hundred delegates from 63 countries from a diverse range of political and religious backgrounds.<sup>24</sup> It resulted in the founding of the World Federation of Democratic Youth (WFDY). The conference issued an oath by which delegates swore

to weld unity amongst youths of the whole world, youths from all races, of all colour skins, from all nations and all religions. We promise to destroy the remnants of fascism from the face of the earth and to build eternal friendship amongst all peoples on earth.<sup>25</sup>

This idealistic oath reveals a focus on trying to overcome differences and address the legacies of racism and prejudice that had underpinned World War Two. Looking back on the war, delegates also promised to remember friends who had died and to ensure young people would never again be destroyed by war.

Following the London conference, Carmel helped organize a more specific World Students' Congress in Prague in August 1946, the same year that she graduated from LSE.<sup>26</sup> The congress included 223 delegates who focused on formulating causes that they thought students should support in the post-war world. Delegates decided that their mission would include continuing struggles against fascism and oppression, contributing to relief work in war-damaged countries and promoting peace, security and democratization worldwide.<sup>27</sup> The congress promoted increased international contacts amongst students through student exchange, travel and sports. The idea was that personal encounters would 'bolster internationalism amongst students'.<sup>28</sup> The conference resulted in the founding of the International Union of Students (IUS).

Through member organizations, congresses and related publications the IUS sought to diffuse its ideas and programs to students around the world.

In 1946 the goals of the IUS reflected a commitment to global equality.<sup>29</sup> Further to this, the IUS recognized ongoing global inequalities of the post-war period in the form of colonial oppression. For many Asian countries such as India, Vietnam and Indonesia, the end of the war had presented an opportunity for independence. Indonesian Republicans had declared independence in August 1945, but they were forced into a colonial war when the Dutch tried to retake the Netherlands East Indies. Recognizing this struggle, the Congress preparatory committee, of which Carmel was a member, sent messages of support to Indonesian students in the quest 'for a freer and better future'.<sup>30</sup> Two Indonesian delegates representing 5,000 Indonesian students then attended the Prague Congress.<sup>31</sup>

In formulating the issues that students should focus on, congress delegates drew attention to the specific challenges for students in colonized countries. They noted:

In colonial and semi-colonial countries the immediate task is political and economic liberation, and the students of these countries have to intensify their social, political and intellectual progress. Students of all nations should strive to aid them in this struggle.<sup>32</sup>

The call for students from 'all nations' to aid students from colonized countries could suggest the perpetuation of colonial hierarchies. Jodi Burkett has, for example, argued that students from the NUS, the British-affiliated member organization of the IUS to which Carmel originally belonged, viewed themselves as only ever providing aid, but not receiving it due to 'longstanding British feelings of 'obligation' or 'responsibility' or even paternalism rather than solidarity in their international relationships'.<sup>33</sup> But this does not seem to have been Carmel's position.

Carmel asserted that through her contact with representatives from colonized countries in the IUS, she learnt for the first time critical perspectives on colonialism. She explained that she had been very unaware of such perspectives, and as a child she had in fact waved British flags at school to celebrate Empire Day.<sup>34</sup> According to

David Featherstone, solidarity is ‘a relation formed through political struggle that seeks to challenge oppression’ which can involve ‘active creation of new ways of relating’.<sup>35</sup> Carmel’s personal story suggests that through contacts developed in the IUS and the shared commitment to challenging global oppression she became more aware of her ‘implication’ in colonialism and found new ways of relating to students from colonized countries.

One of the first Indonesians that Carmel met was the Indonesian IUS delegate Suripno from the National Union of Indonesian Students who became an IUS Council member.<sup>36</sup> Suripno spent the war years studying in Holland and fighting underground with the Dutch Communist Party. He returned to Indonesia in 1946 a year into the independence war with the Dutch and continued to be active in international youth activities.<sup>37</sup> Part of Suripno’s mission in Europe was to seek out stronger relations and aid from foreign governments in the face of increasing Dutch threats at home.<sup>38</sup>

In his early analysis of the IUS that is framed heavily in terms of Cold War rivalry, Altbach suggested that this organization actively tried to recruit representation from the Third World so as to further Soviet influence in these countries. In his view then, the IUS was an instrument of Soviet control.<sup>39</sup> But this view ignores the motivations of individuals and their beliefs concerning what the IUS offered them. In IUS forums, for example, Suripno sought to expose examples of the extremes of Dutch violence and to call out the United States for providing aid- under the aegis of Marshall Plan aid- to the Dutch, which he alleged was being used in part to fund the war against Indonesia.<sup>40</sup> Thinking about Suripno he was, in many ways, also a ‘rooted cosmopolitan’ advocating for Indonesia abroad.<sup>41</sup> He clearly felt that the IUS offered Indonesians valuable support. Indeed one resolution at the founding congress in Prague was that IUS members should continue to oppose colonialism.<sup>42</sup>

Following the Prague congress, Carmel travelled to Yugoslavia together with Suripno as part of an international youth brigade sponsored by the IUS to assist in rebuilding Yugoslavia. The fact that, in this case, representatives from the so-called Third World joined in ‘aiding’ people of the so-called Second World of Eastern Europe suggests again that the IUS was trying to foster diverse solidarities not always based on First to Third World hierarchies. The People’s Youth of Yugoslavia conceived and oversaw

the railway project.<sup>43</sup> Taking up the IUS mandate to assist with post-war relief work, the IUS brigade was tasked with assisting in building the so-called Yugoslav Youth Railway, a 150-mile railway line through Sarajevo and Samac that would provide a transport link from Bosnia to Slavonia.

