

How to become political prisoner

Abstract: The concept and content of existing definitions “political prisoner” and “human rights defender” is considered.

There are examined contradictions, practice of application and the reasons of its ambiguity, genesis of human rights organisations.

Keywords: “victim of regime”; “political prisoner”; “human rights’ defender”; “prisoner of conscience”; political offences; human rights organizations; genesis.

Despite the level of democratic character of any state (regime) there are always victims of improper functioning of its institutions.

In one cases these are victims of mistakes, wrong execution of duties, imperfection of legal institutions and procedures etc., which exclude an intention in violation of human rights. In other cases people is become victims of closed societies – totalitarian autocratic regimes, systemic violation of human rights, which are terms of their existence.

Accordingly, the less mistakes and intentional violations of human rights the more democratic and perfective regime (state) the less victims (intentional or non-intentional) its functioning, but a full elimination of them under existence of human factor is presented to be utopia. At least, it is in the nearest future.

So named political prisoners, origination of which is interpreted ambiguously, take especial place among victims of regime.

It is considered that in order to obtain honorary status of political prisoner one should be imprisoned, attract attention of human defenders and mass media, and later to be included in an appropriate list, and somewhere else. Main is not to be released.

Otherwise, all works would be for nothing, and a month later everybody will forget about unaccomplished political prisoner, his/her imprisonment, tortures, suffers of families, caused loss. European Court will not accept a complaint to consideration due to non-exhausting local remedies.

The last years an issue about notion “political prisoner” is very topical for Russia and

♦ **Kerimov Kamal Bahtiyarovich** – a student of RSU named after Gubkin, member of International Organization for Legal Researches (Russia). E-mail: kyamal.kerimov.94@mail.ru

many other countries.

This notion uses all political opponents. But, authorities state that there are no and cannot be political prisoners in country on determination and opponents and human rights organizations give their arguments and are quoted to concrete samples and concrete persons.

This dispute could be had scientific nature if it is not concerned to people fates and possibilities of solidary actions in their protection. It is quite obviously that to arrange actions in support of drug addicts or “scurvy thefts of other property” is difficult, and sometimes it is impossible due to negative attitude of public opinion to them.

At the same time political prosecution of man has always caused to sympathy to him/her of thousands “tacit non-content persons”, which avoid any risk of well-being and serenity of the children, and therefore they realize his/her superiority over them like an individual.

Non-randomly and without any irony I have related a status of political prisoner to honourable. Man, who does not spare his life for sake of others’ well-being, deserves only respect. This is related to everybody not depending of his/her post or absence of such. However, the last time a notion of “political prisoner” is used by some as a curse, and other one – as an indulgence, moreover for atonement not only all committed but also possible sins. The first contradicts moral, and second discredits people, scale of values of which have other indicators than in market’s life

Let’s try to see who are these people are named political prisoners, and what is understood under word combination of “political prisoner”, who recognize a concrete man as political prisoner, who has right to do it, whom has been authorized and for what need all this.

Whether a leader of oppositional party is political prisoner if he imprisoned for rape of a chair of pro-governmental party, which committed on ideal reasons? And what if reasons are others?

Whether a famous oppositionist might be a political prisoner if he imprisoned for torture of his wife, who is also oppositionist, committed due to jealousy?

And if a doctor-oppositionist makes illegal abortion (article 123 of Criminal Code of RF) or due to vengeance betrays a secret of adoption of a leader of other party (article 155 of Criminal Code of RF)?

Whether official-thief, who try to hide shortage of accountable means through forcible seizure of power (coup), armed rebellion or terroristic act, will be political prisoner?

Whether were political prisoners Saddam Hussein (before killing), Karlos (nickname "Jackal"), Nelson Mandela, Ruskoy and his team, Emperor of Bakassa, President Milosevic, gangster Al Capone, Ribbentrop, Keitel and other similar?

Whether few hundred million people are political prisoners, who deny Holocaust or "genocide" of Armenians, if they are suddenly imprisoned in Belgium, Switzerland, France, Germany or Spain?

Not yet, from recent time one may deny existence in Spain of inquisition and homosexual passions of Catholic pastors. On November 2007 Constitutional Court of Spain ordered that denial of Holocaust might not be recognized as crime i.e. is in frames of freedom of speech.

And what about Muslim women, who refused to take off paranja or hijab and arrested for this in one of the "centre of democracy"?

