

Political prisoners and human rights activists

The issue about the concept of "political prisoner" the last few years is highly relevant not only for Azerbaijan but also for many other countries.

This concept is used by all political opponents moreover an authority asserts that there are no political prisoners in a country and cannot be by a definition and the opposition and human rights organizations bring their arguments and refer to specific cases and specific individuals.

The status of political prisoner is honorary. The man is not sparing his life for the welfare of others deserves respect only. This applies to everyone regardless of position held or lack thereof. However, recently the term "political prisoner" being used by some as a curse and others as an indulgence and for the redemption not only all committed sins but the possible ones. The first contradicts morality and the second discredits the people whose scale of values has other designations than in the market life.

Try to understand who these people are called as "political prisoners", what is meant by the phrase "political prisoner", who recognizes the particular person as a "political prisoner", who is authorized to do so, by whom authorized and what for all it need.

Indeed, will there be a leader of the opposition party a "political prisoner" if he is jailed for committed on ideological reasons raping of a pro-government party's chairman? And if on the contrary then would considerations be different?

Will a well-known oppositionist be a "political prisoner" if he convicted to imprisonment for torturing his wife, oppositionist also, which committed out of jealousy?

Whether a doctor-oppositionist makes an illegal abortion (Article 141 of the Criminal Code) or due to revenge divulges the secret of adoption by a leader of another party (Article 175 of the Criminal Code)?

Will there be a “political prisoner” caught stealing official who tried to conceal the shortage of funds reporting by the forcible seizure of power (coup d’état - the revolution), armed rebellion or a terrorist act?

Had Saddam Hussein before his murder, Carlos, nicknamed "The Jackal", Nelson Mandela, Ruskoy and his team, Emperor Bokassa, President Milosevic, the gangster Al Capone, Ribbentrop, Keitel and others like them considered political prisoners?

Will there be considered as political prisoners few hundreds of millions of people who deny the Holocaust or the "genocide" of Armenians, when they suddenly put in prison in Belgium, Switzerland, France, Germany or Spain?

Although no, a recent time one can deny even the existence of the Inquisition and homosexual passions of the Catholic clergymen in Spain. On November 2007 the Constitutional Court of Spain ruled that the denial of the Holocaust can not be recognized as a criminal offense as it is within the freedom of speech.

And what about the Muslims women, refused to take off the burqa or hijab and arrested for it in one of the "bastions of democracy"?

Not so long ago, as in the tradition of Peter's henchmen and in our county caught bearded men, forced them to lengthen the pants, and resisting imprisoned on trumped up charges.

It is clear that a political demonstration, "topless" or prostitutes dressed as Eve in France or Belgium are not jailed, at least from a demographic reasons, but in one of the Arab countries could do this and even worse, and on quite lawful bases. What does for Lenin's phrase then we get?

There is a hundreds of similar examples, but wait to smile, abuse or swearing, calling the author an apologist of the regime and renegade, accused of blasphemy and other sins.

It seems that not all is as simple as writing in the newspapers (this does not apply to “Zerkalo” (“The Mirror”)) or are shown on TV. Always ready to agree with the opposing arguments if it is not slogans, parliamentary or police slang.

In the good old days "political" were called persons subjected to criminal or administrative prosecution for political crimes or misdemeanors.

The political offenses were violations of the state system, state security, general crimes which committed for this purposes.

Assuming that the right in one of its values is an aggregate of rules and regulations established and protected by the state, regulating the relations of people in society, then all violations on this aggregate which are recognized like crimes in principle should be considered as encroachments on the legal policy of the state and persons committed it are state criminals.

Thus, according to the criminal codes of almost all countries in the world bribers and bribe-takers are persons who committed crimes against state and interests of state service; spies, traitors and diversionists - against the constitutional system and national security; terrorists, bandits, pirates and hooligans - against public safety; participants aggressive war, genocide, extermination of the population, slavery, deportation, apartheid, etc. - against the Peace and Security of Mankind.

All listed crimes with full reasons should be attributed to political but whether the persons who deprived of their liberty for its perpetration political prisoners is another matter.

If such people remain at the freedom and will be walk around the streets with machine guns in the hands even not shooting sparrows and opponents then we begin to complain about the state, demanding an order and peace and the most courageous will come to streets and... then, do we get the new political prisoners?

And what would power go for it even if it is wholly owned by the people? And if it goes, then whom does it need to? Am I exaggerating, shifts the focuses? Perhaps, but will not be hurry.