Students from twenty countries, excluding Russia and the United States, joined this project working together with mostly Yugoslavian peasants, workers and soldiers to excavate tunnels along the mountainside and lay tracks. There was a large delegation from Britain sourced from the British Yugoslav Association. E. P Thomson, then a student at Cambridge University who went on to become a famous Marxist historian, headed the British brigade. In his written account of working on the railway, Thompson observed that the common saying amongst brigade members summed up his personal experience: 'We build the railway. The railway builds us'.<sup>44</sup> Working on the railway project offered Thomson insights into the growing socialist values of Yugoslavia and the potential of collective efforts.<sup>45</sup> Carmel emphasized her experience of intense camaraderie and a growing fascination with Indonesia. At night each national brigade would invite other brigades into their own camp. Railway workers would perform songs, eat, talk, dance and sing together. It was in this context that Carmel recalled watching Suripno perform a classical Javanese dance.<sup>46</sup>

In 1947 Carmel returned to Prague to work at the IUS secretariat. She picked up Czech language. She noted that, although she had friends from all countries including Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Romania, she felt closest to students from Asia (Indians, Burmese, Vietnamese, Chinese and Indonesians) while she was working in Prague. This was possibly because of her experience of being a minority in British society and her empathy thus with Asian students who were a minority in the IUS and living in an unfamiliar context. There was a large group of Indonesians living in the Czech capital, and Carmel frequently mixed with them at their social events. The Indonesians often told her about their struggle against colonialism.<sup>47</sup>

More Indonesians came to Prague when the IUS and the WFDY jointly hosted a World Festival for Youth and Students in 1947. This was a crucial time for the fledgling Indonesian Republic as the Dutch had just carried out military aggressions against the Republicans. As a result, some Indonesians gave up their Dutch

scholarships and went to Prague.<sup>48</sup> Together with other Indonesian delegates from home, they used the festival to promote their opposition to the Dutch military attacks on the Republic. They called upon Dutch and other youths to work together with them to oppose the aggressions.<sup>49</sup> They used this large gathering of 17,000 youths from 73 countries to plead their case.

Through her role in the IUS, Carmel was given opportunities to travel the world. The IUS sent her to India in November 1947 for three months to help prepare for the February 1948 Calcutta Conference of Southeast Asian Youths and Students Fighting for Freedom and Independence.<sup>50</sup> The Calcutta Conference became controversial because of Western accusations that the Soviets had passed on instructions to Southeast Asian communist delegates to foment revolution on their return home.<sup>51</sup> Although these accusations have been proven unfounded,<sup>52</sup> leftist troops in Indonesia did stage a revolt against the Republican government in September 1948 in the town of Madiun. The result was a Republican-led massacre of key communist leaders including Carmel's friend, Suripno. This was the first large scale repression of the Indonesian Communist Party (Partai Komunis Indonesia, PKI) in Indonesia.

In 1948, Carmel met her future husband, Budiardjo, in Prague at the offices of the IUS. Budiardjo was studying political science on a scholarship at Charles University in Prague. This placed him amongst a relatively small cohort of elite Indonesian students studying abroad.<sup>53</sup> They married in 1950. In 1951, Budiardjo returned to Indonesia with a youth delegation and she followed shortly after with their first child. In marrying Budiardjo and migrating to Indonesia, Carmel took a quite dramatic step given her background and both British and Jewish conventions in the 1950s. Her parents had deep concerns about her marrying a non-Jew, what's more a Muslim and a foreigner with different customs.<sup>54</sup>

### **Life in Indonesia: from Politics to Prison**

When Carmel arrived in Indonesia, she experienced culture shock upon seeing the extremes between the rich and poor in affluent and derelict areas of the capital city of

Jakarta. She encountered beggars on the side of the road.<sup>55</sup> In the 1950s, the Indonesian economy was weak and the government was burdened with heavy debts carried over from the war of independence and from the Dutch government more generally.<sup>56</sup>

Thrown into this new context, Carmel acquired Indonesian language fairly quickly and was then able to work as a translator for Antara news agency. Later, she got a job as a researcher in international economic relations for the Foreign Ministry. She got a job at Padjadjaran State University in Bandung and then at Respublika University in Jakarta, which was run by the Chinese political organization Baperki. Determined to make a contribution to Indonesia, Carmel frequently wrote in newspapers about the Indonesian economy, which was facing increasing pressures in the early 1960s, including severe inflation and a large balance of payments deficit.<sup>57</sup>

As a university graduate and a lecturer, Carmel maintained a commitment to issues concerning university life and students, as well as broader politics. She joined the Indonesian Graduates' Association (Himpunan Sarjana Indonesia, HSI), eventually serving on the central executive and chairing its economics section. In this capacity she was vocal in critiquing Indonesian acceptance of IMF economic stabilization policies in return for economic aid.<sup>58</sup> She opposed free market economics and the lifting of price controls on basic commodities. The general political position of HSI was opposition to imperialism and feudalism, and the promotion of socialism as the best political system. HSI members were very engaged in national and international politics, and they also conducted research into issues such as land ownership and how this might improve the position of Indonesian peasants.<sup>59</sup> Although she was based in Indonesia, Carmel was still involved with the IUS and she continued to go overseas with IUS delegations, sometimes travelling to Australia or New Zealand. She also went to China. On these trips she would address student and faculty meetings.<sup>60</sup>

From the late 1950s till the mid-1960s, despite the suspension of elections, there was fierce competition to increase membership of all Indonesian political parties. The PKI rose in popularity during this period, reaching a membership of 3.5 million people by 1965 and a further 23.5 million in affiliated organizations.<sup>61</sup> Carmel had both direct and indirect connections to the PKI. Firstly Baperki the sponsor of the university

where she lectured was on the political left although not directly aligned with the PKI. Secondly, the HSI was aligned with the PKI. Carmel described the HSI as functioning like a party cell providing feedback on the direction of the party.<sup>62</sup> Further to this, Carmel occasionally did translations for the PKI and she was in contact with some party leaders.<sup>63</sup> She describes herself as a 'semi-clandestine' party member.<sup>64</sup>

From the late 1950s onwards, President Sukarno began to increasingly emphasize implementing the Indonesian revolution. He attacked Western imperialism through the campaigns to reclaim Western New Guinea from the Dutch and to oppose the new nation of Malaysia, which Sukarno viewed as a British neo-colonial project. The government took some steps to advance socialism by passing, for example, the 1959 Share-cropping Law and the 1960 Basic Agrarian Law.<sup>65</sup> But the PKI and President Sukarno were both frustrated by bureaucrats' attempts to stall the implementation of these laws.<sup>66</sup> On university campuses this frustration translated into campaigns to politically retool lecturing staff.