It is clear that for political demonstration of "topless" or in suits of Eva of prostitutes of France or Belgium will not imprison, at least from demographic reasons; it might be done worthier in one of the Arabian countries, moreover on quite legal grounds. What will Lenin's word combination we receive then?

There are hundreds of similar samples, but wait to smile, insult or swear, calling the author an apologist of regime and renegade, to accuse him in sacrilege and other sins.

It seems that there is no so simple like are written in newspapers or shown in TV. I am always ready to agree with opposite arguments if they are not slogans, parliamentary slang or police argot.

"Political" in the good old times named persons subjected to criminal or administrative prosecution for commission of political crimes or deeds.

Political crimes are an encroachment on political system, security of state, common criminal crimes, which were committed in these purposes.

If based on that a law in one of its meanings is a combination of established and protected by state power norms and rules, which regulate relationships of people in society, then all encroachments onto this combination, which are recognized as crimes, should in principle be considered as encroachments in legal policy of state, and the persons, who committed them, - state criminals.

So, according to Criminal Codes practically of countries, exactors and suborners (bribe-givers) are the persons committing crimes against state power and interests of state service; spies, traitors and diversionists – against basis of constitutional system and security of state, terrorists, bandits, sea pirates and hooligans – against public security; participants of aggressive war, genocide, killing of habitants, slavery, deportation, apartheid etc. - against peace and security of humans.

All enumerated crimes with full ground should be related to political ones, but whether persons imprisoned for their commission will be recognized as political prisoners, this is another question.

If similar people are free and walk in the streets with automatic guns (even nothing doing), we would begin to blame the state requiring an order and serenity, and more brave people would start to kick against... and what would we receive new political prisoners?

History testifies that a term “political prisoner” was firstly determined and used by leading international non-governmental human rights organizations “Amnesty International”, and later “Human Rights Watch”.

But, before “political prisoners” there were “prisoners of conscience”, lovely for everybody due to sufficient filling a list of bibliographic rarities of that time.

Term “prisoner of conscience” was offered to human defenders community by Peter Benenson in 1961. According to supplemented definition of “Amnesty International” “... a prisoner of conscience is a person whose freedom restricted in result of imprisonment or other way of restriction due to his/her origin, sex, race, language, national or social origin, property status, relative relationships, sex orientation and other characteristics of persons. In addition, people who use violence or propagate violence and enmity are not considered to be prisoners of conscience”.

Presently “Amnesty International” includes prisoners of conscience in list of political prisoners, and under political prisoners is understood “any prisoner, in case of whom presents considerable political element. This might be motivation of prisoner’s actions, the actions or reasons made authorities imprison him/her”.

More than obviously that in compliance with this definition in a list of political prisoners is automatically included all persons using criminal violence on political motives, including the terrorists have jailed in Guantanamo, secret prisons of CIS, in basements and mansards of FSC, MNB, MI-5, MI-6 and other similar organizations.

It is true for some reasons the persons committing the same crimes are named in USA and most part of European countries as terrorists and bandits, and at our countries – political prisoners. It is possible due to the fact that we have not yet grown for real understanding of democracy.

Dictionary on human rights edited by “Human Rights Watch” indicates the following criteria for definition of notion of “political prisoner”:

“1. A person detained without bringing of accusation after political disorders, demonstrations or actions of civil disobedience, which: a) considered to be detained for expression his/her views or opposition to government without application of violence, or b) illegally detained for belonging to certain group;

2. A person falling within above indicated categories, but to who might later be brought accusations in common crimes under obviously false grounds;

3. A person relating to both categories, which charged and imprisoned without fair court or proper legal procedure;

4. A person imprisoning without accusation in commission of any forcible action, but being accused or suspected in belonging to the groups, protecting and committing forcible crimes against state”.

Council of Europe believes that “person, who deprived freedom, falls within notion of “political prisoner” if: a) deprivation of freedom was applied in violation one of the fundamental rights guaranteed with European Convention on Human Rights and its Protocols, in particular, freedom of speech, conscience and religion, freedom of expression and information, and also freedom of assembles and associations;

b) deprivation of freedom was applied on obviously political reasons without connection to any offence;

c) on political motives a duration of imprisonment and its conditions are obviously incommensurables in respect of offence, in which a person was accused or suspected;

d) a person deprived freedom on political motives in discrimination basis in comparison with other persons;

e) deprivation of freedom is a result of proceedings with obviously violations of procedural guarantees, which linked with political motives of authorities”.

