



Mission in Armenia
29 March to 3 April 2008

FOREWORD

Alerted by both the "Democracy in Armenia" group and the Civil Society Institute (an FIDH affiliate) to the violent repression that followed the presidential elections in this country in **February 2008**, the undersigned lawyers and jurist were mandated by the President of the Paris Bar Association (*M. le Bâtonnier de l'Ordre des Avocats de Paris*) and the International Union of Lawyers (*l'Union Internationale des Avocats*) on one hand and, on the other hand, the FIDH (International Federation of Human Rights).

The mission visited Yerevan from **29 March to 3 April** to report on the situation of the right to defend oneself and the right to freedoms in the Republic of ARMENIA following the events that took place in February and March 2008.

INTRODUCTION

Before considering the legal and juridical context of the mission's work, it is appropriate to recall some chronological milestones to put into perspective the current situation in Armenia and its evolution, seventeen years after the independence of the Republic of Armenia was proclaimed in the Southern Caucasus.

- 21 September, 1991: the Republic of Armenia becomes independent following a referendum.
- October 1991: Election by universal suffrage of Mr. Levon TER-PETROSIAN, who becomes the first President of the Republic of Armenia.
- 1992-1994: Fighting in the autonomous region of Nagorno-Karabakh between the opposing Armenian self-defence forces and the Azerbaijan armed forces. A cease-fire comes into force on 14 May 1994.
- September 1996: Controversial re-election of Mr. Levon TER-PETROSIAN as head of Armenia.
- March 1997: Mr. Robert KOCHARIAN (then President of the self-proclaimed Republic of Karabakh) is named Prime Minister of the Republic of Armenia.
- February 1998: Mr. Levon TER-PETROSIAN resigns from his position as President of the Republic.
- March 1998: Election of Mr. Robert KOCHARIAN as President of the Republic of Armenia. The Constitutional Court refuses to pronounce a decision concerning the constitutional regularity of his candidacy as President.
- March 1999: Mr. Vasgen SARKISIAN, leader of the Republican Party and Mr. Karen DEMIRCHIAN, leader of the People's Party, win the parliamentary elections.
- October 27 1999: Assassination in the Parliament of Mr. Vasgen SARKISIAN and Mr. Karen DEMIRCHIAN, together with six other people.
- February 2003: Mr. Robert KOCHARIAN is re-elected as head of the Republic of Armenia.
- May / June 2003: Parliamentary elections, victory of the Republican Party.
- March / April 2004: Violent repression of opposition demonstrations calling for the resignation of Mr. Robert KOCHARIAN.
- 26 February 2007: Adoption of a bill denying citizens of the Republic of Armenia who work and live abroad the right to vote at their embassy¹.

1 "Law on making amendments to the electoral code of the Republic of Armenia" which came into force on 6 March 2007

Mission in Armenia, 29 March to 3 April 2008

- 11 February 2008: The Constitutional Court rejects the appeal by Mr. Levon TER-PETROSIAN concerning the unequal treatment of candidates during the election campaign.
- 19 February 2008: Controversial election of Mr. Serzh SARKISIAN as President of the Republic of Armenia in the first round, with 52.7% of votes.
- 20 February: Start of massive peaceful protests to condemn electoral fraud.
- 22 February: The Deputy General Prosecutor, Mr. Gagik JAHANGIRIAN, speaks to demonstrators, stating that he is impressed by the scale of fraud and acknowledging that he has been prevented from investigating the killings in Parliament on October 27, 1999.
- Arrest of Deputy Prosecutor, Mr. Gagik JAHANGIRIAN, during the night of 23-24 February, followed during the day of 24 February by the arrest of Mr. Smbat AIVAZIAN, a key figure in the campaign of Mr. Levon TER-PETROSIAN, and of Mr. Aram KARAPETIAN, an official of the Nor Zhamanakner ("New Times") party, who had declared his support for the peaceful protests and rallied to the cause of Mr. Levon TER-PETROSIAN.
- 28 February: Mr. Levon TER-PETROSIAN files an appeal with the Constitutional Court. The appeal is rejected on March 7, during the state of emergency.
- 29 February: Mr. Arthur BAGHDASARIAN, a candidate in the presidential elections, who had won third place and who had contested the results announced, backs Mr. Serzh SARKISIAN and is given the post of Secretary of the National Security Council.
- 1 March to 2 March :
 - Violence is used to disperse demonstrators at dawn on Freedom Square, formerly Opera Square, with no prior warning. Use of force to make arrests.
 - Spontaneous gatherings in front of the French, Italian and Russian Embassies.
 - The army takes up position in the city. Violent repression during the evening (official reports note 8 deaths, including one police officer). A state of emergency is declared from 1 March at 10.30 pm for a period of 20 days: it is forbidden to hold meetings, to assemble and to demonstrate; strict censorship of the media.
- During the month of March: a wave of repression targets Mr. Levon TER-PETROSIAN's campaign team. Several hundred violent arrests are made. Over 130 people are imprisoned and charged. Campaign to intimidate people who had taken part in the peaceful gatherings in February. On 17 March, Parliament passed a law that came into force just after the lifting of the state of emergency, on 21 March, considerably restricting the right to meet, to assemble and to demonstrate². It took 15 minutes to pass this law, which effectively prolongs the state of emergency³.

(the Amendments and the Joint Opinion of the Venice Commission are available at the following Internet address:

[http://www.venice.coe.int/docs/2007/CDL-EL\(2007\)008-e.asp](http://www.venice.coe.int/docs/2007/CDL-EL(2007)008-e.asp))

² On returning to FRANCE, the mission learnt of a very exhaustive article by Mr. Jean GUEYRAS that appeared in the **APRIL** edition of the MONDE DIPLOMATIQUE newspaper; up to this time, unlike the English language press, French newspapers had remained particularly silent about the worrying situation in ARMENIA, (see Annex IV).

³ "Amendments to the Law of the Republic of Armenia on conducting meetings, assemblies, rallies and demonstrations" was adopted on March 17, 2007 and came into force on March 20, 2007.

I. LEGAL CONTEXT AND RELEVANT TEXTS

1.1. The Constitution

ARMENIA adopted a Constitution in **1995**, organising power around the President of the Republic, a Parliament composed of a single Chamber, the National Assembly and local self-government bodies, which are all elected by universal, direct suffrage (Article 4).

The Constitution recognises pluralism and a multi-party system, and states that parties are formed freely in accordance with the Constitution and the laws and principles of Democracy (Article 7).

After cataloguing a long list of rights enjoyed by Armenian citizens, Article 49 of the Constitution defines powers for the President of the Republic that are indisputably those of a strong presidential regime: he appoints the Prime Minister, dissolves the National Assembly as necessary, nominates a certain number of holders of high office and high court presidents, recommends a number of candidates for essential positions, such as General Prosecutor, and acts as Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces.

Point 6 of Article 117 of the Constitution is of particular relevance to the mission since it permits the President of the Republic to declare a state of emergency in the event of “an imminent danger to the constitutional order”, before the definition of the legal regime applicable ⁴.

This Article of the Constitution is the basis for the decree of the state of emergency by the President on **March 1, 2008**, opening the way for general repression of the opposition.

1.2. Relevant texts on criminality

1.2.1.

Armenian criminal procedure is characterised by the absence of examining magistrates and by the responsibility of the Court for public proceedings and conducting investigations.

In the outline of principle criminal proceedings in the Criminal Procedure Code, paragraph 4 of Article 11 is of particular importance to the mission, as it recalls that anyone who is detained or arrested shall be promptly informed of the reasons for his detention or arrest.

Paragraph 7 above all forbids all forms of violence during an arrest.

Similarly, all the paragraphs of Article 19 are relevant that note that a suspect or the accused has the right to defend themselves and that investigating bodies are obliged to guarantee these persons the exercise of their rights.

It will be seen that these two standards were largely violated during the March events, although Articles 62 and those following give a very precise definition of the rights of suspects and the accused, as well as the coercive measures that may be used against them.

Finally, the mission noted throughout its hearings that the periods of custody of those prosecuted were fairly systematically over-run by the use of a mechanism that will be referred to later.

There was no serious disagreement with the mission's observation by those members of the higher authorities who were interviewed.

4 Official website of the National Assembly: <http://www.parliament.am/legislation.php?sel=alpha&lang=eng#3>

1.2.2.

The Armenian Criminal Code texts that were used systematically from **1 March** are those relating to:

- mass disorder (Article 225),
- legal offences concerning weapons (Article 235),
- usurping state power (Article 300),
- and to public calls for a change of the constitutional order by force (Article 301).

The last two offences demonstrate the eminently political nature of the repression.

Article 225 on mass disorder provides for punishment with a term of 4 to 10 years' imprisonment for the organisation of such disorder when it is accompanied by violence and / or destruction using fire-arms or explosive devices.

The same acts accompanied by murder are punished by a sentence of 6 to 12 years.

Still within the framework of Article 225, active disobedience to the representative of authorities, or calls for violence, or mass disorder, are punishable by correctional labour for up to 2 years, or arrest for 2 months, or imprisonment for up to 3 years.

The other text used during the many proceedings that were brought, which resulted in the imprisonment of around 130 people (a figure that corresponds to 2,600 people when compared with the French population) concerns what is known in French law as offences against the law on arms and / or explosives, and which is provided for under Article 235 of the Armenian Criminal Code.

When these acts are committed by an organised group, it is to be noted that sentences may be for up to 8 years.

The texts that are the most significant in relation to political repression in the wake of the events of March 1 are Article 300 of the Armenian Criminal Code, which incriminates the usurping of state power, defined as a plot to overthrow constitutional order or the violent breach of territorial integrity, and Article 301, which incriminates "*public calls for changing the constitutional order by force*".

Thus, on **12 March** proceedings were instituted against Mr. Ararat ZOURABIAN⁵ (one of the election campaign officials for Mr. Levon TER-PETROSIAN) on the basis of the first text on the following grounds:

*"participation in discrediting the pre-electoral process and the elections, contesting the legitimacy of the elections to the international community, encouraging the mistrust of large sections of society regarding the election results, promotion of the illusion of public dissatisfaction and rebellion and, to this end, organising events intended to destabilise the internal political situation ..."*⁶.

Certain other charges provided for in the previously mentioned articles of the Armenian Criminal Code were added to this conspiracy charge.

To summarise its observations, the mission has the impression that, to put an end to dispute concerning the

⁵ Ararat ZOURABIAN, born in 1963 in Yerevan, a graduate in Agriculture. Member of the campaign staff of LTP, President of the Armenian National Movement (ANM) since 2002. Arrested on 10 March 2008, charged under Article 300/paragraph 1 and Article 225 of the Criminal Code. Founder of the central branch of Yerkrpah (the Volunteer Veterans' Union).

⁶ These were the grounds used for detention applications.

Presidential election, the results of which were announced on **19 February**, the President of the Republic, in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution, decreed a state of emergency and the authorities initiated prosecutions conducted by the General Prosecutor, expediting proceedings against the opposition party, mainly on the grounds of contesting the elections and their legitimacy, promoting distrust in society and promoting an illusion of dissatisfaction and rebellion.

For good measure, the added "*colour*" of offences against public order and the laws on weapons has been given to these accusations, which seem to us to belong to the realm of democratic debate.

For, in fact, as diplomatic sources pointed out to the mission, it was all the staff of the opposition party who were arrested in the capital and in the provinces.

II. THE MARCH EVENTS

It is appropriate to talk about the March Events, since it is from this time that opposition protests were severely repressed.