A contemporary of Carmel's in the HSI, Harsutedjo, recalled that most of his peers were convinced that Indonesia would become socialist, or at least implement an Indonesian form of socialism. They were conscious of challenges from conservative groups to left-aligned organizations, yet he claimed 'we felt a sense of strength and that the government was on our side'.<sup>67</sup> Carmel similarly commented in her memoir that, because of the close connection between Sukarno and the PKI, she felt 'political developments seemed to be moving in the direction of radical change and I often felt elated that I was on the 'winning side'.<sup>68</sup> Carmel was perhaps excited about the prospect of living in what she expected to be a truly socialist society, a utopian ideal for many activists of the international left. Increasingly President Sukarno and the PKI looked to Communist China as an ideal model for Indonesian advancement.<sup>69</sup> Carmel was similarly attracted to the PRC.

By 1965, Carmel considered Indonesia her home. She had two children with Budiardjo, and they lived together with his wider family, including at times, her sister-in-law and mother-in-law, a practice very common in Indonesia. Moreover, she sought to assimilate into local society. She wrote in her memoir that, 'During the time I had lived in Indonesia, I had identified closely with Indonesian society and never

lived as an expatriate'.<sup>70</sup> She spent all her work and leisure time with Indonesians.<sup>71</sup> At this stage, Carmel believed that because she was married to an Indonesian she automatically had Indonesian citizenship.

Everything changed dramatically, however, when a movement in which members of an armed group calling itself the September 30<sup>th</sup> Movement kidnapped and killed six high-ranking army generals and a lieutenant on the night of September 30, 1965. The army quickly suppressed the movement and mounted a propaganda campaign linking it to the PKI. The army then targeted known members of the PKI and members of all linked organizations, as well as other supporters of Sukarno. The brutal repression included killings of approximately 500,000 people between 1965 and 1968, and mass detentions of both short and long term duration. Between 600,000 and 750,000 people were detained from 1965 to 1976 in connection with the Movement. Other forms of violence included rape, torture within and outside gaols, the destruction or confiscation of property and forced labour within the prisons and prison camps. It is not clear if Carmel drew immediate parallels with the Holocaust when witnessing this violence unfold, but later in the 1970s when she visited Auschwitz with Indonesian friends she certainly drew parallels.<sup>72</sup>

The army-led repression aimed to remove the radical nationalist President Sukarno and eliminate the Indonesian left. The attack on the Indonesian Communist Party and the rise of a military regime in Indonesia was part of a broader global pattern in the Cold War and a process fully supported by anti-communist Western governments who loathed President Sukarno.

In the days following the Movement, Carmel began to be fearful as stories trickled in from friends about arrests and houses being ransacked. Carmel lost her job at the Foreign Ministry and at university very quickly. Respublika University was attacked by army supporters and shut down. Almost overnight, the army declared people affiliated with the communist party or aligned organizations dangerous. Between 1965 and 1968, Carmel's husband, Budiardjo, who had been working as Assistant Minister at the Ministry of Sea Communications was twice arrested then released each time. Then they were both arrested on 3 September 1968, leaving two children aged 17 and 12 at home with her in-laws. Upon her arrest she was repeatedly

interrogated about what she knew about the PKI and what her role in the PKI had been. In her memoir, she suggested that there was considerable hostility to her views on the Indonesian economy from the new technocrats appointed by the emerging regime, who sought to open up Indonesian markets.<sup>73</sup> Carmel was not tortured, but she frequently witnessed the torture of men and women and its after-effects. Carmel was held in miserable conditions for most of the time throughout her detention, with inadequate food, no bedding and no extra clothing.

The last place of detention where she was held was a women's goal called Bukit Duri, Thorn Hill. She was held there for 15 months and during that time because it was a more permanent place of detention she, like most of the other women there, wondered if she would ever be released. The fates of the great majority of political prisoners were so unclear, because they almost never received a trial or sentence and they were provided with no information about their fates. Although Carmel felt very integrated with Indonesian society, her imprisonment brought up difficult questions for her. In her memoir she wrote:

Now that I was a tapol [tahanan politik- political prisoner] I felt rather uncomfortable about seeing whether being foreign born was going to extricate me. But my fellow prisoners had little time for such qualms. 'Get out of here as fast as you can', they would say, 'and start working for our release'. Their pleas made a strong impression on me, though I had no idea at the time how I would set about it.<sup>74</sup>

She described feeling torn because she did not want to be treated differently, but at the same time her background opened up opportunities not just for herself, but for her fellow prisoners.

Carmel's family tried to organize help from England although the British government was not particularly sympathetic, given that Carmel had supported the Indonesian government in opposing the British government's plans for the new nation of Malaysia. The Confrontation campaign resulted in direct combat in which British soldiers had been killed.<sup>75</sup>

The most effective source of support came from Amnesty International (hereafter AI). Sarah Leigh, a lawyer from AI, secured Carmel's release by successfully arguing for a reinstatement of Carmel's British citizenship on the basis that she was stateless. This provided the grounds for her release.<sup>76</sup> On 9 November 1971 she was and flown back to London where her children had already been relocated. Her husband remained in detention. She was determined to use her new freedom to campaign for the release of her fellow prisoners with who she had shared experiences of joint political activism and imprisonment.