Experts of Council of Europe do not distinguish separately notion of “prisoner of conscience” and give main significance to political motive of power, but political element,

which according to definition of “Amnesty International”, might be manifested with both sides.

In opinion of the experts of Council of Europe, “presupposition that person is “political prisoner” should be confirmed by ‘primary’ (prima facie) evidences, and then a state, which applied deprivation of freedom, has to prove that imprisonment corresponds completely to requirements of European Convention on Human Rights like they are interpreted by European Court on Human Rights in respect of merits of case and requirements of proportionality and non-discrimination were observed and deprivation of freedom was resulted with fair procedural proceedings”.

There are few definitions of notion of “political prisoner” formulated by human rights defenders Sergey Kovalev, Alexander Podrabinsky, Valentin Gefter, Sergey Alfer and others. In general, they have duplicated the definition of “Amnesty International”, and the best way – the experts of Council of Europe.

Term “political prisoner” is used in statements of many human rights organizations, to which might be related US State Department (something like a global human rights defender), but there is no important what country or organization recognizes a concrete person as political prisoner. Main is that the decision is and considered to be objective and justified, has applied on common standards and has no had momentary aims.

Let’s consider given definitions of notion of “political prisoner” and try to correlate them with reality.

Chapter 31 “Crimes against justice” of Criminal Code of Russian Federation contains article 299 “Bringing obviously innocent to criminal responsibility”, article 301 “Illegal detention or custody”, article 303 “Falsification of evidences and results of operational searching activity”, article 305 “Passing of obviously unfair sentence, decision or other judicial act” etc. The articles are concerned the cases, which are contained in notion of “political prisoner”.

There is more or less clear with prisoners of conscience. Person deprived freedom on reason of origin, sex, race, language, national or social origin, sex orientation and other characteristics of identity is undoubtedly a victim if being protected his rights and freedoms if he/she does not use violence, propaganda of violence and enmity. This is said by “Amnesty International” and we should agree with this ...but partly.

Being at home or summer cottage for high wall, a person is free to be oriented like his soul wish. The main is not to disturb to neighbours. What about if without violence, propaganda and enmity a person, in the best traditions of European culture, is trying to involve to his/her untraditional sex orientation pupils where he/she teaches mathematics.

There was an incident in one of the schools, when angered parents wanted to beat a master and form-master for forcing the girls to training of obscene dance. The action of “teachers” did not concern to the article about corruption of minors, and if the parents beat them then they might be imprisoned.

And, what would new political prisoners appear, but not prisoners of conscience?

It seems that there is no everything so simple like is written in newspapers and shown in TV.

It is really, what about a teacher who every day in frame of freedom of speech ventriloquizes at lessons about delights of democracy in Holland, where light drugs are openly sold in café, speaks about freedom on disposition her body, which is inherent to famous people of art, nature of gentle and easily vulnerable, and therefore unprotected from surrounding him/her “trash” etc.

If a teacher is imprisoned for exaction money from parents or “naughtiness” with drugs, then under presence of serious protector and considerable material base is made a big stink and lists of political prisoners are enlarged.

Big stink is even made if “teacher” is just dismissed or beaten by “ignorant” parents considering the lessons about democracy as corruption of minors

Certainly, it will be resulted of misunderstanding of a core of democracy, mossy-covered of thought caused by fifty years oppression of Bolshevistic empire, alien ideology etc.

Speaking honestly the most part of parents, independently on a level their democratic character, do not care all this. Main is to prevent their children on drug addiction and not to lose their orientation among the icebergs of universal values.

According to first criterion offered by “Human Rights Watch”, “political prisoner is a person detained without bringing of accusation after political disorders for expression of his/her views or opposition to government without application of violence or illegal detained for belonging to a certain group”.

Consequently, we have political disorders, under which obviously should be understood mass disorders on political (social) reasons, i.e. absence of these reasons and mass character allows speaking only about disorderly conduct – intentional actions grossly violating public order, accompanying with application of violence, destroying or damaging of other property.