In fact, following the announcement of the results of the presidential elections on 19 February 2008, when the election of the majority candidate was proclaimed after the first round, peaceful opposition protests brought together several thousand people in Yerevan for several days⁷. Although they had not necessarily all voted for Mr. Levon TER-PETROSIAN, they were protesting on the other hand against the massive frauds and the economic and social situation in Armenia.

The demonstrations progressed normally up to and including 29 February.

On the morning of 1 March, things changed and the March events began.

According to the French Ambassador to Armenia, the declaration of support for Mr. Serzh SARKISIAN on February 29 by Mr. Arthur BAGHDASARIAN (a candidate in the Presidential elections who had come in 3rd place, Speaker of Parliament until recently), contributed to the decision of the authorities to put an end to the peaceful protests.

It is nevertheless to be noted that, according to many people interviewed by the mission, the opposition had been subject to repression since the previous October. The mission only received evidence of "mild" but well-targeted repression of the supporters of Mr. Levon TER-PETROSIAN, the opposition candidate.

Mr. David MATEVOSYAN⁸, the former police Chief of the region of Meghri from 1991 to 1995 and former member of Parliament from 1995 to 1999, currently imprisoned following the events and whom the mission was able to meet, thus described the facts.

2.1. The sequence of events

At dawn on 1 March, without warning, the police dispersed opposition protesters who had been camping on Opera Square for around ten days. According to evidence gathered by the mission, some of the police force were responsible for dispersing the demonstrators and forcibly expelling them from their camp, whilst others beat protesters with electric truncheons. Mr. Levon TER-PETROSIAN, who was at the site when the police arrived, was forcibly led away and placed under house arrest.

7 The video tapes supplied to the Mission by the authorities, the opposition and the Civil Society Institute (an FIDH affiliate member) confirm this fact.

8 David MATEVOSYAN, born in 1960 in Karchevan in the Meghri region, a graduate in Agriculture. Member of the "Alternative" Aylendrank Movement. Arrested on 1st March 2008 and charged under Articles 235, 300 and 316 of the Criminal Code. In 1990-1991, he coordinated the defence of the Meghri region. 1996-1998, Vice Governor of the region of Syunik; 1999-2000, Director of the Hayantar (ArmForest) agency.

Mission in Armenia, 29 March to 3 April 2008

Consequently, after around ten days of peaceful demonstrations, the authorities decided to use strong-arm tactics and embarked on severe repression under the state of emergency decreed the same evening by the President in office in accordance with Article 117-6 of the Constitution.

It was from that moment that many people were arrested, including the former Chief of Police of the region of Meghri mentioned previously.

The police surrounded Opera Square so that the only way for demonstrators to escape was along North Avenue.

In the afternoon the demonstrators regrouped in the embassy district, especially in front of the French Embassy. According to the French Ambassador and other sources, the choice of Miasnikian Square was not necessarily deliberate, but the demonstrators, shocked by the morning's police repression, probably felt that the presence of the embassies was a protection against possible new violence.

The evidence of individuals and video images, confirmed by the French Ambassador to ARMENIA, indicate that the forces of order had no hesitation in shooting, mostly over the heads of the demonstrators nevertheless, using tracer bullets (ammunition that leaves a trail of light along its trajectory towards a target and which is used to visualise and improve the trajectory of fire either to indicate the target to friendly units or for warning shots). At that moment it was 9 pm, although the state of emergency was decreed only after 10 pm.

It seems that the Armenian army had taken up position in Yerevan to support the forces of order prior to the announcement by the President of the Republic at 10.30 pm of the institution of the state of emergency for a 20-day period. All the witnesses confirm that, as the videos show, the soldiers carried weapons and cartridge clips that are part of the equipment of the Armenian armed forces.

Cars were burned and shops were looted in other parts of the city, including on Machtotz Boulevard, Grégoire Loussavoritch Street, etc.

During the evening, at least 8 people were killed in Leo Street, Baronian Street and Machtotz Boulevard, one kilometre away from Miasnikian Square where the demonstrators were gathered. According to the official version, one of the victims was a police officer who was trying to prevent a grenade from exploding; four other victims were shot and killed and three others died "due to the use of special methods". The autopsy results and ballistic reports have not been published as of today. However, when questioned by the mission about the publication of the enquiry documents, Mr. Davit Harutyunyan, Chairman of the National Assembly Committee on State and Legal Affairs, stated that the families could obtain access to the autopsy reports through their lawyers and that once the complete file was closed (a single file for 8 deaths), it would be made public.

It is to be recalled that the state of emergency decreed in Yerevan provided for the following restrictions:

- the prohibition of public demonstrations;
- the prohibition of strikes and other actions likely to harm the activities of businesses and the civil service;
- restriction of freedom of movement;
- censorship of the media, which is obliged to present solely the official view of internal affairs;
- restriction of the activities of political parties until the circumstances leading to the imposition of the state of emergency no longer exist⁹.

⁹ See the speech of the outgoing President, Mr. Robert KOTCHARIAN, on the state of emergency: <http://www.rferl.org/featurearticle/2008/03/cb1a547c-35ce-49c2-b19e-0e9bb1ef7f35.html> . See also the report by Mr. Thomas HAMMARBERG, Council of Europe Human Rights Commissioner, on this subject: <https://wcd.coe.int/ViewDoc.jsp?id=1265025&Site=CommDH&BackCo>

2.2. Arrests and violation of the rights of suspects

All the NGOs met by the mission confirmed that demonstrators were arrested before 1 March and were beaten in police stations. Two members of Parliament also went to the police station and received the same treatment.

However, prior to 1 March people were released without proceedings being instituted against them.

After 1 March things changed.

One person was arrested on 1 March and was so badly beaten that he had to be taken to the police station in an ambulance. He remained there for 5 days and, following a court decision, was then placed in detention.

The case of an opposition activist was also reported to the mission and is interesting because it corresponds precisely to the evidence of David Matevosyan, previously mentioned. Mr. X was stopped for questioning on the morning of 1 March after leaving the square from which the demonstrators had been moved. He was stopped at a blockade and taken to a police station, where he was put in a cell. He unsuccessfully demanded that his legal rights should be respected, particularly his right to telephone a lawyer. He was given the reasons for his arrest ("*resisting the police in Opera Square*"), which he refused to sign, as he had not been arrested in Opera Square but in Republic Square. The inspectors were not interested in matters relating to the accusations but wanted to know whether he possessed any weapons and whether he had been paid to stay on the square with the other demonstrators. He saw a prosecutor, who asked him to supply names, which he refused to do, and on 2 March at 4 pm he was set free with no explanation given. He attributes his release to the fact that he knew his rights, which he regularly demanded to be respected.

The mission was able to meet people who wished to remain anonymous and who had investigated the arrests and the manner in which suspects' rights were violated in depth.

It is to be noted that, in accordance with recent Armenian legislation, custody is for a period of 72 hours and it does not begin, it seems, with regard to the capital city at least, until suspects are taken to one of the central police stations.

The time spent in police sub-stations is not really taken into account as in theory it is a short period; it seems that custody periods have systematically been over-run, with people arrested being moved between different police sub-stations over several hours, or even several days, prior to being registered at a central police station.

In the view of the people we spoke to, custody periods were deliberately over-run: in this way, people arrested on the morning of 1 March were declared in the evening. To the knowledge of the people who were questioned, no enquiry had been started into these faults committed by police officers.

Similarly, according to the same sources, the investigation into the arrests shows that nearly 70 % of the people arrested were encouraged to give up their right to a lawyer. In some cases the lawyer who was contacted was not even able to enter the police stations.

In any case, large numbers of arrests were made in the street and the procedure, whereby a lawyer should assist a person who was summonsed, was hindered.

It is interesting to note that the authorities the mission met did not contest this kind of argument.

Thus Mr. Davit HARUTYUNYAN, Chairman of the National Assembly Committee on State and Legal Affairs, and former Minister of Justice, expressed the opinion that such violations of the rights of suspects and accused persons were not systematic, another way of saying that they did in fact exist.

Mission in Armenia, 29 March to 3 April 2008

Similarly, the Minister of Justice, Mr. Gevork DANIELYAN, who was met by the mission, took care to specify that he had not been informed of cases of custody periods that over-ran. However, he knew that it had not always been easy to grant access to lawyers and that if there had been violations of suspects' rights, these had taken place early on in the phase of arrests under the control of the General Prosecutor, since his own jurisdiction did not begin until there was a Court order for detention.

It is to be noted at this stage that, out of a total of 500 people held in preventive detention throughout the country, at least 200 people were arrested and 130 held temporarily subject to criminal proceedings.

It seemed to the mission, however, that these figures were probably inaccurate, since the Administration's statistical apparatus appears to be very flimsy.

In all events, this figure does not include people arrested during walks or "political recreation". In fact, after the introduction of the state of emergency and the prohibition of demonstrations, the opposition tended to get round the prohibition of gatherings and demonstrations by "taking a stroll" on North Avenue every day at 6pm. The walks brought together people from different backgrounds and with different political convictions. They were filmed by the police and several dozen participants were arrested each day up to 29 March, the date of the arrival of the Council of Europe delegation. The people arrested were released a few hours later, with the exception of those against whom criminal charges were brought.

2.3. Injury, maltreatment and / or torture and deaths

According to Mr. SMESSOW, the French Ambassador, around one hundred people were injured and "*shots were indisputably fired at the Armenian people*". The official figure of 8 deaths seems to everyone to be a minimum figure¹⁰.

Objectively speaking, the mission has been restricted to the different versions of various people – which in fact do not differ greatly – as it has no way of checking the number of those injured or the number of deaths.

Nevertheless a certain number of elements clearly stand out with regard to the deaths.

First of all, DVDs received from the opposition party and the Civil Society Institute very distinctly show uniformed men, armed with Kalashnikov rifles, firing several times in short bursts about 2 metres from the ground. These bursts of fire occurred on Machtotz Boulevard and Leo Street. The images are interesting because most people to whom the mission spoke stressed the fact that the victims were quite a long way from the demonstration location (see the map of the city in Annex V).

The HERITAGE political party, the only opposition party represented at the National Assembly, sent three of its parliamentary members to the morgue during the days that followed to try to verify the real facts: no-one wanted to meet and talk to them, especially the forensic scientists who, according to the parliamentarians, were frightened because of pressure that had been put on them. The next day they made a statement to the Assembly and asked a series of questions that have remained unanswered.

These members of parliament, interviewed by the mission, estimate that there are probably more than 8 victims, as do many people. But none of the families has filed a complaint as it is alleged that the authorities have influenced them. According to the parliamentarians from the Heritage party, the reason families of the 8 victims officially reported have not filed a complaint as part of the ongoing investigation into the 8 deaths, is that pressure has been put on them. This consequently means that they have no knowledge of the autopsy and ballistics reports.

The Chairman of the National Assembly Committee on State and Legal Affairs, for his part, affirms that the

¹⁰ Since the mission's preliminary report, dated April 17, 2008 the number of deaths has risen to 10, taking into account the fact that two people did not recover from their injuries.

police never fired on the demonstrators.

But this point of view is not shared by certain NGOs and the Heritage party who, on one hand have learned of the death certificate of a person named PETROSIAN (one of the eight people killed during the events of 1 March) which mentions gun-shot wounds, and on the other that no investigation into these deaths, and whose findings would be made public, has been carried out by the authorities.

The Minister of Justice has in fact confirmed to the mission that the whole affair of the 8 deaths, including that of one police officer, is contained in a single file of investigation into the causes of death.