### **Carmel's Return to London and the Founding of TAPOL**

By the time of Carmel's release in the early 1970s, there were fairly limited international sources of support for the hundreds of thousands of Indonesian political prisoners languishing in gaols, detention centres and the penal colonies in remote locations in Indonesia. The Indonesian Left was very isolated politically because President Sukarno and the PKI had sided with the Chinese Communist Party at the time of the Sino-Soviet split in 1960. The government of the Soviet Union did very little to assist. Due to the colonial connection between Indonesia and the Netherlands, there was some support from Dutch scholars and activists in a small group known as the Indonesia Committee headed by Professor Wertheim. In Germany, there was support throughout connections made with West German missionaries in Indonesia.<sup>77</sup> But globally, the issue of Indonesian political prisoners failed to attract a lot of sympathy in the Western world, most likely because the prisoners were viewed as dangerous communists at a time when the war in Vietnam was underway.

Although through Carmel's personal history she was well connected with international socialist networks, she seems to have drawn most support initially from AI, probably due to Indonesia's isolation within the wider socialist world. AI was set up in 1961 by a small group of people in Britain to demand the release of prisoners of conscience by directly challenging individual states. At this time global human rights norms were quite weak, but AI gained increasing legitimacy during the Cold War because of its claim to be non-political and its aim to support political prisoners from a range of different regimes on an individual basis. Each AI adoption group would

adopt prisoners from Eastern, Western and Third World countries to reflect this balanced focus.<sup>78</sup> The most politically effective way to lobby support for the release of Indonesian political prisoners in the Cold War context was to focus on a humanitarian framing and the individual suffering of these prisoners. This was exactly the kind of approach that AI took in its campaigns for Indonesian prisoners, which commenced in 1969 with a letter-writing campaign, and then a major campaign against the penal colony on remote Buru Island, where many long-term prisoners were sent and conscripted into forced labour.<sup>79</sup>

Upon arriving in London, Carmel used the connections she had in AI to set to work almost immediately to help the prisoners she left behind. As in the case of her experiences and knowledge of the horrors of World War Two, she felt compelled to act in response to the Indonesian repression. She began to learn more about AI by working for them in Britain. By the end of November 1971, the same month as her release, she wrote an extensive report for AI on the conditions in Indonesian prisons and cases of torture and the names, stories and locations of prisoners she had met in gaol.<sup>80</sup> AI prepared notes on some of the prisoners that Carmel alerted them to, leading to them becoming AI adoption cases. She was frequently invited by AI to address their groups in the UK and elsewhere.<sup>81</sup>

Carmel felt, however, that despite increasing Western critiques of torture and the infringement of civil liberties, which was largely AI's focus, the Indonesian case was still not getting enough attention.<sup>82</sup> She was frustrated that there were many organizations advocating, for example, the case of Greek political prisoners (following the 1967 military takeover), yet there was far less attention to, and awareness about, what was happening in Indonesia.<sup>83</sup> AI had in fact written an extensive report of Buru Island by this time and AI official Sean MacBride had visited Jakarta to monitor the situation and meet with Indonesian officials in protest.<sup>84</sup> AI was, however, at this stage still consolidating its focus and it had limited resources.

So it was in this context that, in 1973, commencing with a vigil at the Indonesian Embassy in May of that year, Carmel decided to found TAPOL together with her daughter, son-in-law and sister. The first derivation of the organization's name was *TAPOL: the British Campaign for the Release of Indonesian Political Prisoners*. Her

primary motivation for activism was to secure the release of her husband and other Indonesian prisoners whom she had met in gaol.<sup>85</sup> Similar to AI, TAPOL primarily emphasized ‘forgotten prisoners’ and the right to a fair trial as enshrined in principle 10 of the UNDHR- United Nations Declaration on Human Rights. One difficulty TAPOL faced was that it was almost impossible to liaise with advocacy groups inside Indonesia on this case. Only a handful of brave Indonesian lawyers were able to work, in a limited way, on behalf of local prisoners.<sup>86</sup>

To keep the forgotten prisoners in focus, TAPOL used strategic locations and the Indonesian national calendar to hold protest actions. In its first year, 1973, TAPOL organized three vigils outside the Indonesian embassy in Britain at key moments like the 17 August independence Day celebration and in the lead-up to, and during, Inter-Governmental Group of Indonesia meetings, where donor nations and the World Bank met to discuss aid to Indonesia.<sup>87</sup> At these protests they held up small placards with the face of an unknown Indonesian prisoner behind bars, together with other placards condemning the on-going imprisonments. TAPOL was always a fairly small operation initially run from Carmel’s house with several volunteers and a maximum of five or six staff some of whom were part time, yet its rallies could attract a couple of hundred.<sup>88</sup>

In the early years, TAPOL activists engaged in range of activities, often working with other groups such as the Indonesia Committee in Holland, due to limited resources and a shared solidarity. Carmel also established connections with left-leaning European politicians such as Lord Avery who became chairman of the Parliamentary Human Rights Group. Further to this TAPOL representatives, especially Carmel, lobbied the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, the European Commission, the European Parliament and the UN Human Rights Commission and Sub-commission.<sup>89</sup>

In 1974, TAPOL protested in London against Queen Elizabeth’s visit to Indonesia in March of that year. Carmel noted that one difficulty in advocacy work in Britain was that, because it was not a British colony few people knew much about Indonesia.<sup>90</sup> Nevertheless in contrast to the Dutch-based Indonesia Committee, TAPOL functioned in English, which brought in a broader audience. The British government’s

relationship with Indonesia improved significantly after the rise of President Suharto and the formal end to the Confrontation campaign in August 1966.