History shows that for the first time the term "political prisoner" has been defined and used by leading international non-governmental human rights organizations "Amnesty International" and then "Human Rights Watch".

However, before the "political prisoners" were "prisoners of conscience," nice to everybody at least for the fact that significantly added the list of bibliographic rarities of that time.

The term "prisoners of conscience" was proposed by Peter Benenson to human rights community in 1961. According to the supplemented definition of "Amnesty International" "... a prisoner of conscience is a person whose freedom is restricted by imprisonment or other way of restriction due to his origin, sex, race, language, national or social origin, property, family relations, sexual orientation and other personal characteristics. At the same time it is not considered prisoners of conscience people who resort to violence or propagating violence and hostility".

At the present time, "Amnesty International" includes prisoners of conscience in the list of political prisoners and under the political prisoners understanding "... any prisoner in whom case has a strong political element. Such it may be motivated actions of prisoner, the actions itself or the reasons that prompted authorities to send him to jail".

More than obvious that, in accordance with this definition, the category of political prisoners automatically get all those resorting to criminal violence for political reasons, including terrorists, detained in Guantanamo Bay, secret prisons of the CIA, in basements or attics FSS, MNS, MI-5, MI-6 and other organizations labeled images of emitted in it sounds.

It is true for some reason the person who committed the same crime in the U.S. and the most European countries are called terrorists and criminals, and political prisoners call to us. Perhaps, because of that we have not yet matured to the true understanding of democracy.

The Dictionary of Human Rights, published "Human Rights Watch," gives the following criteria for the definition of "political prisoner":

“1) A person detained without charge after the political unrest, demonstrations or acts of civil disobedience who: a) considered to be detained for expressing his views or opposition to the government without resorting to violence or b) illegally detained for belonging to a particular group;

2) A person falling under above categories, but who can later be accused of ordinary crimes under the clearly false pretenses;

3) A person belonging to both categories accused and condemned without a fair trial or due process of law;

4) A person held in detention without charges of committing a violent act, but accused or suspected in belonging to groups which defend and committing violent offenses against the state”.

The Council of Europe believes that "a person deprived of freedom is subject to the term "political prisoner" if: a) deprivation of freedom was imposed in violation of a fundamental rights guaranteed by the European Convention on Human Rights and its protocols, in particular, freedom of speech, conscience and religion, freedom of expression and information and freedom of assembly and association; b) deprivation of freedom was imposed for the clearly political reasons, without regard to any offense; c) for political reasons, the duration of detention and its conditions are clearly disproportionate in relation to the offense, in which the person has been convicted or suspected; d) a person deprived of freedom for political reasons in a discriminatory manner in comparison with other ones; e) deprivation of freedom is the result of the proceedings to clear violations of procedural guarantees which is associated with political motives of the authorities”.

Experts from the Council of Europe do not identify a separate concept of "prisoner of conscience" and give the basic meaning to political motive of power, power rather than a political element, which according to the definition of "Amnesty International" can be occurred on both sides.

In opinion of experts of the Council of Europe, "the assumption that a person is "political prisoner" should be confirmed by the "primary" (prima facie) evidence and then a state which applying the deprivation of freedom must prove that an

imprisonment is fully compliant with the European Convention on Human Rights how they are interpreted by the European Court of Human Rights on the merits of case, that the requirements of proportionality and discrimination have been observed and that imprisonment was the result of a fair trial procedure".

There are several definitions of the term "political prisoner" formulated by human rights activists Sergey Kovalev, Alexander Podrabinski, Valentine Gefter, Sergey Alfer and others but generally they duplicate definition of "Amnesty International" and in the best case the experts of the Council of Europe.

Among our human rights activists are also no consensus on the criteria for determining a person for "political prisoner" as evidenced the discrepancies in the lists drawn up by them.

The term "political prisoner" is used in the statements of many human rights organizations, to which no doubt can be attributed the U.S. State Department (this a kind of global human rights activist) but it does not matter which country or organization recognizes each specific person "political prisoner". The main thing that this decision would be and consider an objective and reasonable would apply under unified standards and have no momentary purpose, changing from the results of exploration and drilling operations.

Let us consider the definition of "political prisoner" and try to correlate it with reality.