According to article 212 of Criminal Code of Russian Federation, organization of mass disorders accompanying with violence, pogroms, arsons, destroying of property, application of guns, explosive and toxic substances or explosive devices, and also offering military resistance to representative of power or participation in these disorders are punished by imprisonment from eight up to fifteen years, calls to mass disorders or violence over citizens – restriction of freedom up to two years or imprisonment at the same term.

This crime is related to crimes against public security and in various interpretations is included in legislation of all countries of the world.

Depending on users, some cases similar actions are named revolution.

In addition, Criminal Code contains provisions on forcible seizure of power, creation and using of illegal military groups, armed rebellion and active participation in it for forcible changing of constitutional system or violation of territorial integrity, public calls to forcible seizure of power, incitement of national, race or religious enmity.

All these crimes are related to the crimes against bases of constitutional system and security of state – against state power and in different interpretation are contained in Criminal Codes all countries of the world.

For example, similar actions are named USA as high treason, and our country is understood the high treason as adhering to the enemy, espionage, divulgence of state secret, assistance of foreign state, foreign organization or their representatives in conducting of hostile activity against state.

Thus, according to legislation of all countries of the world, a person may not in person participate in political disorders, but to be its organizer, to manage with it by radio set, telephone, through his/her assistants or just to watch for conducting the plan of coup (revolution) from a balcony, and for what he/she has to bear criminal responsibility.

Concerning “detention without accusation” “Human Rights Watch” has no also correctness.

According to legislation of all countries, a person might be detained without bringing accusation for terms from few hours up to few days; therefore he/she cannot be included in a list of political prisoners due to insufficient time. For this there are existed the norms of administrative law in all countries including Russia.

Recently, after mass disorders there were detained dozens of men in Greece, but unlike anybody of them was related to political prisoners. It is clear that there should not be political prisoners in Europe and therefore nobody may consider them in this status. Even, if they are existed.

With regards definition of “Human Rights Watch”, is the matter is to take in custody in order to criminal procedural legislation, in this case it is excluded without bringing of accusation. At least it is in Russia. There are no any such facts and cannot be.

Concerning to persons of indicated categories “to whom might later be brought accusations in common crimes on obviously false grounds”, this is crime provided with Criminal Code. Responsibility should be borne by those who trumped up an accusation.

By the way, it is paradox that if to bring an accusation on obviously false grounds to “common” pickpocket, nobody includes him in a list of political prisoners. Or, will one include?

New Charter of “Amnesty International” of 2003 in section about aims, objectives, main principles and methods declares that protection will be subjected the human right in dependence on their social status, religious, nationality, origin etc.

Essentially, any individual committing crime is a victim of regime. It is interesting how many thieves or rapists were recognized as political prisoners without considering of affiliation, political creeds and role in any political campaigns?

According to dictionary of “Human Rights Watch”, the third category of political prisoners is “persons relating to both first and second ones who accused and imprisoned without fair court or illegal process of law”.

Concerning to process of law developed in Russian with participation Council of Europe’s experts is clear: if judicial proceedings produced with gross violations of the norms of criminal procedural law, it should be recognized unfounded. This is concerned to all kinds of processes, but not only political one.

In respect of fair court, this matter depends on evidences and proving. Nobody can be convicted if there is no guilt. Under availability of discrepancies in assessment of

sufficiency of evidences' collection, all doubts should be interpreted in favour of suspected and accused. Main is that these doubts are objectives but not to have political and unsubstantiated nature.

The fourth category is “persons in custody without accusation in commission of any forcible action, but accused or suspected in affiliation to groups, which protect and commit forcible crimes against state”.

This statement is abracadabra, first part contradicts second one.

If a person is a member of group committing forcible crimes against state and accused in this then it means he/she is an accomplice of actions committing by the group and has to bear responsibility for that, even if he/she has done in group only household duties.

Now, it is about recommendations of Council of Europe. First clause of these recommendations should be understood so that political prisoners are the persons deprived freedom for publications in mass media with his/her ideas in respect of any aspects of political and other life of state, religious, participation in assemblies and associations etc.

We are agreed with this and provisions of articles of Convention, which are said about exceptions.

So, article 2 “Right to life” of European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms says that deprivation of life is not considered as violation of this article, when it is a result of completely necessary application of force for protection of any person from illegal violence; for fulfillment of legal arrest or prevention of person's escape who detained in legal grounds; for suppression, in compliance with law, of a riot or insurrection.