TAPOL tried to disseminate information on the Indonesian repression via its English language bulletins. The bulletins provided updates on conditions in specific prisons and penal camps. They featured details of particular prisoners' circumstances, called case notes. In January 1974, for example, the bulletin profiled the political prisoner Mrs Siti Mudigdo, reporting that she had served as a member of parliament while representing the PKI, as vice-chair of the Indonesian Women's Movement (Gerwani) and vice-chair of the Women's International Democratic Federation.<sup>91</sup> TAPOL tried to use these short profiles of prisoners to connect readers of the bulletin with specific prisoners. In doing so, like AI adoption cases, it notified foreign governments that the fate of a particular prisoner was being monitored. The information for these case notes came from many sources including Carmel's personal memories as well as foreign and Indonesian sympathizers who had visited prisoners or contacted their families, then travelled from Indonesia to Europe or sent on information by post.<sup>92</sup> Some prisoners were also able to send letters out of prison to TAPOL and other information came via local church groups that helped support particular prisoners.<sup>93</sup>

By profiling individual prisoners, TAPOL seemed to follow the precedent of AI which sought, in Hopgood's words, to 'open the prison door and show you the prisoners' faces and wounds, so you can see and feel for yourself, so your conscience can be touched.'<sup>94</sup> Although they did not regularly gain access to images of detention by identifying specific prisoners, TAPOL like AI, notified foreign governments that the fate of a particular prisoner was being monitored. In a membership drive in 1974, a TAPOL leaflet stated that the principles of TAPOL are identical to AI in that it is 'concerned with the humanitarian aspects of political imprisonment'.<sup>95</sup>

The bulletin at one stage had 900 subscriptions and was also sold in several bookshops. It was distributed across 75 countries in Europe, America, the Pacific and Australia and it also had some subscribers in Indonesia.<sup>96</sup> The Indonesian Legal Aid Foundation (Lembaga Bantuan Hukum, LBH), one of the few organizations in Indonesia able to advocate for prisoners, subscribed to the bulletin and distributed copies to other NGOs. In the repressive context of the Suharto regime (1966-1998)

human rights activists and students who took an interest were able to read the bulletins at the offices of LBH and other NGOs. Papang Hidayat explained that it was very hard to get alternative information during the Suharto regime about the 1965 case. Reading the bulletins as a young student in 1993 at a Jakarta based NGO ‘opened my eyes to a completely/totally different story about the 1965 event’.<sup>97</sup> Indonesian students who grew up under the regime were told through textbooks, museums and propaganda films that the PKI was barbaric for their accused role in the murder of the generals in 1965.<sup>98</sup> He remembers reading stories about individual prisoners and gaining for the first time insights into the kinds of human rights abuses they suffered.

Another mode of activism that TAPOL used was speaking tours. Carmel was one of the few former political prisoners to be released so early with access to the resources to publicize her fate, and that of fellow prisoners, to the world. In 1974, for example, Carmel toured Australia and New Zealand for five weeks to raise awareness about Indonesia’s prisoners. She spoke to politicians, academics and trade union activists.<sup>99</sup> In January 1975, Carmel went on a speaking tour of West Germany. Here, there were large attendances of Indonesian university students who seemed keen to hear about what was happening in Indonesia.<sup>100</sup> In these tours Carmel used her personal experiences of imprisonment to try to persuade more people to do something about Indonesian political prisoners. In Western countries it is possible that her Britishness/whiteness and the fact that the Suharto regime imprisoned a British person helped increase support for the more general cause of Indonesian prisoners. Simpson notes that for Western audiences, she ‘cut a sympathetic and familiar figure: eloquent, attractive, determined, and able to bridge the psychological distances between ordinary human rights supporters and the people on whose half they advocated.’<sup>101</sup> Carmel’s memories of imprisonment were frequently profiled in press coverage around her speaking tours.<sup>102</sup> Through this kind of advocacy, Carmel used whatever networks she could access to increase pressure on the Indonesian government to release the political prisoners. The staff running the TAPOL office was always quite limited amounting to only two or three people at a time including Budiardjo who worked full time for the organization.

Although Carmel was able to reach a range of audiences, she was becoming well known to the Indonesian government and they frequently accused her and TAPOL of

being communists and of being determined to discredit the regime. Liem Soei Liong, a TAPOL activist who worked closely with Carmel, admitted that the Suharto administration was indeed a key target of TAPOL's activism.<sup>103</sup> Carmel personally hated the military regime. When the Indonesian invasion of East Timor took place in 1975, TAPOL also took up this cause and changed its name to *TAPOL: The Indonesia Human Rights Campaign* to reflect a broader mandate. In making this choice, TAPOL activists were also following the currents of US foreign policy, which increasingly came to emphasize the human rights records of foreign governments, despite the hypocrisy of its actions. Some Western governments, however, were wary of Carmel. She was denied entry to the US in 1977, on the grounds that she had been a former communist.<sup>104</sup>

The sources that I have been able to find, written by and about Carmel, rarely mention why communist ideology appealed to her. A possible reason for this is that a primary audience throughout her human rights activism in relation to Indonesia was Westerners across the United States, Australia and Europe. Within these societies, as Francisca de Haan has noted, communism is today more commonly associated with the idea of 'communist crimes' and human rights violations, rather than 'the Soviet contribution in defeating Nazi Germany, with anti-fascism more generally, or with a struggle for social justice or an egalitarian society'.<sup>105</sup> It is possible that Carmel has internalized these perceptions. Reflecting on her activism recently, for example, she stated she was most comfortable advocating for issues such as the release of political prisoners rather than following a party line that she did not always understand.<sup>106</sup> Because of the enduring perception that communism is an outdated and dangerous ideology, many people are understandably reluctant to talk openly about their commitment to communist politics. Furthermore in Indonesia, the country that Carmel's activism centres on, communism is not only banned, it is even more demonized than it is in the Western world. To identify as a former communist to an Indonesian audience means condemning oneself as a social outcast.

In 1978, as a result of pressure from advocacy groups including TAPOL, the International Labour Organisation, the International Commission of Jurists, AI and the new emphasis from the USA's Carter Administration on human rights, the Indonesian government released the majority of political prisoners from 1965. It

seems then that the culmination of domestic pressure in donor countries moved Western governments to press the issue. Here, the role of TAPOL along with other organizations, academics and journalists, was crucial in shaping domestic opinion by continuously reminding the public of the plight of those in prison.