The Criminal Code of Azerbaijan in Chapter 32 "Crimes against justice," contains Article 290 " Attracting obviously innocent to a of criminal responsibility", Article 292" Illegal detention, imprisonment or detention", Article 294 "Falsification of evidence", Article 295 "Making of obviously unlawful judgment, decision, determination or ruling", etc. All these articles relate to the cases contained in the concept of "political prisoner".

With the prisoners of conscience everything is more or less clear. A person deprived of liberty by reason of origin, gender, race, language, national or social origin, sexual orientation and other personality characteristics is undoubtedly a victim if one just does not resort to protect his rights and freedoms through violence,

incitement to violence and hatred. About this says "Amnesty International" and with this should agree.... but partly.

Being at home or at the cottage in Mashtaga, but behind the high fence a person freely act like the soul desires. If only the neighbors are not distracting.

And what about if without violence, propaganda and hostility in the best traditions of European culture a person is trying to attract to his sexual orientation pupils of the school where he teaches math.

In one of the central schools of Baku there was event where the angered parents wanted to "lather neck" to the principal and class teacher for forcing their girls of "belly dance" training. On Article 171 of the Criminal Code the "teachers" "are not pulled" but if the parents beat "teachers" and then they could be jailed.

And what there would be new political prisoners but failed prisoners of conscience?

It seems that not all is as simple as writing in newspapers and are shown on TV.

Indeed, what about the teachers, who daily as part of freedom of speech ventriloquize on the lessons about the virtues of democracy in the Netherlands, where soft drugs are sold openly in cafes, coherently says about freedom of the order with his body, which is the constant companion of famous artists, fine natures and easily vulnerable and therefore unprotected from the surrounding cattle etc.

If such is jailed for extortion of money from their parents or "pampering" with drugs, then there are serious patrons and solid material base would raise a lot of noise and the lists of political prisoners augmented at someone.

The noise will rise even if the "teacher" just get fired or beat the "ignorant" parents, who considered the lessons of democracy corrupting minors.

Yes, maybe it will be a consequence of misunderstanding the essence of democracy, mossy thought, due to the fifty years oppression of the Bolshevik empire, alien ideology, etc.

Frankly, the vast majority of parents, no matter how zealous they were Democrats, all of this does not care as long as children do not become drug addicts

and have not lost the orientation among of the political icebergs which have frozen human values.

According to the first criterion, proposed by "Human Rights Watch," "political prisoner is a person detained without charge after the political unrest for expressing his views or opposition to the government without violence or illegally detained for belonging to a particular group."

Consequently, we have political unrest, under which obviously should be understood mass disorders for political (social) reasons, as the absence of such causes and mass allows only talk about hooliganism - deliberate actions that breach public order, involving the use of violence, destruction or damage to property of others.

According to the Article 220 of the Criminal Code of Azerbaijan, the organization of mass disorders accompanied by violence, pogroms, arson, destruction of property, firearms, explosives or explosive devices, as well as armed resistance to a representative government, or participation in the riots be punished by imprisonment for a term of four to twelve years, and appeals to riot or violence against the citizens - the restriction of freedom for up to three years imprisonment for the same period.

This crime is attributed to crimes against public security and the various interpretations contained as such in the legislation of all countries.

Depending on the users, in some cases, such actions are called a revolution.

The Criminal Code of Azerbaijan also contains provisions on the forced seizure of power (Article 278), the creation and use of illegal armed formations or groups (Article 279), armed rebellion, and active participation in it in order to forcibly change the constitutional order or violation of territorial integrity (Article 280), public calls for the violent seizure of power (Article 281), inciting ethnic, racial or religious hatred (Article 283).

All these crimes are classified as crimes against the constitutional system and security of the state - against the state and also in different interpretations are contained in the Criminal Code in all the countries of the world.

In the U.S. ex. such actions are called treason, and in our country it means a desertion to the enemy, spying, issuance of state secrets, to assist a foreign state, foreign organization or their representatives in carrying out hostile activities against the Republic of Azerbaijan.

Thus, according to the legislation of all countries of the world a person can personally not participate in the political unrest, but to be the organizer, to lead them on the radio, the telephone, through aides, or just watch the incarnation of the plan the coup (revolution) from the balcony, for which he should be held criminally responsibility.

There is no accuracy in "Human Rights Watch" concerning the "detention without charge".

To detain a person without charge under the laws of all countries can be for a period of several hours to several days, so it does not have time to even get the list of political prisoners. In order to do this there are rules of administrative law in all countries, including Azerbaijan.