Article 8 “Right to respect for private and family life” of Convention says that, “everyone has the right to respect for his private and family life, home and his correspondence”, there shall be no interference of a public authority with the exercise of this right, except such as is in compliance with the law and necessary in democratic society in interests of national security and public security or economic wellbeing of country, for protection of health or morals or protection the rights and freedoms of others.

Part two of article 9 “Right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion” of European Convention says that freedom to confess a religion or hold of beliefs are only subject to restrictions established by law and necessary in democratic society in interests of

public serenity, protection of public order, health or morals or protection the rights and freedoms of other persons.

Part two of article 10 “The right to freedom of expression” says that fulfillment of freedoms enumerated in part one and imposing duties and responsibility might be conjugated with formalities, conditions, restrictions or sanctions, which established with law and necessary in democratic society in interests of public security, territorial integrity or public safety in order to prevent divulgence of information received in confidence or for maintaining the authority and impartiality of the judiciary.

Part two of article 11 “Freedom of assemblies and associations” says that carrying out of the listed in part one is not a subject of any restrictions except those, which established with law and necessary in democratic society in interests of national security and public serenity, in purposes of prevention disorders and crimes, for protection health and morals or protection rights and freedoms of other persons.

Saving clauses are contained in article 5 “The right to liberty and security”, article 6 “The right to fair trial”, article 7 “No punishment without law” and some others.

In addition, article 18 of the Convention says that restrictions permitted to said rights and freedoms, listed in section one, shall not be applied for any purposes other than those for which they have been prescribed.

Unfortunately, in dependence on opportunistic ideas and situations, opponents of both parties often forget about saving clauses and existence of article 18.

There is an abstract the statements on deprivation of freedom applied on political grounds in connection with any offence. It cannot be that, at least in our country. There would be a person, and article will be always found, but this is a topic of other recommendation.

Duration of imprisonment and its conditions are in direct connection with accusation and valid Criminal Code. Which sanction is indicated if the law those might be applied.

History knows two or three occasions, when judges brought a verdict, which had exceeded a sanction of Criminal Code. But it was a long ago, when there were neither political prisoners nor human rights defenders, and judges were those...

Assertions about duration of imprisonment are not serious and are direct interference in justice, for what one might be imprisoned in democratic countries. I do not think that European Court knows a case better than local court, which examines a case and directly is

touched with participants of process, if anybody is not interested in its concrete result (European or local court).

Similar character has predicting situation of “deprivation of freedom on discrimination base” as under sentencing the significance has no political affiliation but entirely different. At least, we have this.

Particular interest is an interpretation of notion “burden of evidence” by the experts of Council of Europe, according to which human rights defenders assert on availability of political prisoners, and a state has to prove that there is no such fact.

This status given by Council of Europe to the persons, who disinterestedly protect rights and freedoms of others, testifies about significance of this matter for international community and in addition, this is obliged of human rights defenders to be honest, consistent and fair during conducting voluntarily taken public duties.

In this connection, Daniel Estulin, Canadian researcher, wrote that persons taking this heavy weight of human rights defenders have to follow the next rules:

- To work unselfishly, not to take money those who are interested in a case;
- Not to lie and to be careful in his/her judgements;
- Not to be a marionette in hands of politicians and rich men;
- To beware of special service bodies and human rights cartels;
- To know genesis of human rights movements etc.

Following to advices of well-known expert in area of communication, let's try to consider history of appearance and development (genesis) of more authoritative human rights organizations taken from famous foreign publications.

According to “Amnesty International”, “human rights defenders are persons, who propagate or protect by peaceful means the rights of man. Human rights defender is distinguished by the fact that he/she protects rights of others independently on their profession. Human rights defenders advocate universality and indivisibility all man's rights. They do not give priority any one group of the rights to detriment of others ones...”.

Do you know where it is taken from? From oath of Rogers' rangers with their motto “Rangers lay a way”. They are those who performance a role of scouts in fight to Indians. If you wish to know more apply to Internet.

Day of formation of “Amnesty International” is considered to be 25 May 1961, when Peter James Solomon, an English lawyer, being published the article “Forgotten prisoners” in “Observer” newspaper began campaign “Call to amnesty”.