Not all 1965 prisoners were, however, released at this time. Some remained in prison camps for longer, others awaited trial and a small number were kept for decades on death row with executions well into the 1980s and 1990s of these ageing men. TAPOL persisted in its advocacy of these cases, and reported that former prisoners and their families were subjected to ongoing discrimination. TAPOL also highlighted the renewed ideological campaigns in Indonesia against the so-called communist threat.<sup>107</sup>

## **Conclusions**

So what can we conclude about transnational activists from Carmel's life story? Tarrow notes in his work the strong role of migrants as transnational activists because of their liminality and ability to move across cultures. Stephen Hopgood emphasized the alternative religious backgrounds and international outlook of the founders of AI, many of whom were Catholics, free Church or Jewish rather than members of the established Anglican Church.<sup>108</sup> As I have argued Carmel's position as a second-generation Jewish migrant living between migrant and non-migrant communities gave her exposure to different traditions and ways of life from a fairly early age. Her experiences of a Catholic school, living with billet families during the war and her entry to university introduced her to further broadening experiences.

During her time at the London School of Economics, she sought out connections with students from other countries. Carmel noted in an interview, 'I was interested in the spirit of internationalism and the spirit of working together'.<sup>109</sup> The IUS offered her exactly this kind of connection. Growing out of the war and longer communist traditions in Europe, Carmel's activism initially focused on anti-fascism and promoting greater global equality including a commitment to opposing colonialism.

Her awareness of colonial inequalities was a direct product of her interaction with Indonesian anti-colonialists in the IUS.

While living in Indonesia, Carmel continued her political activism as a university lecturer and graduate activist. Carmel's relationship with Indonesia is complex. For her, it was initially a place of hope with which she was captivated. Under the army-dominated Suharto regime (1966-1998) Indonesia turned into a place that she associated with brutal military repression. This was something which she felt compelled to resist, due to the injustice of her arrest and the arrest without trial of many of her 'fellow travellers'.

Carmel used her connections across the Anglo world and the new emphasis on human rights amongst Western governments to advocate on behalf of Indonesian political prisoners upon her return to Britain in 1971 until late in her life. Her activism extended to East Timorese, Acehnese, West Papuan, student and Muslim prisoners of conscience in Indonesia. She focused on opposing the Suharto regime and the military's methods of extreme brutality that she had witnessed. Across her activism, she sought to build transnational solidarity amongst peoples of diverse backgrounds and a commitment to greater equality. Her ability to move between cultures in her advocacy was quite remarkable.

---

<sup>1</sup> Thanks to Bastiaan Nugteren, Jess Melvin and Faye Chan for their research assistance in preparing this paper. Thanks also to Carmel Budiardjo, Barbara Patilla, Liem Soei Liong, Brad Simpson and Papang Hidayat for their assistance with information for this chapter and to Sean Scalmer for his feedback on earlier drafts of the paper.

<sup>2</sup> For a survey of research in this field see Donatella della Porta, "Life Histories," in *Methodological Practices in Social Movement Research*, ed. Donatella della Porta (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 264-268.

<sup>3</sup> Donatella della Porta, "Life Histories Analysis of Social Movement Activists," in *Studying Social Movements*, eds Maria Diana and Ron Eyerman (London: Sage, 1992), 173.

<sup>4</sup> David Featherstone, *Solidarity: Hidden Histories and Geographies of Internationalism* (London: Zed Books, 2012), 12.

<sup>5</sup> Sidney Tarrow, *The New Transnational Activism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 29.

<sup>6</sup> Selma Berroll, *East Side/East End: Eastern European Jews in London and New York, 1870-1920* (London: Praeger, 1994), 25.

<sup>7</sup> Carmel Budiardjo, interview by author, London, 27 November 2014.

<sup>8</sup> Budiardjo, interview.

<sup>9</sup> V. D. Lipman, *A History of the Jews in Britain since 1858* (Leicester and London: Leicester University Press, 1990), 43.