Recently, in Greece after the riots have been arrested dozens of people, but hardly any of them would be assigned to political prisoners. It is clear that in Europe there should be no political prisoners, and therefore so no one can be considered. Even, if they are.

With regard to the definition of "Human Rights Watch," that in the case of detention in accordance of criminal procedural law, without being charged it is excluded. In any case it has no in Azerbaijan. Such facts, no one has and can not be.

As for the persons specified categories, "who can later be charged with ordinary crimes under clearly false pretenses," then this is already a crime under Article 290 of the Criminal Code. Those who fabricated the charges must answer for it.

By the way, paradoxically, that if for clearly false pretexts to indict the "common" hustler then no one will not include him in list of the political prisoners. Or does it turn on?

In the new 2003 Charter of "Amnesty International" in the sections on goals, objectives, basic principles and methods, declared that the protection will be

subjected to the rights of all people, regardless of their social status, religion, nationality, origin, etc.

After all generally speaking any person who commits a crime is a victim of the regime. I wonder, how many thieves, rapists, or are recognized as political prisoners regardless of their political affiliation, political views and role in various political campaigns?

The third category of political prisoners according to the dictionary "Human Rights Watch» are the persons related to the first two categories which are charged and convicted without a fair trial or the illegal process of law."

Concerning legal procedure, developed in Azerbaijan with the participation of experts from the Council of Europe, it is clear that if the proceedings carried out with gross violations of the rules of criminal procedure then it shall be deemed insolvent. This applies to all types of processes and not just political.

As for a fair court, then this question rests on the evidence and proof. If there is no evidence of guilt then no one can be condemned and if there are discrepancies in the evaluation of the sufficiency of evidence then all doubts should be construed in favor of suspects and defendants. Only to these doubts would be objective and not politically motivated and far-fetched.

The fourth category is "persons detained in prison without charges of committing a violent act, but the accused or suspected of belonging to groups that defend and committing violent crimes against the state."

This assertion is abracadabra as the first part of it contradicts the second one.

If a person is in a group that commits violent crimes against the state and he is accused of this then it means that he is complicit in acts committed by a group and he must answer for it even if he performed in the group household duties.

Now, it is concerning the recommendations of the Council of Europe. The first point of these recommendations should be understood that political prisoners are persons who deprived of their freedom for speech in the press and other media with their thoughts about certain aspects of political and other public life, religion, participation in meetings and associations, etc.

Completely agree with that, as agreed with the stipulations of articles of the Convention, reading about exceptions.

Thus, Article 2 "Right to life" of the European Convention on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms "stipulates that deprivation of life is not considered a violation of this article when it results from the use of force is absolutely necessary to protect any person from unlawful violence; for lawful arrest or to prevent the escape of a person lawfully detained; to suppress, in accordance with the law, rebellion or insurrection.

Article 8 "Right to respect for private and family life" of the Convention states that it is not allowed to interference by a public authority with the exercise of this right, except for the intervention provided by law and necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security or public safety, economic well-being of the country in the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals or the protection of the rights and freedoms of others.

The second part of Article 9 "Freedom of thought, conscience and religion" of the European Convention states that the freedom to manifest one's religion or beliefs shall be subject to such limitations as are prescribed by law and necessary in a democratic society in the interests of public safety, to protect public order, health or morals or the protection of rights and freedoms of others.

In the second part of Article 10 "Freedom of expression" says that the implementation of the freedoms enumerated in the first part, and carries with it duties and responsibilities, may be subject to such formalities, conditions, restrictions or penalties as are prescribed by law and are necessary in a democratic society in the interests of national security, territorial integrity or public safety, the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals, protection of the reputation or rights of others, for preventing the disclosure of information received confidentially or maintaining the authority and impartiality of justice.

The second part of Article 11 "Freedom of assembly and association" states that the rights listed in the first part of shall not be subject to any restrictions except those which are prescribed by law and are necessary in a democratic society in the interests

of national security or public safety, the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals or the protection of the rights and freedoms of others.

Reservations contain and Article 5 "The right to freedom and personal security" and Article 6 "The right to a fair trial" and Article 7 "No punishment without law" and some others.

However, Article 18 of the Convention states that the restrictions permitted concerning the rights and freedoms listed in the first should not be used for purposes other than those for which they have been intended.

Unfortunately, depending on opportunistic considerations and situations, opponents on both sides of the reservations and the existence of Article 18 of the Convention is very often overlooked.