However, it is surprising that in such serious cases, which obviously provoke a great many rumours, the authorities should not have done everything they could to publicise the findings of an investigation like this, which can be carried out rapidly by the forensic scientists and possibly the ballistics experts.

In any case, the affirmation of the Chairman of the National Assembly Committee on State and Legal Affairs does not lack ambiguity as he maintains that the police did not shoot at the demonstrators, and it is worth remembering that the army had been recalled to the capital. The videos show men using Kalashnikovs to fire in front of them who are clearly men in uniform. In addition, the eight reported victims were not killed on Miasnikian Square – where the demonstrations were held, - but on Machtotz Boulevard, Baronian Street and Leo Street (see 2. 3 paragraph 4).

Finally, with regard to the matter of torture, the mission notes that many of the people interviewed spoke of intimidation and violence at the time of their arrest and while they were held in custody.

According to sources who wished to remain anonymous, people who had had access to detainee registers noted that they included information on their state of health. Several entries in these registers mentioned that detainees had been beaten. According to the same sources, the staff of Yerevan prison would have seen people arrive in a poor state of health.

Referring to the 1984 Convention against Torture, an offence is committed in that “*when such pain or suffering is inflicted*” (on a person) “*by ... a public official or other person acting in an official capacity ... punishing him for an act he or a third person has committed or is suspected of having committed...*”.

With respect to the criteria of discrimination required by the Convention against Torture, this is fulfilled in that it was the opponents of the authorities in power who were subject to this treatment.

2.4. The incomprehensible silence of the Yerevan Bar Association

The description of political repression, the violence and its scale, however incomplete it may be due to the short stay of the mission in Yerevan, makes the silence of the Yerevan Bar Association incomprehensible

On April 1st, the mission was received by Mr. Ara GHAZARIAN, the representative of the Bar Association President, and who indicated that the latter could not attend. The Bar Association President did not subsequently contact the mission, which had nevertheless been specifically requested through his representative. The latter recalled that, as is the case in many countries that formally belonged to the Soviet system, two lawyers’ unions exist and had only merged in 2005, creating the Yerevan Bar Association, which comprises 763 members.

He stressed the existence of the “*public defender system*” of remunerating lawyers, whose cost is covered by the state budget.

In Yerevan there are 12 “*public defenders*” and 17 who are in training; apart from the selected lawyers, these are the lawyers who had knowledge of the legal proceedings resulting from the March events. The mission met none of these, despite its request to do so.

Mission in Armenia, 29 March to 3 April 2008

The representative of the Bar President stressed that the Bar Association was not political and that it could not take a stand on matters of this kind.

The mission replied that issues of freedom, violation of the rights of suspects and the accused, even of violence, maltreatment and / or torture were not political issues but, on the contrary, are the essence of the meaning behind a lawyer's intervention.

Mr. Ara GHAZARIAN confirmed to us that until lawyers were present in police stations, degrading treatment, the violation of rights, the non-notification of the latter and periods of custody that over-run were in fact general practice.

However, as was confirmed to us the Bar Association took no kind of stand on the essential issues of defence, using their political character as an argument.

As the Ombudsman told us later, *“recourse to lawyers goes against the Soviet tradition and lawyers have not found their place in trials...”*

From the mission's point of view, lawyers have not yet found their place in the City

III. THE RESPONSE OF THE AUTHORITIES

From the various interviews the mission was able to hold with the Armenian authorities, it emerged that the latter used only repression as a response to the extremely serious protests expressed by the opposition.

It is appropriate to recall, in fact, that elections in Armenia have been regularly marred by irregularities.

Fraud has been condemned at each stage of this country's electoral evolution, and it can be said that when such fraud has not been to the satisfaction of particular political currents that lay claim to hegemony, State crime has appeared.

It is worth recalling that on October 27, 1999, in the middle of a session of the National Assembly, an assassination commando murdered the people who had won the parliamentary elections¹¹.

This **particularly traumatic affair** has never been completely cleared up, but, to return to the current situation in Armenia, it is worth recalling that it is precisely the Deputy Prosecutor who was in charge of this case, Mr. Gagik JAHANGIRIAN, who was arrested by masked men, charged and detained during the night of 23-24 February 2008 for offences against the law on weapons, just after declaring his support for the opposition and denouncing the massive and, according to him, unprecedented fraud.

It was in this particularly unsettled context that the issue of the regularity of the elections arose during the months of February and March 2008.

3.1. Meeting with Mr. Davit HARUTYUNYAN, Chairman of the National Assembly Committee on State and Legal Affairs

The Chairman of the Committee on State and Legal Affairs, Mr. Davit Harutyunyan, is aware that he holds a strategic position not just in the National Assembly, but also in the Armenian power structure.

When he received the mission, he identified the reasons that in the end, in his view, justified the excessive repression.

Thus he did not hide the fact that arrests and the over-running of periods of custody were nothing new in Armenia and that, furthermore, as part of his function as Minister of Justice in 1998, he had brought to a vote a law providing for custody periods to start from the moment of arrest.

This was a way of saying that in fact the people arrested were not immediately registered as such and so their custody had not started until well after their arrest (see point II. 2 above).

Nevertheless, the Chairman of the Committee on State and Legal Affairs did not admit, contrary to the analysis of other sources, that there was systematic over-running of periods of custody.

When questioned on the way in which prosecutions were conducted in Armenia, he pointed out the supervisory role of the General Prosecutor, as a result of which he enjoys extremely wide powers. In fact, it is the General Prosecutor who conducts public actions and carries out all investigations. But our interlocutor stressed the fact that this extremely powerful person was not appointed by the President of the Republic, but recommended by the latter to the National Assembly.

Returning to the role of Parliament, he considered that the General Prosecutor, independently from the Minister of Justice, should present an annual report to the National Assembly. But he deplored the fact that his successor at the Ministry of Justice had not taken up his project for reform in this regard.

11 See the chronological reminder of events in the introduction, p.2

He therefore admitted the existence of serious problems during the arrests in the month of March and wished for parliamentary control over the General Prosecutor.

On the other hand, the analysis of Mr. Davit HARUTYUNYAN is significantly different concerning the March events, their origins and their consequences. He attributes the deaths to “the situation of mass disorder”, whilst recognising that there was no question of natural death and that it was therefore necessary to open an inquiry into the cause of these deaths.

He is the only person interviewed by the mission who spoke of 47 police being injured, letting it be understood, moreover, that this was explained by the use of grenades by the demonstrators.

He also stated to the mission that the hundred people who were arrested were all accused of offences against the law on weapons. He furthermore stressed that Mr. Gagik JAHANGIRIAN, the Deputy Prosecutor mentioned earlier, had also been arrested for an offence of this nature.

When we examine the accusations against Mr. Ararat ZOURABIAN (see I. 2. 2 above), we understand the extent to which the words used by Mr. Davit HARUTYUNYAN are tendentious and belong to an interpretation that is widely spread in the circles of power.

Finally, as indicated previously, Mr. Davit HARUTYUNYAN affirmed that the police had never shot at the demonstrators.

According to him, the international bodies had taken unwise stands, particularly the United States of America, which considered that the manner in which the elections proceeded justified a form of interpellation by the authorities in power (“should address this issue”). In his opinion, the street had incorrectly interpreted this expression and saw it as encouraging a certain violence and intransigence.¹²

Thus, for our interlocutor, the cause of these events was not internal and linked to the malfunction of the institutions, but external, thus permitting the Armenian political class to be relieved of any responsibility.

3. 2. Meeting with the Minister of Justice, Mr. Gevork DANIELYAN.

The delegation was received by the Minister of Justice following the direct intervention of one of the members of parliament belonging to the Heritage party, whilst several requests presented from Paris, had not resulted in permission for an interview. It is true nevertheless that, as the mission was able to observe on site, the premises of the Ministry of Justice, temporarily moved a long way from the city centre, are subject to frequent power cuts, hence the problems in receiving faxes and connecting to Internet.

The Minister of Justice spoke at length about reinforcing the arsenal of repression, considering that the sentences provided for by the Russian penal system, which had been the inspiration for the Armenian Criminal Code, were insufficient and he announced that these plans would rapidly be discussed at the National Assembly, implying that they would be voted since the government holds an absolute majority.

It is worth noting that he allowed the mission to meet any one it chose to from the list of 130 people held in detention, with the exception, nonetheless, of around twenty people who were totally forbidden to communicate. **This led the mission to observe that the prisoner it met had not seen his family or telephoned his parents since his arrest. When the mission questioned the Minister on this subject the next day, it was told that all the prohibitions had just been lifted¹³.**

¹² When he was also questioned about the law of February 26, 2007 which, since the last parliamentary elections in the spring of 2007, no longer allow Armenian expatriates to vote in their embassies abroad, he replied that the expatriates still had the possibility of coming to vote in their country, that the Armenian state had no obligation to organise such ballots abroad and, more generally, that the Armenians outside the country (who make up 2/3 of the Armenian people, counting those in Russia and Armenians of the Diaspora) could not determine political life in Armenia.

¹³ The Mission is pleased to have worked to achieve this return to the norm, a high point of its stay in Armenia.

Mission in Armenia, 29 March to 3 April 2008

The Minister of Justice began by confirming the number of people arrested since the election results were announced: 130 people.

He then explained that these 130 people had been arrested principally for offences against Articles 225-1, 225-2 and 225-3 of the Criminal Code.

The Minister of Justice spent some time indicating the content of these articles, as follows:

- Article 225-1 of the Criminal Code principally incriminates the organisation of illegal protests, as well as the fact of not submitting to police orders.

Sentences incurred are from a fine to up to two months in prison.

- Article 225-2 of the Criminal Code makes it a crime to participate in protests that result in serious disturbance of public order, and in particular acts that could cause death by endangering another person.

- Article 225-3 goes further, since it makes it a crime to take part in demonstrations that result in death.

Nevertheless, in view of the insufficient repression, according to the Minister of Justice, in the application of the combined provisions of Articles 225-2 and 225-3 of the Criminal Code, these articles were currently the subject of discussions in Parliament with a view, he explained, to more severe repression with respect to accusations as well as the penalties incurred.

Thus, according to him, Article 225-3 of the Criminal Code does not permit significant repression of participation in a demonstration involving the death of a person, as opposed to simple participation in a demonstration involving serious disturbance to public order accompanied by the endangering of the life of another person (which carries a maximum sentence of 8 years under Article 225-2, and a maximum sentence of 10 years under Article 225-3).

The Minister of Justice emphasised the fact that these articles were directly inspired by the Russian Criminal Code and that they should be revised.

He explained at length to the delegation that after the reform of the Code, organisers could henceforth be punished for a different offence involving collective responsibility for damage caused during demonstrations.

It therefore appears that, in the light of the Article that is being prepared, any organisation of a demonstration, whether it were authorised or not, would open the way for the organizers to be held responsible for the consequences of the demonstration, in the same way that the French law against vandalism and violence during demonstrations ("*loi anti-casseurs*") used to be used to establish the collective responsibility of demonstrators.

As part of the arsenal of repression, the Minister of Justice added that he was also working on strengthening the provisions of Article 300 of the Criminal Code, which specifically incriminates "*actions aimed at the overthrowing of constitutional order*".

The sentences presently incurred are for three years and the modification currently under consideration would increase it to five years for "*any call to overthrow constitutional order*".

Yet the simple appearance of an article in the press, reporting the words of an individual or reproducing a political speech contesting constitutional order or simply the elections, is sufficient to be termed a punishable attempted overthrow.

This therefore leaves the way clear for offences of opinion through the media that would prevent any

freedom of information, particularly during an election period.

It seems unlikely that the European Court of Human Rights would accept such provisions.