- <sup>10</sup> Ronnie Caplane, 'Rights Activist Says Genocide Continues in Indonesia,' *Jweekly*, 26 October, 1996. <http://www.jweekly.com/article/full/4323/rights-activist-says-genocide-continues-in-Indonesia>.
- <sup>11</sup> See Tony Kushner and Nadia Valman, eds., *Remembering Cable Street: Fascism and Anti-fascism in British Society* (London and Portland: Vallentine Mitchell, 2000).
- <sup>12</sup> Tony Kushner, *The Persistence of Prejudice: Antisemitism in British Society during the Second World War* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1989), 70.
- <sup>13</sup> Lipman, *A History of the Jews*, 230.
- <sup>14</sup> Kushner, *The Persistence of Prejudice*, 59, 62.
- <sup>15</sup> Chanan Tomlin, *Protest and Prayer: Rabbi Dr Solomon Schonfeld and Orthodox Jewish Responses in Britain to the Nazi Persecution of Europe's Jews, 1942-1945* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2006), 78.
- <sup>16</sup> *Jewish Chronicle*, 18 August 1944, as cited in Tomlin, *Protest and Prayer*, 81.
- <sup>17</sup> Lipman, *A History of the Jews*, 212.
- <sup>18</sup> Stuart Hall, "Political Belonging in a World of Multiple Identities," in *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context and Practice*, eds. Steven Vertovec and Robin Cohen (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 26.
- <sup>19</sup> Jodi Burkett, "The National Union of Students and Transnational Solidarity, 1958-1968," *European Review of History*, 21, no. 4 (2014): 543.
- <sup>20</sup> Carmel Budiardjo, *Surviving Indonesia's Gulag: A Western Woman Tells Her Story* (London: Cassell, 1996), 19.
- <sup>21</sup> Henry Srebrink, "The British Communist Party's National Jewish Committee and the Fight against anti-Semitism during the Second World War, Immigrants and Minorities," *Historical Studies in Ethnicity, Migration and Diaspora*, 8 (1989).
- <sup>22</sup> Caplane, 'Rights Activist Says Genocide Continues in Indonesia'.
- <sup>23</sup> Philip G. Altbach, "The International Student Movement," *Journal of Contemporary History* 5, no. 1 (1970), 160-161.
- <sup>24</sup> Suar Suroso, *Bung Karno Korban Perang Dingin* (Jakarta: Hasta MISTRA, 2008), 146.
- <sup>25</sup> Suroso, *Bung Karno Korban Perang Dingin*, 147.
- <sup>26</sup> "Invitation Commission, Notes from meeting April 10, 1946," International Union of Students Archive, International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam, Netherlands.
- <sup>27</sup> "Final Program of the World Student Congress Prague, August 17-31, 1946," International Union of Students Archive, International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam, Netherlands.
- <sup>28</sup> "Final Program of the World Student Congress Prague."
- <sup>29</sup> IUS Preamble to constitution [www.stud.uni-hannover.de/gruppen/ius/constitution/Preamb.html](http://www.stud.uni-hannover.de/gruppen/ius/constitution/Preamb.html)
- <sup>30</sup> "Report of the International Preparatory Committee upon its work, November 1945-August 1946," International Union of Students Archive, International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam, Netherlands.
- <sup>31</sup> "Countries represented at the Prague Congress 1946," International Union of Students Archive, International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam, Netherlands.
- <sup>32</sup> "The Task of the Student Youth in Working for Peace and a Better World Commission III," World Student Youth Congress Prague 1946, International Union of Students Archive, International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam, Netherlands, 1.
- <sup>33</sup> Burkett, "The National Union of Students," 542.
- <sup>34</sup> Budiardjo, interview.
- <sup>35</sup> Featherstone, *Solidarity*, 5.
- <sup>36</sup> "Members of the Executive Committee, Members of the Council International Union of Students, Praha August 1946," International Union of Students Archive, International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam, Netherlands.
- <sup>37</sup> Ann Swift, *The Road to Madiun: The Indonesian Communist Uprising of 1948* (Ithaca: Cornell Modern Indonesia Project, Monograph Series No. 69, Cornell University Press, 1989), 34.
- <sup>38</sup> Swift, *The Road to Madiun*, 35.
- <sup>39</sup> Altbach, "The International Student Movement," 163-165.
- <sup>40</sup> Suroso, *Bung Karno Korban Perang Dingin*, 154-155. For more on the uses of Marshal Plan aid see Gouda, *American Visions of the Netherlands East Indies/Indonesia*.
- <sup>41</sup> Tarrow, *The New Transnational Activism*, 29.
- <sup>42</sup> "Resolutions of the World Student Youth Congress Prague 1946", International Union of Students Archive, International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam, Netherlands, 4.
- <sup>43</sup> Edward Thompson, *The Railway: An Adventure in Construction* (The British Yugoslav Association, London, 1948), viii.
- <sup>44</sup> Thompson, *The Railway*, 1.
- <sup>45</sup> Thompson, *The Railway*, 3.

- 
- <sup>46</sup> Budiardjo, *Surviving Indonesia's Gulag*, 11.
- <sup>47</sup> Budiardjo, *Surviving Indonesia's Gulag*, 11-12.
- <sup>48</sup> Budiardjo, *Surviving Indonesia's Gulag*, 12.
- <sup>49</sup> Suroso, *Bung Karno Korban Perang Dingin*, 150.
- <sup>50</sup> Ruth T. McVey, *The Calcutta Conference and the Southeast Asian Uprisings* (Ithaca: Modern Indonesia Project, Southeast Asian Program, Dept. of Far Eastern Studies, Cornell University, 1958), 4.
- <sup>51</sup> McVey, *The Calcutta Conference*, 1.
- <sup>52</sup> McVey, *The Calcutta Conference* and Larisa Efimova, "Did the Soviet Union Instruct Southeast Asian Communists to Revolt? New Russian Evidence on the Calcutta Youth Conference of February 1948," *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* (2009), 449-469.
- <sup>53</sup> David T. Hill, "Indonesia's Exiled Left as the Cold War Thaws," *Review of Indonesian and Malaysian Affairs* 44, no. 1 (2010), 22-30.
- <sup>54</sup> Budiardjo, *Surviving Indonesia's Gulag*, 13.
- <sup>55</sup> Budiardjo, *Surviving Indonesia's Gulag*, 15.
- <sup>56</sup> Kian Wee Thee, *Indonesia's Economy since Independence* (Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 2012), 4-7.
- <sup>57</sup> Budiardjo, *Surviving Indonesia's Gulag*, 107.
- <sup>58</sup> Budiardjo, *Surviving Indonesia's Gulag*, 108.
- <sup>59</sup> Harsutedjo, interview by author, Jakarta, 10 November 2011.
- <sup>60</sup> Budiardjo, interview.
- <sup>61</sup> Rex. Mortimer *Indonesian Communism under Sukarno: Ideology and Politics, 1959-1965* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1974), 366.
- <sup>62</sup> Budiardjo, *Surviving Indonesia's Gulag*, 19.
- <sup>63</sup> Budiardjo, *Surviving Indonesia's Gulag*, 15, 19.
- <sup>64</sup> Budiardjo, *Surviving Indonesia's Gulag*, 19.
- <sup>65</sup> Mortimer, *Indonesian Communism Under Sukarno*, 285-286.
- <sup>66</sup> Lance Castles, "Socialism and Private Business: The Latest Phase," *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies* 1, No. 1, June (1965), 13-45.
- <sup>67</sup> Harsutedjo, interview.
- <sup>68</sup> Budiardjo, *Surviving Indonesia's Gulag*, 15.
- <sup>69</sup> On Communist China in the Indonesian imagination see Hong Lui, *China and the Shaping of Indonesia: 1949-1965* (Singapore: NUS Press; Kyoto: CSEAS Series on Asian Studies 4, 2011).
- <sup>70</sup> Budiardjo, *Surviving Indonesia's Gulag*, 192.
- <sup>71</sup> Budiardjo, *Surviving Indonesia's Gulag*, 16.
- <sup>72</sup> Caplane, "Rights Activist Says Genocide Continues in Indonesia."
- <sup>73</sup> Budiardjo, *Surviving Indonesia's Gulag*, 106-110.
- <sup>74</sup> Budiardjo, *Surviving Indonesia's Gulag*, 192.
- <sup>75</sup> Jamie Mackie, *Konfrontasi: The Indonesia-Malaysia Dispute, 1963-1966* (Kuala Lumpur and New York: Oxford University Press, 1974).
- <sup>76</sup> Budiardjo, *Surviving Indonesia's Gulag*, 200-202.
- <sup>77</sup> Bradley Simpson, "Human Rights Discourses and Suharto's Indonesia" in *The Breakthrough: Human Rights in the 1970s* eds. Jan Eckel and Samuel Moyn (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013), 191.
- <sup>78</sup> This paragraph draws on Ann Marie Clark, *Diplomacy of Conscience: Amnesty International and Changing Human Rights Norms* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2001), 4-14.
- <sup>79</sup> See 1968-1971 files Amnesty International Archives, International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam, Netherlands.
- <sup>80</sup> "Report on Conditions in Bukit Duri Women's Prison in Jakarta," File ASA 21 November 1971, Amnesty International Archives, International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam.
- <sup>81</sup> TAPOL Archives, London, England and Budiardjo, *Surviving Indonesia's Gulag*, 208.
- <sup>82</sup> Carmel Budiardjo, "Three Years as a Political Prisoner in Indonesia," *Journal of Contemporary Asia* (1973), 3, 374.
- <sup>83</sup> Budiardjo, *Surviving Indonesia's Gulag*, 209.
- <sup>84</sup> See, for example, "Indonesia the Buru Resettlement Project," File 1969 ASA21 and "Indonesia November 1970" (Report from MacBride), File 1970 ASA217, Amnesty International Archive, International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam, Netherlands.
- <sup>85</sup> Budiardjo, *Surviving Indonesia's Gulag*, 192.
- <sup>86</sup> Simpson, "Human Rights Discourses," 191.
- <sup>87</sup> "Campaign Activities."
- <sup>88</sup> Liem Soei Liong, email correspondence 17 February 2016.