Approval of the deprivation of liberty applied for political reasons without regard to any offense is an abstract. It does not happen, at least in Azerbaijan. It always finds a paragraph for accusation it would be a man to be accused but this is a subject another recommendation.

Duration of detention and its conditions are in direct connection with the prosecution and the existing Criminal Code. What is the penalty specified in the law, and that can be applied.

In the entire history of Azerbaijan it was only one case when a judge determined the defendant from Stepanakert punishment greater than the sanction of the Criminal Code. But that was long ago when had not been any political prisoners or human rights activists and still the judge was....

Assertion about duration of detention is not serious and this is a direct interference with justice, for which in the West one can be jailed. I do not think that it is more visible from Strasbourg than to the court for a long time reviewing the case and direct contact with the participants of the process, if only someone (Strasbourg or local court) is not interested in a particular result.

A similar pattern has predictable situation of "deprivation of freedom in a discriminatory manner" because at sentencing the value has no political affiliation, and quite another. In any case, we have.

A special interest is the interpretation of the Council of Europe experts term "the burden of proving" according to which human rights activists say on the availability of political prisoners and the state must prove that it is not a camel.

Such status which is allocated the Council of Europe persons who selflessly defending the rights and freedoms of others, testifies to the importance being given to by the international community to this problem and at the same requires defenders to be honest, consistent and fair in the performance voluntary undertaken public duties.

In this regard Canadian researcher Daniel Estulin had written that people who took upon themselves the heavy burden of human rights defenders should follow these rules:

- to work selflessly not to take money from those who are after their delivery order the music;
- do not lie and be careful in his judgments;
- beware of secret services and the human rights of cartels;
- to know the genesis of human rights movements, etc.

Following the advice of world famous expert in the field of communication try to consider the history of the origin and development (genesis) of the most respected human rights organizations, borrowed from no less well-known foreign publications.

According to "Amnesty International", "human rights activists are called people who are alone or jointly with others promotes or defending human rights through peaceful means. A human rights activist is different in that he defends the rights of others, no matter who he is by profession. Human rights activists assert the universality and indivisibility of all human rights. They do not give preference to any one group of rights to the detriment of others ..."

Do you know where it is borrowed? From the Ranger oath of Rodgers with their motto "Rangers are paving the way." They were the ones who had played the role of intelligence in the fight with the Indians. Want to know more, search on the Internet.

Day of "conception" of "Amnesty International" is considered to be May 25, 1961, when the British lawyer Peter James Henry Solomon Benison began the

company to “Call for an amnesty” published article “The Forgotten Prisoners” in the newspaper “The Observer”.

According to Sergei Korotaevsky “... Peter Benison had gone to the Amnesty all his life. His grandfather on his mother line the Russian Jew Grigory Benison worked in oil and securities and had made fortune in Baku. In the revolution he was running with his family in England, where Flora mother of the future human rights activist was married to a British officer Brigadier General Harold Solomon of who was born son Peter. In 1923 Harold Solomon was in the disaster, became disabled and therefore the family split up. Flora had consorted with Alexander Kerensky who lived in exile.

In the biography of Peter Solomon Benison has known only by the name of the mother, there are many gaps. There are many gaps but it is known that grew up him a poet Auden. An idol of Peter in his student’s year was famous anti-fascist and writer Arthur Koestler.

In 1984 Flora Benison in her autobiographical book “From Baku to Baker Street” writes that she was a bad mother and Peter was brought up by poets.

In fact, the poet Auden, who was employed as a teacher, instilled a love of Peter to poetry, however due to the fact that the house of Benison’s Auden was convicted in homosexual relationships then the mother sent the boy to boarding school. It was away from the bonds of conscience.

In 1939 Peter had took grandfather surname of Benison, in 1947 he graduated from Oxford and became a lawyer and a member of the Labour Party.

According to his official biography, during the Second World War, Peter Benison did not have the fleet because of the emigration of the past, and dissident views, it is known that he served in a top-secret special services unit, engaged in deciphering of codes.

In the early 50-s on behalf of the British trade union leadership P. Benison had gone to Spain to Generalissimo Franco and then to Cyprus, visited Hungary in 1956, then South Africa.

After Benison visiting to Spain the state was torn political blockade, after visit to Cyprus there had began liberating revolution and anti-government demonstrations in Hungary etc.

In June 1961 Benison and his associates had established a human rights organization "Amnesty" which was officially named "Amnesty International" on September 30, 1962.