According to Sergey Korotayevsky, “... Peter Beneson went to Amnesty whole life”. His grandfather in mother line, Grigory Benenson, Russian Jew, had been involved in oil and securities businesses, made a fortune in Baku, and in revolution moved with family to England, where Flora, a mother of future human rights defender, had got married for Harold Solomon, British officer, Brigadier-General, who became a father of Peter. In 1923 Harold Solomon got accident and became an invalid, and in connection with this a family had been disrupted. Later, Flora got married to Alexander Kerensky, who lived in emigration.

There are lots of white spots in biography of Peter Beneson, known only on surname of his mother. It is known that he was brought up by poet Oden, and in his student period Arthur Kestler, famous antifascist and writer, was Peter’s cult hero.

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

In fact, poet Oden, who was engaged as a tutor, grafted to Peter a love to poetry, but due to the fact that Oden was disclosed in homosexual ties in Benenson’s house, mother had sent a boy in boarding school.

In 1939 Peter took grandfather’s surname of Benenson, in 1947 he graduated Oxford and became a lawyer, a member of Labour Party

According to official biography, during Second World War Peter Benenson was not taken in the navy due to his emigrant origin and dissident views. However there is known that served in top secret subdivision of special services involving in decipher.

In the beginning of 50-s, on instruction of leadership of British trade-unions P. Benenson visited Generalissimos Franco in Spain and later in Cyprus, in 1956 he visited Hungary and South Africa.

After visiting of Spain, the state sidestepped political blockade. After visiting Cyprus, liberation revolution had been begun there, and anti-governmental actions in Hungary etc.

On June 1961 Beneson and his like-minded persons formed “Amnesty” human rights organization, which 30 September 1962 was re-named “Amnesty International”.

The organization began teeming activity, but in 1966 “Amnesty International” was accused in cooperation with secret services. USSR accused “Amnesty” in links with CIA and Intelligence Service, and the western countries – in links with KGB

Benenson acknowledged that he received money from government, but had done this for political prisoners and their families, but for the organization. Polly Taby, journalist and functionary of “Amnesty”, confirmed that Benenson obtained funds from secret services, but had not indicated from which.

In turn, Benenson accused his supporters and high ranking functionaries of “Amnesty International” Sean McBride and Robert Swan in links with CIA and Intelligence Service. It was begun international scandal and Benenson had been retired.

From 1965 up to 1974 a Chair of Executive Committee of “Amnesty International” was Sean McBride, after him in 1974-1977 – Dirk Borner, and from 1977 to 1979 – Thomas Hammarberg, who was later a Commissioner of Council of Europe on Human Rights. In 1980-1986 Hamamrberg was Secretary General of “Amnesty International”

Sean McBride was born in 1904 in Paris in family of famous Armenian beauty Goin, to whom William Butler had dedicated his sonnets. Sean’s McBride’s father was executed in 1916 in Ireland for participation in rebellion. From 1917 to 1936 both his mother and he were members of Irish revolutionary army (IRA), which was recognized as terroristic organization. He took part in the war for independence of Ireland against England, the government of which had considered all his family as terroristic cell, who were guilty in kill of hundreds innocent people.

Being served in IRA Sean McBride for account of the organization got legal education in Dublin, and after Second World War created Republican Party. In 1948 he became a minister of foreign affairs in government of John Costello, and from 1950 to 1960 he was a member of Irish parliament. Later, he had headed “International Amnesty”.

In 1973 Sean McBride as vice-president took part in the Peace World Congress in Moscow, in 1974 he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize, and in 1976 – a recipient of Lenin Peace Prize.

Another not less authoritative human rights organization is International Helsinki Federation on Human Rights (IHF), which was established in 1983 joining human rights organizations from 40 countries all over the world.

“Human Rights Watch” was a member this organization some time, but in the end of 2007 IHF was declared bankrupt and had been closed due to financial cheating of its managers, who plundered “targeted credits” of influential funds.

With regards of Human Rights Watch, it began its activity on July 1973, when a group of American writers, historians and publishers created Committee in protection of Andrey Almarik, a famous soviet dissident and publicist, who was sentenced by soviet authorities for writing and distribution of his works. A member of this group was also Robert L. Bernstein, the president of one of the biggest book publishing houses “Random House”, who in 1978 created “US Helsinki Watch Committee” human rights organization in New York, which had formed its sections around the world. In 1989 through joining of the sections was created “Human Rights Watch”.