- 
- <sup>89</sup> Liem Soei Liong, email correspondence 17 February 2016.
- <sup>90</sup> “Carmel Budiardjo Founder of TAPOL.”
- <sup>91</sup> “The TAPOLs Case Notes,” *Tapol Bulletin*, no. 3 (January 1974), 14.
- <sup>92</sup> Liem Soei Liong, interview by author, London, December 1 2014.
- <sup>93</sup> Liem, interview.
- <sup>94</sup> Stephen Hopgood, *Keepers of the Flame: Understanding Amnesty International* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006), 73.
- <sup>95</sup> “TAPOL British Campaign for the Release of Indonesian Political Prisoners,” TAPOL Archive London, England.
- <sup>96</sup> Liem Soei Liong, email correspondence 17 February 2016.
- <sup>97</sup> Papang Hidayat, Email communication, 3 August 2015.
- <sup>98</sup> See Katharine McGregor, *History in Uniform: Military Ideology and the Construction of the Past in Indonesia* (Singapore: NUS Press, 2007).
- <sup>99</sup> “Ex-TAPOL Tours Australia and New Zealand,” *Tapol Bulletin*, no. 5 (June 1974), 2.
- <sup>100</sup> “Ex-TAPOL Tours Germany,” *Tapol Bulletin*, no. 8 (January 1975), 2.
- <sup>101</sup> Simpson, “Human Rights Discourses,” 195.
- <sup>102</sup> “What Political Prisoners are Suffering in Indonesia,” *Methodist Recorder*, January 1 1976.
- <sup>103</sup> Liem, interview.
- <sup>104</sup> “US Visa Denied,” *TAPOL Bulletin*, no. 19 (January 1977), 2.
- <sup>105</sup> Francisca de Haan, “The Women’s International Democratic Federation (WIDF): History, Main Agenda, and Contributions, 1945-1991,” Women and Social Movements (WASI) Online Archive, 6.
- <sup>106</sup> Carmel Budiardjo, Email correspondence June 23, 2015.
- <sup>107</sup> Some examples are the following reports: “Former Tapols and the Communist Bogy,” *TAPOL Bulletin*, no. 63 (May 1984), 16-17; “Three Communist Prisoners under Threat of Execution,” *TAPOL Bulletin*, no. 66 (November 1984), 14; “Three More Long Term Prisoners Executed,” *TAPOL Bulletin*, no. 71 (September 1985), 3-9; “Nine Long Term political Prisoners Executed,” *TAPOL Bulletin*, no. 78 (December 1986), 2; “Ex-Prisoners as Social Pariahs,” *TAPOL Bulletin*, no. 88 (August 1988), 5; “Six Long Term Tapols Executed,” *TAPOL Bulletin*, no. 98 (April 1990), 1-6; “No Change for PKI Suspects,” *TAPOL Bulletin*, no. 99 (June 1990), 12-13; “New Bersih Diri Regulation,” *TAPOL Bulletin*, no. 99 (May 1984), 13; “Re-Examining the Ex-Tapols ... Again!,” *TAPOL Bulletin*, no. 101 (October 1990), 9, 19; “‘Clean Environment’ out! ‘Under the Influence of’ in!,” *TAPOL Bulletin*, no. 101 (October 1990), 16-17.
- <sup>108</sup> Hopgood, *Keepers of the Flame*, 58.
- <sup>109</sup> Budiardjo, interview.