The organization has developed a stormy activity but in 1966 had begun scandals in connection with the accusation of "Amnesty International" in collaboration with the secret services. Soviet Union blamed the "Amnesty" in cooperation with the CIA and Intelligence service and the West had accused them in collaboration with the KGB.

Benison admitted that he had received money from the government but said that did it for political prisoners and their families and but not to the organization. Journalist Polly Tybee, a functionary of "Amnesty" also confirmed that Benison received money from the secret services but did not specify from which one.

In turn Benison had accused his colleagues of senior functionaries of the "Amnesty International" Sean McBride and Robert Swann of having links with the CIA and Intelligence service and begun an international scandal, and Benison resigned.

From 1965 to 1974 Sean MacBride was a Chairman of the Executive Committee of "Amnesty International", in 1974-1977 Dirk Burner and in 1977 - 1979 Thomas Hammarberg who is the Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights now. In 1980-1986 Hammarberg was Secretary-General of "Amnesty International".

Sean MacBride was born in 1904 in Paris, in a family famous Armenian beauty Guiyang, to who were dedicated sonnets of William Butler. Father Sean MacBride was executed in 1916 in Ireland for participation in rebellion and he with his mother, which had been repeatedly arrested. From 1917 to 1936 they were in the Irish Revolutionary Army which referred to terrorist organizations and had participated in the war for independence Ireland against England. The British government believed

that the whole his family terrorist group which were responsible for the deaths of hundreds of innocent people.

During the time being in the IRA Sean MacBride had received a lawyer degree for the organizing expenses in Dublin. After the Second World War he founded the Republican Party and in 1948 became foreign minister in the government of John Costello. From 1950 to 1960 he was a member of parliament in Ireland and then led the “Amnesty International”.

In 1973 Sean McBride as Vice President had participated in the World Peace Congress in Moscow. In 1974 he became a Nobel laureate in peace and in 1976 he was awarded by Lenin Peace Prize.

Another and no less authoritative human rights organization was the International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights (IHF) that had founded in 1983 and uniting human rights organizations from 40 countries worldwide.

A certain time Human Rights Watch and Human Rights Center of Azerbaijan consisted in it, but in the end of 2007 the IHF had been declared bankrupt and closed down due to financial fraud of its managers, plundered “targeted loans “ of influential foundations.

As for Human Rights Watch the beginning it activity could be attributed to the July 1973 when a group of American writers, historians and publishers had formed the Committee to Protect Andrei Amalrick, the famous Soviet dissident and journalist, who was convicted by the Soviet authorities for writing and distributing his works. In this group included the president and owner one of the biggest publishing «Random House» Robert L. Bernstein, who in 1978 in New York had created a human rights organization “US Helsinki Watch Committee” which later was forming its sections around the world. In 1989 through the merger of the sections was established Human Rights Watch.

Financing of the sections and the new organization was carried out mainly by charitable foundations and multimillionaires, such as Aaron Diamond Foundation, JM Kaplan Foundation, Revson Foundation, Sherman Foundation, Mack Arthur Foundation, John Merck Fund, J. Mertz-Gilmore Foundation and others.

It should especially note the role of billionaire George Soros who came to the Right Human Watch along with his wife, investors of his investment fund and their families.

R. Bernstein was recommended for the post of president of the human rights organization by the Board of Trustees of the Ford Foundation in which also included and includes the director and the chairmen of the largest U.S. industrial and financial corporations such as Xerox Corp., Alcoa inc., Coca-Cola Co., Carlyle Asset Management Group and others.

A very credible human rights organization and the union is considered to be “Reporters Without Borders”.

Here is what about it writes on May 7, 2010 an American researcher F. William Engdahl (quoting verbatim).

“Reporters Without Borders is an international non-governmental organization (NGO). According to its website the headquarters of the RSF is located in Paris. A very curious location for the organization which turns out to be financed by Congress and the agencies associated with the U.S. government.

If we log to the website of the RSF to look for who is behind these self-appointed judges of the World Press Freedom we do not find anything there. There is not even the board of directors and not to mention the list of financial backers. Each year the published data on income and expenditure organization does not give even a hint on whom providing it financial support.

It says that millions of dollars of its annual income the organization receives from the “sale of publications”. But neither the names of publications sold nor the names of those to whom they are sold, not yet in sight. As noted one researcher recently, “even taking into account the fact that the books are published free of charge, RSF had to sell 170,200 books in 2004 and 188 400 books in 2005 in order to get the \$ 2 million, which according to the organization, it earns each year - that is to 516 books per day in 2005. It is clear that the money had to come from other sources. So it turned out in fact”. Any attempts to order on the website of RSF any of its

publications did not give any information about the sale price and a brief content of such publications. Indeed, it is very curious.