However, the Minister modified this provision and indicated that if the journalist targeted by the provisions of the new Article 300 of the Criminal Code were to publish information and specified that it related to a call by such and such a politician, he would only be prosecuted if he ignored the censor and if he repeated this information in a second publication.

There is also provision for a specific crime in Article 301 of the Criminal Code, which would consist of calling on the forces of order not to respond to orders from "*the legitimate authorities*".

Finally, in response to the delegation's questions on the number of people charged with carrying weapons illegally, the Minister indicated that this concerned around twenty people, in particular Sasun Mikaelian, the member of parliament arrested after the state of emergency was imposed and whose parliamentary immunity was lifted at the beginning of March 2008.

The parliamentary risks sentences provided for in Article 235 of the Criminal Code, of from three to six years imprisonment for illegally carrying a weapon.

Conditions of custody

The Minister of Justice did not entirely deny that persons injured as a result of violence committed during the demonstrations were not treated during their custody.

He explained that the police had used violence to disperse the demonstration successfully and the fact that people had been injured in these conditions seemed "normal".

However, he denied that violence had been used during their arrest.

He also specified that he had no knowledge of periods of custody that were prolonged for more than 72 hours, and that people had been arrested either when they were convened as simple witnesses, or during the demonstrations.

The Minister of Justice also spoke of the fact that the prisoners overall had given up their right to a lawyer in as much as the Bar Association was "largely understaffed".

The Minister admitted that the prison population in Armenia had increased by a little over 20% in the two weeks that followed the imposition of the state of emergency but, in his view, the conditions of detention had no way deteriorated. The mission is not able to confirm or contradict this point.

Concerning the eight deaths on March 1, 2008, the Minister of Justice indicated that a single file had been opened. It covers all the victims, including the case of a police official who had thrown himself over a grenade to try to protect the crowd and the policemen behind him. He had died and several other policemen were injured.

A file had been opened because the origin of the grenade and the person responsible for throwing it were unknown.

But he refused to entertain the idea of an international investigation apart from a technical investigation into ballistics matters.

3. 3. The house arrest of Mr. Levon TER-PETROSIAN

We must evoke the situation of Mr. Levon TER-PETROSIAN as an example that is symbolic of the uniquely repressive response of the authorities.

The day after the 1 March demonstrations, Mr. Viktor SOGHOMONIAN, the spokesman for outgoing President, Mr. Robert KOCHARIAN, had declared to AFP (*Agence France Presse*) that “*I do not currently see how dialogue might be possible (...) How can we negotiate with the people who are responsible for these events? The wounds are still raw*”.

He added to AFP that those responsible for the clashes “*will be sentenced with the full severity of the law*”, nevertheless refusing to indicate whether the head of the opposition party, Levon TER-PETROSIAN, would be prosecuted.

However, Mr. Levon TER-PETROSIAN is currently subject to a regime of house arrest, with no knowledge of the exact grounds for this. He has not been told of any formal decision.

He has not been allowed to move freely in the capital city of Yerevan or anywhere else in the country, since dawn on 1 March. He is obliged to inform the security services of all his movements. This means that he must obtain prior authorization¹⁴.

When we returned from our meeting at his home we noticed that police cars were parked in front of his home.

There is, therefore, the strong impression that the opposition is being stifled, to the extent that its most symbolic representative, Mr. Levon TER-PETROSIAN, may not express himself freely and does not enjoy full and complete freedom of movement¹⁵.

Mr. Levon TER-PETROSIAN explained to the mission the reasons for the serious lack of confidence that gradually developed between society and the current authorities. The latter, who were described as being extremely corrupt, had no hesitation in using criminal methods to eliminate any challenge to the established authority from political life and the life of society, leaving society and individuals with no protection against the authorities.

If justice is deprived of all independence, it cannot freely investigate or guarantee citizens fair and equitable trial.

Confusion between political and economic power results in a parliament that is dominated either by subservient deputies or by oligarchs, who adopt laws proposed by the President in 5 minutes without a debate (the lifting of parliamentary immunity for 4 deputies) or in 15 minutes (the law of 17 March 2008 restricting civil liberties).

With regard to the election campaign, Mr. Levon TER-PETROSIAN also reminded the mission that the television channels, whether private or public, and the radio stations, totally controlled by the authorities, did not treat the candidates equally. Worse still, with respect to himself, there was discrimination against him. The refusal to grant him broadcasting time on television led his campaign staff to be creative and distribute DVDs of his speeches to people's homes for their information.

Finally, during its meeting with Mr. TER-PETROSIAN, the mission wished to check what it had been told

14 Since the mission returned, it has been informed that the house arrest of Mr. Levon TER-PETROSIAN has been relaxed since he no longer requires prior formal authorisation to travel.

15 This type of stifling was prepared by anti-Semitic subjects in the media, which were pointed out to the mission. The anti-Semitic campaign continues today especially in the official newspapers for the month of May. See Annex II.

Mission in Armenia, 29 March to 3 April 2008

by several sources, including diplomatic sources. The latter presented the opposition party as being absolutely inflexible in its requirement that any dialogue required prior recognition of the fraudulent character of the election results of 19 February 2008.

Mr. Levon TER-PETROSIAN replied clearly when he was questioned on this point.

He indicated that he had no reservations in agreeing to the European Union's proposals for dialogue with the state authorities.

It is to be recalled that as from 3 March the Presidency of the European Union had recommended:

- lifting the state of siege that imposes restrictions on public freedoms;
- the release of all citizens detained for having exercised their right to demonstrate;
- the establishment of an independent enquiry commission into the events of 1 March;
- constructive dialogue between the authorities and the opposition to strengthen peace and stability.

For purposes of accuracy, the mission considered it necessary to recall this point, which may permit ARMENIA to consider a dialogue between its various political constituencies.

3.4. The situation in the street

Since 1 March 2008, taking into account the prohibitions on demonstrating or assembling at any location, the opposition party developed the habit of meeting every day from 6 pm on North Avenue, one of the great avenues of Yerevan and strolling peacefully and anonymously, without any banner.

Nevertheless, the police were always present at these events, as the mission was able to observe *in situ*. Cameramen and photographers accompanied the police, deliberately filming and photographing passers-by, creating a climate that was charged with suspicion and fear.

These fears were perfectly justified as, during these moments of "*political recreation*" - let us recall that in accordance with the law of 17 March 2008, which came into force the day after the state of siege was lifted, gatherings and demonstrations were forbidden *de facto* - many people had been arrested since 21 March and released, often a few hours later. These arrests may be considered as acts intended to intimidate people and prevent any gathering.

However, on the occasion of the combined visits of the mission mandated by the President of the Paris Bar Association, the International Lawyers' Union and the FIDH, as well as that of the Council of Ministers of the Council of Europe, arrests during the peaceful strolls came to an end.

IV. CRITICISM OF THE AUTHORITIES' POSITION

This section of the mission's report does not include criticism made by the opposition party, but criticism made by stakeholders of Armenian society who have a central role in running its institutions.

4.1. Meeting with a Constitutional Court Judge: Mr. Valery POGOSIAN

Of the 9 Judges of the Constitutional Court responsible for pronouncing a verdict on the regularity of the presidential elections in February 2008, one was unable to officiate due to illness.

The mission was able to meet him and, obviously, Mr. Valery POGOSIAN explained that he could provide no information on the details of the appeals filed by Mr. Dikran KARAPETIAN and Mr. Levon TER-PETROSIAN, the candidates in the Presidential election, for which he had also been one of the four Rapporteurs.

However, he gave us his evaluation, based on constitutional arguments, of whether or not the Constitutional Court could rule on a matter related to the electoral process when the state of emergency had already been decreed.

The appeal was filed with the Constitutional Court on 28 February (that is, two days before 1 March) at a time when there was clearly considerable debate and when the majority of the population believed that there was extremely serious electoral fraud.

Judge Valery POGOSIAN informed the mission of certain pressing questions in connection with this. Could the Constitutional Court have been unaware of the situation when an appeal was referred to it? Did its ruling contribute to making the situation even more difficult? Is it not sensitive for the Constitutional Court to issue a ruling when an extremely serious political matter is under consideration in the country?

On the other hand, according to Judge Valery POGOSIAN, the Court should not have sat in the middle of the state of emergency. Similarly, the Court should not have issued any ruling during the state of emergency, because it is essential to make debates public, which it was impossible to guarantee in this case.

If it is true that the referral had been made to the Court prior to the imposition of the state of emergency, and that the regulations require it to announce a decision within ten days of an appeal being referred, then, according to the Judge whom the mission met, the ten day count should not have included the 20 days of the state of emergency and should have continued after it was lifted. Instead of which, the Court rejected the dual appeal filed in the middle of the state of emergency although it was obvious that a certain amount of pressure was being brought to bear on it.

Judge Valery POGOSIAN recognised that the Constitution provides that a law should specify the methods of operation of the various administrative, legislative and judicial authorities during the state of emergency. In the absence of such a law that was expected but still not drawn up or put to the vote, it remained necessary to rely on general legal principles and the recommendations of the Court's internal regulations.

When the mission questioned the Judge on his personal opinion of the validity of the election process, he replied that as a simple citizen he had noted, as had many other people that day, suspicious movement in the streets (minibuses that were directed along routes that were different from their usual routes, transport taking people to polling stations, etc.). In his opinion, the answer to the issue of the validity of the election process might lie in the fact that 500,000 people came into the streets to protest against the declared results. In his view, this meant that the majority of the population believed the violations to be so many and so serious that the election results had been distorted. The mission believed it should report the words of this eminent personality insofar as other evidence and the videos are in the same vein.

4.2. Meeting with the Ombudsman, Mr. Armen HARUTYUNYAN

The mission was received by the Ombudsman, whose position has existed in Armenia for only the last two years.

The Ombudsman severely criticised the amendments aggravating the penal laws, that were announced to us by the Minister of Justice on the same day.

For our interlocutor, "*the reasons given are totally insufficient*" to justify the amendments and he added that there was absolutely no need for their alignment with the most severe laws in Europe.

His position on the March events was made public on 25 April in a long report that was being written when the mission met him.

The Ombudsman fully confirmed the information brought to the attention of the mission regarding the March events themselves.

Custody periods were generally exceeded, even though the Ombudsman defined the over-run periods as being many rather than systematic.

Similarly, the role of the lawyer did not fulfil his expectations. Here he pointed out that the lawyers had not yet found their place in the procedure.

The Ombudsman confirmed what had been said by other sources, that he had visited the police stations at the time of the events and that, especially, he had to intervene on several occasions to permit the lawyers to act.

In the final analysis, he believes that the whole judicial system must develop and that more weight must be given to two norms in particular: the norm relating to freedom of expression and that relating to fair trial.

He believes, as does the mission, that the only responses to the events were repressive and that there is no opening to democracy since society has not assumed its independence in relation to the political authorities.

Concerning the extremely difficult question of the number of deaths, the Ombudsman pointed out that he could receive personal and confidential complaints from individuals and that in this case he had received none, leading him to believe that there was nothing to indicate that the number of 8 deaths was greater. However, he explained that if there had been more deaths, this would inevitably become known in time.

Finally, the Ombudsman believed that the State of Emergency decreed by the President of the Republic on the grounds of Article 117-6 of the Constitution in no way contravenes constitutional order, even if the law that should specify the method of putting it into practice had still not been voted.

The Ombudsman's freedom of expression and analysis is evidence of the potential for rich democratic debate within society, which the authorities in power do not appear to allow.