Funding of the sections and new organizations had mainly been done by charitable funds and multi-millionaires such as Airon Diamond Fondation, J.M. Kaplan Foundation, Revson Foundation, Scherman Foundation, Mak Arthur Foundation, John Mepck Fund, J. Mertz-Gilmore Foundation and others.

A role of George Soros should especially be noted. He came in “Human Rights Watch” with a wife, investors of his investment funds and their families.

R. Bernstein was recommended by Board of Trustees of Ford Fund to be the President of human rights organization. Directors and Chairmen of the biggest American manufacturing and financial corporations such as Xerox Corp., Alcoa inc., Coca-Cola Co., Carlyle Asset Management Group and others were members of the Ford Fund.

The next very authoritative human rights organization is considered to be “Reporters without Borders”. F. William Engdahl, an American researcher writes the following about this organization:

“Reporters without Borders is an international Non-Governmental Organization (NGO). According to its website it is headquartered in Paris, France. Paris is a curious home base for an organization that, as it turns out, is financed by the US Congress and by agencies tied to the US government.

If we go to the RWB website to find who stands behind these self-anointed judges of world press freedom, we find nothing. Not even their boards of directors are named, let alone their financial backers. Their annual published Income and Expenditure statements give no clue, who stands behind them financially.

Millions of dollars of their annual income are disclosed as being from “sale of publications.” It does not name the publications or to whom they were sold. As one researcher noted, “Even taking into account that the books are published for free, it would have had to sell 170 200 books in 2004 and 188 400 books in 2005 to earn the more than \$2 million the organization claims to make each year 516 books per day in 2005. The money clearly had to come from other sources, as it turns out it did.”[4] An attempt to go on the RWB website to order any of their publications found no link to any purchasing information nor any price listings or book summary. Very curious indeed.

In their official financial statements and income accounts published in September 2009, they state: “The organisation’s finances in 2008 were marked by the end of the campaign (begun in 2001) over the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games which significantly affected income and expenditure.” [5] That means RWB spent eight years and undisclosed amounts of money campaigning against the Government of China in the run-up to the Beijing 2008 Olympics. For what purpose? Notably, the RWB names China’s President Hu Jintao as this year’s ‘predator’ for his actions in cracking down on unrest in Tibet in March 2010 and Xinjiang in July 2009, both of which were the covert work of a US-financed NGO called National Endowment for Democracy (NED).

After years of trying to hide it, Robert Menard, Paris-based Secretary-General of Reporters Sans Frontieres or RWB, confessed that the RWB budget was primarily funded by “US organizations strictly linked to US foreign policy.”[6] Those US based organizations which support RWB include the US Agency for International Development (USAID) and the US Congress’ National Endowment for Democracy (NED). Also included is the Center for Free Cuba, whose trustee, Otto Reich, was forced to resign from the George W. Bush Administration after exposure of his role in a CIA-backed coup attempt against Venezuela’s democratically elected President Hugo Chavez.

As one researcher found after months of trying to get a reply from NED about their funding of Reporters without Borders, which included a flat denial from RSF executive director Lucie Morillon, the NED revealed, according to Diana Barahona writing in Znet that Reporters without Borders received grants over at least three years from the International Republican Institute. The IRI is one of four subsidiaries of NED. An IRI spokesperson has denied IRI funding the RWB.

The NED, as I detail in my book, *Full Spectrum Dominance: Totalitarian Democracy in the New World Order*, was created by the US Congress during the Reagan administration on the initiative of then-CIA Director Bill Casey to replace the CIA's civil society covert action programs, which had been exposed by the Church committee in the mid-1970s. As Allen Weinstein, the man who drafted the legislation creating the NED admitted years later, "A lot of what we do today was done covertly 25 years ago by the CIA."

Perhaps an organization sitting as judge of world press freedom ought itself to practice a little more openness and transparency about where its backing originates. Otherwise we might think they have something to hide".

Stated above does not give the grounds to assert that listed human rights organization are cooperating with secret services, and its member are fraudsters or persons, who politicizing sexual traditions.

Most of human rights defenders are honest, goal-seeking and courageous people, who are selfishly fulfilling their obligations to protect universal values.

They receive reproaches, threats and sometimes violence and never obtain prizes and awards. They spend their scanty earnings for trips, rent of offices, publications in media, conducting seminars and conferences, help to political prisoners and many others.