In its official financial statements and income accounts published in September 2009 RSF said: “The financial situation in the organization in 2008 was marked the end of the campaign (begun in 2001) on subject of the Olympic Games 2008 in Beijing which greatly affected the income and expenses”. This means that the RSF had spent eight years and it was unclear how much money on the campaign against the government of China on the eve of the Beijing Olympics in 2008. What was the purpose at? It is remarkably the RSF called Chinese President Hu Jintao "persecutor" and "predator" for his actions to suppress unrest in Tibet in March 2010 and in Xinjiang in July 2009. But in both cases, these riots were the result of secret US-funded non-governmental organization called the National Endowment for Democracy. That's it.

After years of efforts to conceal the sources of financing of the RSF the Secretary General Robert Menard has admitted that organization's budget is replenished mainly by “the U.S. organizations that are closely related to U.S. foreign policy”. Among these organizations standing behind RSF is foundation Open Society Foundation and the billionaire speculators George Soros, the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) and the National Endowment for Democracy of the U.S. Congress. They also include “(Center for Free Cuba” the trustee of which Otto Reich was forced to resign from the Bush administration when the world heard about his role with supporting of the CIA in the preparation of plot to overthrow the democratically elected Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez.

One researcher for several months trying to get an answer to the question from the National Endowment for Democracy about financing of “Reporters Without Borders”. The Executive Director of RSF Lucie Morillon had refused to answer this question. As a result, the fund admitted that the "Reporters without Borders" had received grants at least three years from the International Republican Institute (International Republican Institute). This institute is one of the four branches of the National Endowment for Democracy.

In my book “Full Spectrum Dominance: Totalitarian Democracy in the New World Order” (Influence across the entire spectrum: Totalitarian Democracy in the New World Order), I wrote in detail about what this fund was established by the U.S. Congress during the Reagan administration on the initiative of the then Director CIA's Bill Casey (Bill Casey), to become the successor to the CIA's secret programs on the effects on civil society. These programs have been exposed in the mid 70s by the Commission Church. A few years later, Allen Weinstein (Allen Weinstein), draw up a draft law establishing the National Endowment for Democracy, admitted: “Much of what we are doing today, 25 years ago the CIA covertly made”.

It is probably the organization performing the functions of a judge on World Press Freedom itself needs to be more open and frank talk about who supports and finances it. Otherwise we will have a thought about what it has something to hide”.

The foregoing in any case does not give grounds to assert that these groups of human rights organizations all working for the secret services, consist of crooks - embezzlers or persons politicized sexual traditions.

Most human rights activists - is honest, determined and courageous people who selflessly perform undertaken obligations to protect universal values.

In addition to accusations, threats and sometimes violence, they do not receive awards, scholarships and awards, in fact, spend their meager wages on the trip, the content of offices, media, publication of manuals, leaflets, seminars and conferences, support for political prisoners, and many more.

In their spare time at night, forced to save electricity, they pore over the works, illuminating them way to a brighter future, where there are no political prisoners in jails are sitting only nonparty robbers and the corrupt officials, making barriers advocacy.

However, as it were, who did not apply to human rights activists, without them not yet do. The Kremlin and the mausoleum of V.I. Lenin complaints from former Soviet republics have not take and Strasbourg considers complaints square-cluster method once in five years and the courts have gone over to cost accounting, complicated by the global financial crisis.

One hope for human rights activists but it is a pity that they protect only those who are considered political prisoners. And that is as a rule very extraordinary people who, unfortunately, is becoming less and less. Our regrets not refer to the number of outstanding personalities who found themselves behind bars but their total number in the Republic.

Moreover, it appears that some of the designated or selected human rights activists completely forgot the rules of Estulin which was mentioned above.

V.A. Gilyarovskii in one of his stories literally leads the conversation at the police station for questioning very solid dandy:

“... - Your occupation?

- I am gaming.

- I do not understand! I ask you, what are you subsisting for a living?

I am gaming! I subsist in the betting game, in the Imperial racing and running companies, cards, as you know, issued by the Imperial Orphanage ... I play the game, allowed the government... “.

So, here is and for some who call themselves human rights activists, advocacy has become a kind of the game that permitted by the Government and where one can earn good money. But that's half trouble.