In fact, from the very first days of the month of March, the Ombudsman did not hide his criticisms and even made them public, making the President of the Republic bitterly regret having appointed him to this position¹⁶.

He concluded by noting that Armenia could not face the future without a reduction of its inequalities, improved redistribution of wealth and a broader range of liberties¹⁷.

16 See Annex III.

17 When he was additionally questioned on the allegations of discrimination affecting the Yezidi minority, he confirmed that these fragile populations benefit from even less protection than others.

CONCLUSIONS

The mission was given a double mandate: to make a thorough investigation into the state of emergency decreed on 1 March 2008 in the circumstances noted above, and to report on the situation of the rights to self-defence and freedoms in the Republic of ARMENIA.

5. 1.

From a legal point of view **firstly** it is completely obvious in the view of the mission that Armenian society needs most of all a return to standards of democracy.

A return because, at the same time the state of exception was lifted, the government moved quickly to put to the vote on 17 March a law restricting the freedom to conduct meetings and demonstrations, and which has been largely criticised by the Venice Commission. A return to standards of democracy still presupposes the lifting of measures restricting freedom of movement that are applied to political figures of the opposition, the liberation of detained persons, the end of harassment of the opposition press, and re-establishment of the freedom to meet and to demonstrate.

But such a return will not be sufficient to lift society out of the type of stalemate situation in which it finds itself and which takes different forms.

As the Ombudsman pointed out, more weight must be given to democratic norms, which, as in many countries, including Western countries, means reinforcing the power of citizens who are confronted by the omnipotence of the State and its bodies.

In truth, from the mission's point of view, society's independence from the political authorities could not be recommended without considering the question of the readiness for democracy and the challenges to established authority that are required.

This requirement demands a much more reliable electoral system, which guarantees free and honest elections.

5. 2.

After the issue of norms **then** comes the question of an independent, impartial investigation into the events of March 2008.

Regarding this issue, when the mission was received by the Minister of Justice, it asked him whether an investigation had been carried out to support the view held in certain political circles that the demonstrators had used grenades against the police.

The Minister indicated that the debris of grenades used by the demonstrators had been sent to international experts together with, as comparative evidence, grenades that the member of parliament Mr. X had confessed to disposing of during the events.

The delegation was surprised and asked him if other comparative evidence had been sent to these experts, especially the grenades with which the police force and the army were equipped.

The Minister replied that there were too many types of grenade...

It goes to show how much an impartial, independent and incontestable investigation is needed and that, in the mission's view, it is not certain that Armenian authorities with these characteristics can be put in place.

5.3.

Improvement in the situation in ARMENIA and full respect for human rights requires dialogue between all parties.

Such dialogue is the only way to put an end to the political tensions that are accompanied by serious human rights violations: arrests, arbitrary detention and violations of the right to defence. But the prior requirement for frank and lasting dialogue that will bring about real change is that light should be shed on the events of February-March and the human rights violations during this period.

We furthermore call on the authorities to conduct, as soon as possible, impartial and effective investigations into the deaths and cases of torture that were noted during the state of emergency and into the murderous use of force on 1 March.

Only an objective and open evaluation of the situation is likely to contribute to putting an end to the most serious crisis that ARMENIA has known.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE ARMENIAN AUTHORITIES:

1. To release unconditionally persons detained arbitrarily since their arrest was politically motivated or made with the intention of sanctioning the exercise of basic freedoms.
2. To set up as quickly as possible an independent, transparent and, if necessary, international commission of enquiry into the events of the end of February - March 2008 and the human rights violations committed during this period.
3. To ensure that those responsible for these violations are brought to justice and duly punished. Similarly, to ensure that recent attacks on human rights activists are punished¹⁸.
4. To repeal the law that includes amendments to the legislation on public demonstrations adopted on 17 March 2008 during the state of emergency, in accordance with the views of the Venice Commission.
5. To guarantee the independence of the judicial authorities, to guarantee the right to a fair trial and in particular to allow representatives of civil society access to police station detention cells and put an end to the ill-treatment inflicted on detainees.
6. To guarantee the exercise of basic freedoms, especially the freedom of expression, of movement, freedom to meet, to demonstrate and the right to participate in political life.
7. To guarantee, in all circumstances, the physical and psychological well-being of human rights defenders.
8. To reform the electoral system in order to guarantee free, honest and fair elections.
9. To respect the commitments made in the framework of the Council of Europe, the OSCE, the United Nations and the European Union and in particular to comply with the conclusions of Resolution 1609 (2008) of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, which calls on the Armenian authorities to undertake the reforms necessary for respect of the Rule of Law, and, to this end, to cooperate fully with these mechanisms.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS:

FIDH calls on the appropriate international and regional institutions and mechanisms, principally:

1. the UN Human Rights Commission Special Procedures such as the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention, the Special Rapporteur on the Independence of Judges and Lawyers, the Special Rapporteur on the Right to Freedom of Opinion and Expression, and the Special Rapporteur on Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment,
2. the Monitoring Committee of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, mindful of its report to the June 2008 session of the Parliamentary Assembly,
3. the Special Representative to the European Union for the South Caucasus and the bodies responsible for monitoring implementation of the EU-Armenia Action Plan.

The mission calls on these bodies to bring to bear all necessary pressure to bear for the full respect by Armenia for human rights in accordance with its commitments and to assist the Armenian authorities with their investigations into the events of February and March 2008.

Paris, 10 June 2008

Mr. Antoine COMTE

Mr. Carine JACOBY

Mr. Patrick ARAPIAN

Mr. Kirill KOROTEEV, FIDH Mission Representative

Annex I:

List of political prisoners drawn up by Mr. Mikael DANIELYAN, President of the Helsinki Association in Armenia.

The mission met Mr. Mikael DANIELYAN during its stay in Armenia. He has been an important figure in human rights defence for many long years and enjoys an international reputation in the field. As well as the official list of the Ministry of Justice, the Helsinki Association, directed by Mikael Danielyan, was able to provide the mission with the attached list of people imprisoned since February 2008 and the March events.

On Wednesday 21 May he was attacked by Tigran Urikhanian, the former President of the Armenian Progressive Party. He had already been attacked in 2004.

On 28 May 2008, Arsène Kharadyan, one of the officials of the civil youth movement "Hima", was violently beaten up.

Name	Occupation	Arrest date	Accusation	Place of detention
Zhora Sapeyan	Head of the Hanrapetutyun (Republic) Party Unit in Talin	29 Januray 2008	RA Criminal Code 258/3 Convicted to 2 years and 6 months	"Nubarashen" criminal-executive institution (CEI) Hovik Arsenyan
Mkrtich Sapeyan	Chief of Aragatsotn region "Yerkrapah" office	29 Januray 2008	RA CC 258/2 Convicted to 2 years	"Nubarashen" (CEI) Hovik Arsenyan
Haik Gevorgyan	Member of the Hanrapetutyun (Republic) Party	29 January 2008	RA CC 258/3 Convicted to 1 year and 6 months	"Nubarashen" CEI Hovik Arsenyan
Gagik Hovhannisyan	Proxy	08 February 2008	RA CC 309/2	"Yerevan-Kentron" CEI Hovik Arsenyan
Marzpetuni Ayvazyan (brother of Smbat Ayvazyan)	Member of the Hanrapetutyun (Republic) Party	19 February 2008	RA CC 188/3	"Nubarashen" CEI (on hunger-strike)
Harutyun Urutyun	ANM member, Head of Maralik Campaign Headquarters	19 February 2008	RA CC 149/2 Sentenced to 7 years in prison, appeal is submitted	"Nubarashen" CEI
Gagik Jhangiryan	Former Deputy General Prosecuter of RA, former Military Prosecutor	23 February 2008	RA CC 235/1, 316/1	"Yerevan-Kentron" CEI
Vardan Jhangiryan Pending Trial	Chief of Gegharkunik and Kotayk regions Electricity Unit.	23 February 2008	RA CC 316/2	"Hospital for Convicts" CEI

Mission in Armenia, 29 March to 3 April 2008

Aram Karapetyan	President of the "Nor Jamankner" (New Times) Party	24 February 2008, 15:30	RA CC 333	"Vardashen" CEI Harutyun Bakhdasaryan
Smbat Ayvazyan	Member of Political Council of the Hanrapetutyun (Republic) Party, Former Minister of the State Income	24 February 2008, 9:45	RA CC 316/1	"Vardashen" CEI Hovik Arsenyan
Arsen Asatryan	Security Guard of MP Khachatur Sukiasyan (Head of the Yerevan Campaign Headquarter)	24 February 2008	RA CC 235/1	"Vardashen" CEI Artur Alikhanyan
Marat Bagdasaryan	Security Guard of MP Khachatur Sukiasyan (Head of the Yerevan Campaign Headquarter)	24 February 2008	RA CC 235/1	"Vardashen" CEI Artur Alikhanyan
Vardan Kirkosyan	Driver of G. Jhangiryan	24 February 2008	RA CC 235	"Nubarashen"
Petros Makeyan Pending Trial	Chiefman of "" "Jokhvardakan hayrenik" (Democratic Motherland) Party	25 February 2008, 14:00	RA CC 149/2	"Nubarashen" CEI Varduhi Elbakyan
Ashot Zaqaryan Pending Trial	Head of the Guymri Branch Yerkrpah, Former Chief of Police of Gyumri	25 February 2008	RA CC 149/2	"Vardashen" CEI Grisha Manikyan
Husik Baghdasaryan Pending Trial	Member of "Hanrapetutyun" (Republic) Party	26 February 2008	RA CC 235/1 Convicted to 3 years	"Nubarashen" CEI Sentenced to 3 years
Hovhannes Harutyunyan Pending Trial	Member of the Hanrapetutyun (Republic) Party, "Yerkrapa" – Arabkir chef	26 February 2008	RA CC 235/1 Convicted to 1,6 year	"Yerevan-Kentron" CEI Vardan Zurnachyan Sentenced to 1 year
Shota Saghatelyan Pending Trial	Member of the Hanrapetutyun (Republic) Party	26 February 2008	RA CC 149/2	"Nubarashen" CEI

Mission in Armenia, 29 March to 3 April 2008

Yura Mamyán Pending Trial	Member of ANM, Head of Noyemberyan Campaign Headquarters	26 February 2008	RA CC 235 /1 Convicted to 3 years	"Yerevan-Kentron" CEI Seda Safaryan
Davit Vosjanyan Pending Trial	Member of Levon Ter-Petrosyan Central Campaign Office, former Meghri Police Chief, Proxy	01 March 2008	RA CC 225 prim, 316/2	"Vardashen" CEI Artavazd Parsadanyan
Ar Malkhasyan Pending Trial	Member of Hanrapetutyun Party	01 March 2008	RA 225 prim, 316/2	"Nubarashen" CEI
Gurgen Mikaelyan	Proxy	01 March 2008	RA CC 225/2	"Nubarashen" CEI
Hovhannes Ghazaryan Pending Trial	Member of ANM, Coordinator of Armavir Campaign Headquarters	01 March 2008	RA CC 225/1, 316/1	Nazeli Vardanyan
Vahagn (Vardges) Hayocyan	ANM executive secretary, manager of campaign offices in marzes	01 March 2008	RA CC 225prim/2, 316/2	"Nubarashen" CEI Seda Safaryan
Tigran Baghdasaryan	Member of ANM, Arabkir Community Campaign Headquarters	01 March 2008	RA CC 225/2, 316/2	"Nubarashen" CEI Ara Zaqaryan
Davit Araqelyan Pending Trial	Chief of of Center community campaign office	01 March 2008	RA CC 225prim/2, 316/2	"Vardashen" CEI Seda Safaryan
Masis Ayvazyan Pending Trial	Member of ANM, Regional coordinator of campaign office	01 March 2008	RA CC 225prim/2, 316/2	"Vardashen" CEI Varduhi Elbakyan
Levik Khachatryan Pending Trial	ANM board member, Regional Coordinator of Campaign Office, Proxy	01 March 2008	RA CC 225prim/2, 316/2	"Nubarashen" CEI Hrach Alezyan