However, not depend on attitude to human rights defenders, today there is impossible to leave out them. Kremlin and V.I. Lenin's mausoleum have not yet received complaints from former soviet republic. Strasburg examines complaints based on an opportunistic approach.

The single hope is human rights defenders, but unfortunately, they defence only those, who is considered to be a political prisoner. As rule, they are very unusual men, who, unfortunately, is became less in the world.

In addition, it seems that some of them appointed or chosen as human rights defenders have forgotten Estulin's rules, about which we have spoken above.

V.A. Gilyarovsky in one of his stories gives literal conversation in the police station during interrogation one very trustworthy dandy.

"- Your business?

- Playing.

- I do not understand! I ask you, what are you earning for life?

- I am playing! I earn funds with play in sweepstakes in imperial racing and running societies, cards, produced by Imperial educational home... Playing in games allowed by government...”

For some, who are named themselves like human rights defenders, human rights activity is turned into so named allowed by government plays, in which one might be earned well. But this is a half of trouble.

Main is that everybody gets tired to be volitional or non-volitional participant of manipulations-deceptions.

Honestly speaking, there one has got tired from mentor ton of various foreign consultants, who, it seems, are interested in money, gas and oil and who bravely and skillfully work the grants off and fulfilling formulated aims. They are the same ours' embezzlers of public funds.

It seems that they do not care our rights, which are used by them as a piece of jack in their big political deals.

In order not to make unsubstantiated statements, let's try using the samples of foreign researches on human rights activity to make clear concrete matters.

As we noted above, some European countries introduced a criminal responsibility for denial of these or others historical events. Do not you see parallels with man, who had hardly been burnt only for the fact that said it had still whirled?

Well, if in “bulwarks” of democracy somebody begins to judge (think, make judgements) other than a group of corrupted idiots adopting appropriate law, he might be imprisoned.

Do you imagine what wail would be risen by these gentlemen if Russia adopts a law about criminal responsibility for denial of genocide of Indians in USA and imprison for that in legal grounds?

What is it like not “brainwashing” carrying out on developments of secret services?

Everything is clear with idiots and agents, but who from human rights defenders or judges of European Court voiced for protection of freedom of speech and thought, which are declared in all adopted and planned Conventions on protection of rights and freedoms of man?

Where is a voice of global human rights defender, which took under protection of terroristic raid to “peaceful caravan” of his like-minded persons?

I might be objected that Strasburg has no rights to interfere in internal matters of the states and to adopt other decisions, which are out of its jurisdiction. And what, is it supervision instance for Russia, or they cannot stand on ceremony with us?

There are the questions only, the questions, on which nobody want to answer.

In fact, whether are political prisoners the Muslim women who refuse to take paranja or hijab off and arrested for that in the “bulwarks of democracy”?

Whether human rights defenders know that one of the European countries is hit on to imprison the Muslim women for violation of law about carnival masks. If they know, then why keep silent?

Where are “Amnesty International”, “Human Rights Watch” and others consumers of grants, which made Azerbaijani authorities release “political prisoner”, who later killed on mercenary motives newlyweds and their kid, and after that burnt a flat together with corpses of victims of political games?

Why “Amnesty International” has refused to recognize Nelson Mandel political prisoner, whether Al Capone, Saddam Hussein and others were political prisoners, what the links between some human rights defenders and secret services etc. – the answers in these and other questions are a topic of special conversation.

Bibliography

1. “Radio-Era” FM for “Kiev telegraph”
2. Criminal Code of RF – <http://www.base.consultant.ru/cons/cgi/online>
3. Hew O. Shaughnessy - independent.co.uk
4. R. William Eng-dahl. Reporters without Borders seems to have a geopolitical agenda. “Online Journal” 7.5.2010
5. http://naviny.by/rubrics/politic/2008/05/14/ic_news_112_290476
6. <http://nn.by/index.php?c=ar&i=26131>
7. www.peoples.ru
8. <http://telegraf.by/belarus/2006/07/22/capf/>
9. <http://www.amnesty.org.ru/pages/vestnik28-3-rus>
10. <http://www.amnesty.org.ru/pages/vestnik28-4-rus>
11. <http://www.charter97.org/ru/news/2009/5/12/18129>
12. www.echr.ru/documents/decisions.html - Classification on the decisions on relations to articles of Convention.
13. <http://www.rosconcert.com/common/arc/story/php/426090>
14. <http://www.svaboda.org/content/article/1733876.html>