The main thing is that many are tired of being a voluntary or involuntary participant of such manipulations, the main argument in which is the noodles on ears.

To be honest, tired and mentor tone of various foreign consultants, who seem to be except money and oil (although it is the same) do not care who bravely and skillfully work out grants, carrying out their objectives, but who have not yet known in what part of the world we are. They are no better and no worse than many of our embezzlers, but had learned to choose socks to ties, although in this long time our do not inferior them.

It seems that generally speaking all of them do not care about us and our rights, which are used them as a bargaining chip in larger political deals.

Not to be unfounded, try using specific examples drawn from foreign research materials with your and our human rights actually understand the issues with which

the crumb-son went to his father, not knowing that for the wrong answers of daddy he could ever be jailed.

As noted above a number of European countries introduced criminal responsibility for denying the Holocaust and "genocide" of Armenians. Do not you notice the parallels with the fact that nearly burned to the fact that it is still spinning?

Yes, if these "strongholds" of democracy somebody starts to talk (to think, to construct inferences) differently than a group of corrupt idiots who have adopted the relevant law, he can be jailed.

Can you imagine what would be howling these gentlemen if we adopt a law criminalizing denial of the Khojaly genocide and imprisoned for it legally?

What is this if it is not "brainwashing" carried out on the development of secret services about which we explain later?

It is clear with idiots and informer but who among human rights activists or judges of the European Court of raised his voice in defense of freedom of speech and thought which declared in all the adopted and planned Conventions for the protection of individual rights and freedoms?

Where is the voice of the global human rights activist who has taken under the protection of the terrorist attack on the peace caravan of their own associates but did not notice the log in the eye?

Someone may object saying that Strasburg has no right to interfere in the internal affairs of States and to make other decisions outside its jurisdiction. And as for Azerbaijan, is it reviewing authority or can not one stand on ceremony with us?

Some questions, questions to which no one wants to answer.

Indeed, whether considered to be political prisoners Muslim who refused to remove the veil or hijab and arrested for it in the same "bulwark of democracy"?

Do the human rights activists in a European country smart enough to put Muslim women in violation of the carnival masks though the old carminative is it there on your head? If they know, why are they silent?

Where are "Amnesty International", "Human Right Watch" and other granteater which compelled us so long to release "political prisoners" who soon after killed out

of greed newlyweds and their minor child and then setting fire to the apartment along with the corpses of victims of political games?

Why has the “Amnesty International” refused to recognize Nelson Mandela a political prisoner were there political prisoners Al Capone, Saddam Hussein and others, what was the relationship between some human rights activists and security services, as it turned out that the Court did not find in the complaint Hasanova violations of the Convention on Human Rights and The Constitutional Court of Azerbaijan adopted a contrary decision, etc. etc. - the answers to these and other questions waiting for resolution.

Bibliography

1. «Радио-Эра» FM для «Киевского телеграфа»
2. Хью О. Шогнесси independent.co.uk
3. R. William Eng-dahl. Reporters Without Borders seems to have a geopolitical agenda. “Online Journal” 7.5.2010
4. http://naviny.by/rubrics/politic/2008/05/14/ic_news_112_290476
5. <http://nn.by/index.php?c=ar&i=26131>
6. www.peoples.ru
7. <http://telegraf.by/belarus/2006/07/22/capf/>
8. <http://www.amnesty.org.ru/pages/vestnik28-3-rus>
9. <http://www.amnesty.org.ru/pages/vestnik28-4-rus>
10. <http://www.charter97.org/ru/news/2009/5/12/18129>
11. www.echr.ru/documents/decisions.htm - Классификация решений по отношению к статьям Конвенции
12. <http://www.rosconcert.com/common/arc/story/php/426090>
13. <http://www.svaboda.org/content/article/1733876.html>

Allahverdiyev R.S., member of
the International Organisation
for Legal Researches

Political prisoners and human rights activists

Resume

The concept and the maintenance of existing definitions "political prisoner" and "human right activists" are considered.

Contradictions, practice of application and the reason of its ambiguity, genesis of human rights organisations are examined.

Аллахвердиев Р.С., член Международной
организации правовых исследований

Политзаключенные и политзащитники

Резюме

Рассматривается понятие и содержание существующих дефиниций «политзаключенный» и «правозащитник».

Исследуются противоречия, практика применения и причины ее неоднозначности, генезис правозащитных организаций.