Mission in Armenia, 29 March to 3 April 2008

Ashot Manukyan	Member of ANM territorial council Chief of Lori Marz, Chief of campaign office	01 March 2008	RA CC 225 prim/2, 316/2	“Nubarashen” CEI Inesa Petrosyan
Samvel Harutyunyan Pending Trial	Proxy	01 March 2008	RA CC 225 prim/2, 316/2	“Nubarashen” CEI Artur Grigoryan
Avetiğ Nersisyan Pending Trial	“Yerkrapa” member	01 March 2008	RA CC 225prim/2, 316/1	“Nubarashen” CEI Amalia Avagyan
Misak Hovhakimyan Pending Trial	Proxy	01 March 2008	RA CC 316/1	“Nubarashen” CEI Vahe Grigoryan
Khachik Gasparyan Pending Trial	“Yerkrapa” member	01 March 2008	RA CC 225prim/2, 316/2	“Nubarashen” CEI Amalia Avagyan
Mushegh Saghatelyan	Head of the Ani Campaign Headquarters, member of “Vogu Pordzutyun” NGO,	01 March 2008	RA CC, 225 prim/2, 301, 316/2, 318/1	“Vardashen” CEI Seda Safaryan
Soghomon Yeritsyan Pending Trial	Proxy	01 March 2008	RA CC 316/1	“Nubarashen” CEI
Armen Avagyan Pending Trial	Activist	01 March 2008	RA CC 316/1 Convicted to 1,6 years	“Nubarashen” CEI
Hamlet Abrahamyan Pending Trial	Member of Artik Campaign Office, Proxy	02 March 2008	RA CC 225 prim, 316/2	Inesa Petrosyan
Vardges Gaspari Pending Trial	Proxy	02 March 2008	RA CC 225 prim, 316/2	“Nubarashen” CEI (on Hunger-Strike) Varduhie Elbakyan
Vahram Mkhitaryan	Activist	02 March 2008	RA CC 316/1	“Nubarashen” CEI
Raju Petrosyan Pending Trial	Proxy	02 March 2008	RA 225/2, 316/2 Convicted to 2years and 6 months	“Nubarashen” CEI
Arman Shahinyan	Proxy	02 March 2008	RA CC 225/2	“Nubarashen”CEI

Mission in Armenia, 29 March to 3 April 2008

Hakob Hakobyan	Deputy of National Assembly, Chief of “Vogu pordzutyun” NGO	03 March 2008	RA CC 235/1, 300/1	“Yerevan-Kentron” CEI Melanya Arustamyan
Artur Guroglyan	Activist	03 March 2008	RA CC 225/3, 300/1	“Yerevan-Kentron” CEI
Sargis Parunakyan Pending Trial			RA CC 316/1 Convicted to 3years	“Nubarashen”CEI
Sos Gevorgyan Pending Trial	Activist	03 March 2008	RA CC 235/1	“Nubarashen” CEI
Karapet Rubinyan	Former Deputy Speaker of National Assambly, former Chief of Staff of the President of RA, Proxy	03 March 2008	RA CC 300/1	”Yerevan-Kentron” CEI Hovik Arsenyan
Gegham Harutyunyan	Member of the Republic (Hanrapetutyun) Party	03 March 2008	RA CC 225/3, 300/1	“Yerevan-Kentron” CEI Nikol Grigoryan Sentenced to 1.5 year
Myasnik Malkhasyan	Deputy Chief of Yerkrpah (Voluntary Union of War Veterans) Deputy of National Assambly	03 March 2008	RA CC 225/3, 300/1	“Yerevan-Kentron” CEI Melanya Arustamyan
Frunz Manasyan	Activist	03 March 2008	RA CC 225/2	”Yerevan-Kentron” CEI
Gurgen Eghiazaryan	Former Deputy Head of National Security Service, Proxy	03 March 2008	RA CC 300/1	”Yerevan-Kentron” CEI Varduhi Elbakyan
Kristophor Elazyan	Former policeman (he refused to give false statement against activists)	03 March 2008	RA CC 225/2	“Vardashen” CEI Vardan Zurnachyan (on hunger-strike)

Mission in Armenia, 29 March to 3 April 2008

Hovik Mkhitarian	Hrazdan	03 March 2008	RA CC 300/1	"Yerevan-Kentron" CEI
Karen Tarkhanyan Pending Trial	Activist	04 March 2008	RA CC 225/1	"Nubarashen" Zara Budaghyan
Harutyun Mkrtychyan Pending Trial	Proxy	04 March 2008	RA CC 225/2	"Nubarashen" CEI
Aslan Avetisyan	Member of the Hanrapetutyun (Republic) , Proxy	06 March 2008	RA CC 225/2	"Nubarashen" CEI
Artur Shahnazaryan	Proxy	06 March 2008	RA CC 225/2	"Vardashen" CEI
Khachik Simonyan	Head of Yeghvard Branch of the Hanrapetutyun (Republic) Party, Proxy	06 March 2008	RA CC 225/2, 300/1	"Yerevan-Kentron" CEI
Grigor Gevorgyan	Activist	07 March 2008	RA CC 225/2, 200	"Yerevan-Kentron" CEI
Grigor Voskerchyan	ANM Board member, Head of Abovyan Campaign Headquarters	08 March 2008	RA CC 225/1	"Yerevan-Kentron" CEI (on hunger-strike) Gevorgyan Hrant
Aram Bareghamyan Pending Trial	Head of Hrazdan Campaign Headquarters	09 March 2008	RA CC 225 prim, 316/2	"Nubarashen" CEI (on hunger-strike)
Nver Sargsyan Pending Trial	Proxy	09 March 2008	RA CC 225/2	"Nubarashen" CEI
Alexandr Arzoumanyanyan	Head of Central Campagn Headquarters, former Foreign Minister	10 March 2008	RA CC 225/3, 300/1	"Yerevan-Kentron" CEI
Ararat Zurabyan	Chiefman of Armenian National Movement Party	10 March 08	RA CC 225/3, 300/1	"Yerevan-Kentron" CEI

Mission in Armenia, 29 March to 3 April 2008

Suren Sirunyan	Member of ANM	10 March 2008	RA CC 225/1	“Vardashen” CEI
Gevorg Ghazaryan Pending Trial	Member of “Erkrpah”, branch of Gyumri, Proxy	10 March 2008	RA CC 225/1	"Vardashen" CEI
Samvel Abovyan	Member of ANM	10 March 2008	RA CC 225/2	“Vardashen” CEI
Artak Hovsepyan	Member of “Erkrpah”, Proxy	11 March 2008	RA CC 235	“Artik” CEI, Hakob Tcharoyan
Sargis Mkrtchyan	Activist, Disabled, Diabetic	11 March 2008	RA CC 225/2, 176/1	“Nubarashen” CEI
Aghasi Mkrtchyan	Member of “Erkrpah”, Proxy	11 March 2008	RA CC 225/2	“Nubarashen” CEI (on hunger- strike)Harutyun Baghdasaryan
Sasun Mikaelyan	Deputy of National Assembly	12 March 2008	RA CC 225/3, 300/1	“Yerevan-Kentron” CEI
Vardan Ghavalbabunts	Member of Malatia- Sebastia Campaign Headquarter, Proxy	16 March 2008	RA CC 225/2	“Vardashen” CEI, Harutyun Baghdasaryan
Arshak Banuchyan	Deputy Principle of Matenadaran, Coordinator of Vayots-Dzor Campaign Headquarters, Proxy	24 March 2008	RA CC 154/prim2, 225/1, 225prim/1	“Nubarashen” CEI
Hakob Petrosyan	Activist	25 March 2008	RA CC 225/prim, 316/1	"Nubarashen" CEI
Yasha Melqonyan Pending Trial	Proxy	27 March 2008	RA CC 225prim/2, 316/2	“Yerevan-Kentron” CEI
Shant Harutyunyan		11 April 2008	RA CC 225prim/2, 316/2	"Nubarashen" CEI Harutyun Baghdasaryan

Mission in Armenia, 29 March to 3 April 2008

Samvel Karapetyan	Proxy	11 April 2008	RA CC 38, 150 Convicted to 3years Under appeal	N/A
Simon Amirkhanyan	Proxy	11 April 2008	RA CC 38, 150 Convicted to 3 years Under appeal	N/A
Artur Nazanyan	Activist	12 April 2008	RA CC 225/2	"Nubarashen" CEI
Tigran Suqiasyan	Activist	12 April 2008	RA CC 225/2	"Nubarashen" CEI
Eghishe Grigoryan	Activist	12 April 2008	RA CC 225/2	"Nubarashen" CEI
L. Gasparyan	Activist	15 April 2008	RA CC 225/2	"Nubarashen" CEI
Eduard Ashughyan		26 April 2008	RA CC 225/2	"Nubarashen" CEI
Lendrush Tonoyan		25 April 2008	RA CC 225/2	"Nubarashen" CEI
David Aghayan		05 May 2008	RA CC 316/1	"Nubarashen" CEI Varduhi Elbakyan
Styopa Sargsyan	N/A		RA CC 225/2, 176/1	"Nubarashen" CEI
Armen Vardanyan	N/A		RA CC 225/2, 176/1	"Nubarashen" CEI
Mkrtich Abrahamyan Pending Trial	N/A		RA CC 225/2	"Nubarashen" CEI
Grigor Aghamalyan Pending Trial	N/A		RA CC 225/2	"Nubarashen" CEI
Aharon Antonyan	N/A		RA CC 225/2, 183/2.2, 177/2.1	"Nubarashen" CEI
Karen Avagyan	N/A		RA CC 225/2	"Nubarashen" CEI
Arayik Bagratyan	N/A		RA CC 225/2, 176/2.3	"Nubarashen" CEI
Grigor Barseghyan	N/A		RA CC 225/2, 176/2.1,3	"Nubarashen" CEI
Arman Geghamyan	N/A		RA CC 225/2, 176/2.1	"Nubarashen" CEI
Edik Grigoryan	N/A		RA CC 225/2, 176/2.1	"Nubarashen" CEI
Hakob Grigoryan	N/A		RA CC 225/2	"Nubarashen" CEI

AT PRESENT THE LIST CONTAINS VERRIFIED DATA ON THE PLACE OF DETENTION AND ACCUSATION ARTICLE OF THE PERSONS MENTIONED THEREIN.

Meliq Grigoryan	N/A		RA CC 225/2, 225prim/2, 316/2	“Nubarashen” CEI
Tigran Hakobyan	N/A		RA CC 225/2, 176/1	“Nubarashen” CEI
Norik Harutyunyan	N/A		RA CC 225/2	“Nubarashen” CEI
Andranik Ghazaryan	N/A		RA CC 225/2, 176/1	“Nubarashen” CEI
Vahe Ghazaryan Pending Trial	N/A		RA CC225/2	“Nubarashen” CEI
Yurik Ghukasyan	N/A		RA CC 225/2, 176/2.1,3	“Nubarashen” CEI
Artur Margaryan	N/A		RA CC 225/2, 176/2.1	“Nubarashen” CEI
Arman Margaryan	N/A		RA CC 225/2, 176/3.4	“Nubarashen” CEI
Roman Mnatsakanyan Pending Trial	N/A		RA CC 225/2	“Nubarashen” CEI
Artak Nahapetyan	N/A		RA CC 225/2, 176/1	“Nubarashen” CEI
Albert Nersisyan Pending Trial	N/A		RA CC 225/4	“Nubarashen” CEI
Artur Petrosyan	N/A		RA CC 225/2, 176/1	“Nubarashen” CEI
Garik Petrosyan	N/A		RA CC 225/2, 176/2.1,3	“Nubarashen” CEI
Armen Sargsyan	N/A		RA CC 225/1	“Nubarashen” CEI
Mher Sargsyan	N/A		RA CC 225/2, 176/2.1,3	“Nubarashen” CEI
Stepan Sargsyan	N/A		RA CC 225/2	“Vanadzor” CEI
Yurik Simonyan	N/A		RA CC 225/2	“Vanadzor” CEI
Nver Stepanyan Pending Trial	N/A		RA CC 225/2	“Nubarashen” CEI
Tatev Gasparyan Pending Trial			RA CC 235/1	“Yerevan-Kentron” CEI
Hrayr Peninyan	N/A		RA CC 225/2	“Vanadzor” CEI

PERSONS WHO GOT SUSPENDED SENTENCES

- 1.Seryoja Siradeghyan - RA CC Article 235/1, 2years
- 2.Rafik Asryan – RA CC Article 235/1, 1 year
- 3.Gegham Harutyunyan – RA CC 235, 1.5 years (with probation)
- 4.Mesrop Zaqaryan – RA CC 316/1, 2 years (with probation 2yers)
- 5.Rubik Voskanyan – RA CC 225prim/1, 316/1, 2.6 years, 200.000 AMD Fine (with probation 1.6 yers)
- 6.Davit Hambardzumyan – RA CC 316/1, 1.6 years (with probation 2years)
- 7.Avetiğ Ghrejyan – RA CC 235/1, Sentenced to 2 years
- 8.Artashes Matevosyan RA CC 225/2, 4 yers (with probation 2years)
- 9.Karlen Manucharyan RA CC 225/2, 2.10 years
- 10.Armen Movsisyan RA CC 225/2, 3.6 years (with probation 3 years)

DETENTION ON REMAND HAS BEEN SUBSTITUTED WITH A WRITTEN UNDERTAKING NOT TO LEAVE A PLACE

- 1.Gurgen Aslanyan
- 2.Hamlet Hovhanisyan
- 3.Aram Sargsyan
- 4.Razmik Tevoyan RA 225/2, 300/1
- 5.Norayr Norikyan
- 6.Shogher Matevosyan
- 7.Tigran Makeyan
- 8.Karen Makeyan
- 9.Suren Surenyants RA CC 225/1, 300/1
- 10.Petros Hakobyan RA CC 225/2prim, 316-2
- 11.Frunze Stepanyan
- 12.Zakar Matevosyan RA CC 225prim
- 13.Levon Kizakyan RA CC 225/2
- 14.Vemir Mkhitaryan RA CC 225/2
- 15.Sedrak Grigoryan RA CC 225/2, 300/1
- 16.Vladimir Araqelyan RA CC 300/1
- 17.Levon Davtyan RA CC 225/2prim, 316/2
- 18.Vahagn Hareyan (Pending Trial) RA CC 38-225/1
- 19.Aleksan Vardanyan RA CC 225/2
- 20.Hovhannes Mkheyanyan RA CC 334, Pending Trial
- 21.Suren Barseghyan RA CC 225/3, 300/1
- 22.Yerjanik Abgaryan RA CC 300/1
- 23.Edik Khachatryan RA CC 235/2, Pending Trial

PERSONS CURRENTLY IN DETENTION AS MENTIONED IN THE LIST POSTED ON 19 MARCH 2008 IN THE OFFICIAL SITE OF PROSECUTION OFFICE OF ARMENIA

- 1.Suren Minasyan

PERSONS WHO WERE INITIALLY MENTIONED AS MISSING IN THE ORGANIZATIONS LIST AND WHOSE FURTHER DESTINY IS STILL UNKNOWN

- 1.Artak Sargsyan
- 2.Narek Shahinyan
- 3.Hovhannes Hambardzumyan
- 4.Alen Simonyan
- 5.Nikolay Kocharyan
- 6.Gagik Yeghiazaryan
- 7.Kamo Torosyan
- 8.Armenak Karagyozyan
- 9.Garegin Kurghinyan

Mikael Danielyan, Chairman of Helsinki Association

Annex II:

ARTICLE PUBLISHED FIRST IN *HAYOTS ACHKHAR* (24 May 2008) AND LATER IN *GOLOS ARMENII*

The Hayotz Ashkhar article has been re-printed in the Golos Armenii (both newspapers are controlled directly from the office of the president) and is another anti-semitic outburst.

Hayots Ashkhar Daily
Published on May 24, 2008
Armenia

Armenian National Congress or Jewish Congress?

The information that the Ter-Petrosyan-led movement was funded and governed from abroad is gradually becoming more precise and argued.

The fact that Mr. Ter-Petrosyan has ties with Masonic as well as powerful Jewish political and economic organizations and has constantly been under their influence did not seem convincing to some people. However, the analysis of his political activity of the past 6 months directly confirms the above mentioned.

First, in the estimation of well-informed people, the atmosphere of masonry (its first precondition being the denial of national values) and cosmopolitanism has become essentially overwhelming in the ex-President's family and his surroundings, especially during the recent years. And this has been achieved due to the efforts of L. Ter-Petrosyan's wife.

That Mr. Ter-Petrosyan's wife is a Jew has been published in the press many a time. However, we recently managed to find out the real names of Mrs. Ter-Petrosyan and her family members. Her father's name is Pliskovsky Frayim Abramovich, and here mother's name is Kourtach Brakha Ibramovna and before marriage, Ms. Lyudmila's full name was Pliskovsaya Lyudmila Frayimovna.

Having grown up in the influential and rich community of the Jews. Lyudmila Ter-Petrosyan has been consistent enough in her efforts of spreading her influence on L. Ter-Petrosyan, his son and his family members.

And here is an interesting fact: after resigning from office, L. Ter-Petrosyan never visited any marz of the country apart from Vayots Dzor. After he and his wife paid several visits to the cemetery of the Jews (situated near the village of Yeghegis), they decided to have it renovated and reconstructed. What's more, L. Ter-Petrosyan promised the Jewish community that right after being elected a President in 2008 he would deal with the reconstruction of the cemetery in person.

By involving Lyudmila Ter-Petrosyan in the leadership of their infra-structures, the Masonic organizations of the United States, the Russian Federation, Europe and the Near East managed to maintain permanent and reliable ties with Levon Ter-Petrosyan and offer him assistance. When the Jewish flag was waved on the Theatrical Square during his pre-election meetings, nobody paid a special attention to that.

However, the developments following the March 1 incidents make us conduct a more thorough analysis as to why the 'liberation movement' was best elucidated especially by those American and Russian media which are under the influence of the Jewish lobby. There were a number of noteworthy facts revealed in the course of the journalistic investigation.

Mission in Armenia, 29 March to 3 April 2008

Once we already informed you that the principal goal of L. Ter-Petrosyan's one-day visit to Moscow (mid-January, 2008) was the meeting with the Vice Chair of the RF right-wing forces Leonid Gozman, a Jew by nationality. Mr. Gozman is also the leader of the St.

Petersburg branch as well as one of the entrusted individuals of Alexander Tchoubays, Head of the Russian Energy Systems. Why do you think L. Ter-Petrosyan had a strictly confidential meeting and a tête-à-tête with Leonid Gozman for 6-7 hours?

Let's also note that L. Gozman and the 'Holding' he leads have unlimited political and economic resources; their financial-economic balance and annual circulation make up tens of billions of dollars. Spending a sum of USD 100-200 million for assisting L. Ter-Petrosyan in the Armenian elections was not a great difficulty for this particular structure (which also coordinates the programs of their American and European partners in the CIS countries).

This is the agreement Leonid Gozman and Levon Ter-Petrosyan concluded in January 2008, in a confidential meeting held in Mr. Gozman's private residence in the vicinities of Moscow. L. Ter-Petrosyan's electoral campaign was to start in a couple of days' time, and the sums arrived in time. They entered Armenia through different organizations and were invested in the political process.

The Jewish-Masonic lobby spent USD 65-70 million on L. Ter-Petrosyan's campaign, and it's going to spend twice more for achieving its principal-goal, i.e. bringing L. Ter-Petrosyan to power.

Those sums enter Armenia through different public organizations, natural persons and artificially created enterprises and are mainly transferred to the closed accounts of Armeconombank'.

The sums are also periodically given to the emissaries who are sent abroad on mission by Levon Ter-Petrosyan. Then, through different banks, these people transfer the money to Armenia.

Why did the representatives of 'Great East', a powerful organization with unlimited financial and political resources, arrive in Armenia in mid-January? What were they planning and agreeing upon with Hovhannes Igityan, an activist standing close to L. Ter-Petrosyan?

Why did the influential Masonic organization operating in the countries of the Near East conduct a series of two-week closed meetings with Hovhannes Igityan, who thereafter started meeting with L. Ter-Petrosyan almost every day?

How come that just within a couple of hours on the night of March 2 H. Igityan rapidly left Armenia with the help of large sums and different individuals and found himself in France and then left for Strasburg and Brussels?

How come that Hovhannes Igityan, who was only the Head L. Ter-Petrosyan's campaign headquarters in Avan district, has had meetings with senior officials in Europe and beginning March 10, has been conducting lobbying among the Parliamentarians of the Council of Europe, representing Armenia exclusively in dark colors?

He gave misinformation to CoE Secretary General Terry Davis, Head of PACE Rene van der Linden and different European media representatives and experts who were preparing for the PACE April 17 hearings devoted to Armenia.

Furthermore, the Jewish-Masonic lobby is currently using the same aggressiveness to have the Council of Europe deprive the Armenian delegation of the right to vote. Under whose auspices did H. Igityan implement those 'activities'? Of course, through his connections with the Masonic 'Great East' organization. As to the details of the process, L. Ter-Petrosyan is fully aware of them. H. Igityan kept in touch with him from Europe on daily basis.

Mission in Armenia, 29 March to 3 April 2008

It will be extremely interesting to ask L. Ter-Petrosyan why the members of the Jewish-American Committee (the second largest Jewish lobbying organization in the United States and Europe) are arriving in Armenia on May 27-28? It should be noted that those arriving in Armenia are not ordinary members of the organization but rather, its leaders, i.e. Peter Rosenblat, Barry Jabes and John Waters, as well as American-Armenian translator Ross Vardanyan who will accompany them.

According to available information, the leaders of the Jewish organization want L. Ter-Petrosyan to report them on his accomplishments; thereafter, they will specify the ex-President's further steps in the following three directions:

1. Armenia's domestic problems
2. US-Armenian relations
3. Turkish-Armenian relations

If L. Ter-Petrosyan expresses exhaustive and satisfactory attitude towards those issues, the political and financial assistance will be undoubtedly continued, and the US-RF segment of the Jewish chain will open a 'second respiratory tract' for L. Ter-Petrosyan's political activity.

Annex III:

Statement of the Ombudsman, Mr. Armen HARUTYUNYAN made after the tragic events of 1st March 2008 and the response of former President, Mr. Robert KOCHARIAN

**Human rights defenders position on the existing situation in the country
03/03/08**

1. Even from the pre-electoral campaign period, the public activities of different political bodies resulted in the atmosphere of intolerance in our society. Unfortunately the calls for tolerance, made both by competent international organizations and by the Human Rights Defender were ignored. Even more, the atmosphere of intolerance turned into mutual hatred after the tragic events on the March 1.

2. The events of March 1 started from the forced dispersal of the demonstrators in the Azatutyun square early in the morning. It was officially announced that there was an accumulation of weapon in the place of demonstration, and Police officers simply tried to inspect the area but faced tough resistance.

The Human Rights Defender's position is that the authorities should clarify some issues. Notably, who, when and under what circumstances there was made a decision to disperse peaceful demonstration by using force early in the morning of March 1, whether the demonstrators were presented an official warning of corresponding searching and whether the participants refused or resisted, and whether the use of force was adequate to the situation.

The aforementioned issues are conditioned by the announcement of the demonstrators that early in the morning without any warning, they were attacked and severely beaten. It is difficult for us to reveal the truth but there is an unanswered question. What was the reason that the police imposed restrictions on the activities of journalists, for us to get full impartial information. The fact of such prevention was officially confirmed by "Erkir media" and "ALM" television broadcasters.

3. People near the French Embassy are a part of our society, they are not burglars or hooligans. They were convinced that they were citizens of Republic of Armenia who illegally suffered violence from law enforcement bodies.

The Police suggested to make a procession and hold a demonstration near Matenadaran. What was the reason that the people who could lead the demonstrators, did not do that, but at the last moment announced that the demonstrators did not obey them. Eventually what was the reason that demonstrators disagreed with both law enforcement bodies and with the representatives of Levon Ter-Petrosyan's electoral headquarter. Perhaps, the reason was the early morning events? Perhaps so many wounded and 8 dead persons were the result of this disagreement? The Defender deeply condoles with the relatives of the victims.

4. Current activities of some mass media, mainly TV broadcasters directed to the increase of the tension in atmosphere is at least doubtful. Particularly, it is continuously broadcasted the announcements of high level officials stating to punish or call to trial only those who participated in March 1 demonstrations.

Why the issue of possible illegal actions and corresponding responsibilities of law enforcement bodies are not discussed.

5. The presidential decree of 01.03.2008 introducing a state of emergency imposes restrictions on civil and constitutional rights. Thus, according to subpoint 4 of the 4th point of the decree, mass media reports on domestic political matters may include only official information. Whereas, according to the information, received by the Defender, the activities of "A1plus", "Lragir" informational internet portals have been suspended. In connection with it, the head of the National Security told the Defender that the reason for such extreme measures is that the internet providers of the corresponding sites are located abroad. According to the head of the National Security the latter were warned about the restrictions prescribed by the decree, but they refused to stand to them justifying that they act within the legislation of their own state.

The subpoint 3 of point 4 of the aforementioned presidential decree provides that law enforcing bodies have the right to restrict the free movement of people, means of transport and execute searching. The complaints received by the Defender indicate that in a result of broad interpretation of the mentioned subpoint the right of people to enter Yerevan city is inadequately eliminated.

Besides, the defender receives complaints concerning mass arrestments which is accompanied by, according

Mission in Armenia, 29 March to 3 April 2008

to applicants, violations of criminal procedural norms. As for this question the Defender had a telephone conversation with the RA Prosecutor-General, who eagerly offered to present the list of all arrested people to the office of the Defender.

Nevertheless, some representatives of law enforcing bodies tried to prevent the Defender from executing his powers. Such case happened at the RA Police Yerevan department Qanaqer-Zeytun police station.

6. We think that the present situation is conditioned by rough governing system, over-centralization of power, artificial essence of system of checks and balances, social and economic polarization, combination of business and authorities, absence of public control over authorities, deficiency of civil liberties. So it is the situation which has been continuously mentioned by me as the Human Rights Defender of RA, that we have systematic problems in the sphere of the protection of human rights in Republic of Armenia. All these results in the fact, that one big part of our society feels apart from the administration, has a total distrust towards public institutes, electoral mechanisms, justice and mass media.

A certain part of political bodies tried to make use of the situation for its narrow political interests following not the way of dialogue, but the one of confrontation. Of course, the authorities have their part of responsibility in the current situation.

There are two ways to solve the situation: illegal, that is leading to deadlock and legal. The deadlock would be the situation when the political arena becomes deserted and a total feeling of fear would be formed. The other way must be based on real democratic mechanisms, human rights must be considered as a highest value or a headstone, and the way of dialogue and cooperation must be followed up.

It is reassuring that this way is preferred by the newly elected president. It shows that the coming government tries to follow the legal way. It is characteristic that a proposal of cooperation is made by a political leader, whose political party, forms the majority in the Parliament.

I'm sure that even in this situation the possibility of dialogue and political way of peaceful solution of the existing disagreements is not exhausted.

Armenia's out-going President, Mr. Robert Kocharian, criticises the Ombudsman.

<http://www.armenialiberty.org/armeniareport/report/en/2008/03/CA0BFD67-5C6A-4AD0-BEA7-60BBEC9BC719.ASP>

WEDNESDAY 5, MARCH 2008



President Robert harshly criticized on Wednesday Armenia's state human rights ombudsman, Armen Harutiunian, for questioning the use of lethal force against thousands of opposition supporters who took to the streets of Yerevan at the weekend.

In a report released on Monday, Harutiunian said Saturday's deadly clashes between security forces and protesters may have been the result of a violent break-up earlier in the day of the peaceful opposition sit-in in the city's Liberty Square.

Mission in Armenia, 29 March to 3 April 2008

The Armenian police say Ter-Petrosian and his most ardent supporters who were camped in the square more 11 days hoarded weapons, ammunition and even drugs and had to be dispersed.

Harutiunian wondered whether riot police tried to search the square or issued a warning to the protesters before using force. He said the much bigger crowd that barricaded itself elsewhere in central Yerevan and clashed with riot police hours later was not necessarily controlled by opposition leaders.

“After all, what was the reason for the demonstrators’ disagreement with both law-enforcers and representatives of Levon Ter-Petrosian’s campaign team?” he asked. “Maybe the reason for that was the events that took place in the morning.”

The ombudsman also condemned the state-controlled electronic media for presenting only the official version of events. “Why aren’t they discussing possible illegalities committed by representatives of law-enforcement bodies and the issue of holding them accountable?” he said.

A spokeswoman for Armenia’s Office of the Prosecutor-General, Sona Truzian, insisted on Wednesday that security forces that confronted the opposition crowd on Saturday night did not fire at protesters and themselves came under fire. But she could not explain just how at least seven protesters died in the standoff, saying only that circumstances of their deaths are being “meticulously” examined by law-enforcement authorities.

Kocharian was clearly angered by the ombudsman’s report, telling journalists that Harutiunian is tarnishing Armenia’s image broad and “does not understand what he is talking about.” He said every state official must remember that they “work for Armenia and not for Strasbourg.”

Harutiunian had worked as a legal adviser to Kocharian before being elected as human rights ombudsman by the National Assembly two years ago. Kocharian himself nominated his candidacy for the job. The outgoing president said on Wednesday that he now considers the nomination to be the “most unsuccessful” of his personnel decision

Annex IV:

Article by Mr. Jean GUEYRAS, published in the newspaper Le Monde Diplomatique in April 2008

Presidential Election contested in Yerevan

Dangerous instability in Armenia

The bloody repression mourned in Yerevan on 1 March following protests against the Presidential election results, has created extreme tension in relations between Armenia and the United States, which is considering partial “suspension” of its economic aid. Mr. Vladimir Putin, however, warmly congratulated the new President, Serzh SARKISIAN, and welcomed him to Moscow on March 24 for discussions on future relations between the two countries.

by Jean Gueyras

According to the Armenian authorities, seven civilians and one police officer were killed in Yerevan on the night of March 1, with one hundred and thirty three people injured, almost half of whom were police. Demonstrators were protesting against the “fraud” that accompanied the Presidential election. It is difficult to verify these statistics due to the censorship that has muzzled the press since the start of the state of emergency (1). The humanitarian organisation Human Rights Watch has noted police use of deadly weapons that are prohibited by international law. Over a hundred opposition members were arrested and risk trial for “usurping power and incitement to riot”.

On 9 April Mr. Serzh Sarkisian will thus become head of a country muzzled by repression and battered by the brutality of twenty days of the state of emergency. Elected by a hair's breadth (52.9 % of votes), his credibility is severely damaged, to the extent that his success in the Presidential election on 19 February resembles a pyrrhic victory. Aram Abrahamian, who directs the influential Yerevan daily Aravot, believes that the new chief of state has finally fallen prey to the hypocrisy of his predecessor, both a friend and rival. In his view, “the use of violence against the demonstrators was organized by [Mr. Robert] Kocharian and will seriously compromise the legitimacy of Sarkissian”. They are both closely linked, however.

Mr. Sarkissian is from Nagorno-Karabakh, the autonomous region of Azerbaijan that is in the majority Armenian and that, using weapons, won its “independence” at the beginning of the 1990s, and, in addition, occupied part of the territory of Azerbaijan.

Arriving in “the motherland” in 1990, he headed up the key ministries of the Interior, National Security and, in 2000, Defence, before becoming head of the government in April 2007. He owes this avalanche of promotions to a large degree to the President of the Republic, Robert Kocharian, who also comes from Nagorno-Karabakh, and whose vision he shares.

The two men were in addition the principle artisans of the eviction, in 1998, of the man who had facilitated their acceptance into the leading elite of Yerevan: the first President of the Republic, Levon Ter-Petrosian. The latter was forced to resign for having proposed a compromise solution to the problem of Nagorno-Karabakh, which was considered to be too biased in favour of the enemy Azeri (2).

Subsequently the two cronies were suspected of being involved in the massacre of 27 October 1999. On that day, five men armed with automatic rifles penetrated the National Assembly and killed eight people, including the two most powerful men of the period: the Prime Minister Vazgen Sarkisian, considered a national hero because of his role in the war in Nagorno-Karabakh, and the charismatic, popular

Parliamentary President Karen Demirchian (3).

Those who benefited most from these assassinations were undeniably President Kocharian – who had been relegated to a purely honorary role by his Prime Minister Vazgen Sarkisian – and his friend Serzh Sarkisian, the then Minister of national Security. Logically, the latter should have been punished for negligence or incompetence. Not at all: he was even promoted to Defence.

A palace revolution

The massacre of 27 October was not, therefore, as was claimed, the work of a band of extremist nationalists, but the fruit of a palace revolution that brought to power a President who had until then been reduced to cutting ribbons. The General Prosecutor, Gagik Jahangirian (4), who tried to push the official investigation further to find out whether the five killers had been manipulated, was quickly removed from the case. And Mr. Aram Sarkissian, who was appointed as Prime Minister in honour of the memory of his brother Vazgen, was summarily sacked. The way was now clear to consolidate the regime of Mr. Kocharian, supported by the ambitious Serzh Sarkisian.

Signs of disagreement between the two allies appeared around two years ago, when the question of the successor to President Kocharian arose. According to the Constitution, the latter could not seek a third term. Nevertheless he hoped for the election of a man devoted to him and whose omnipotent Prime Minister he would become – in short, an arrangement equivalent to that of Mr. Vladimir Putin in Russia.

This plan was not at all to the liking of Mr. Sarkisian, who had long dreamed of succeeding his accomplice as President of the Republic. In order to impose themselves, each of the two rivals set themselves the goal of winning a majority in the National Assembly during the legislative election in May 2007. Defence Minister Sarkisian, who was promoted to head of government in May 2007, made a takeover bid for the Republican Party: he joined it as a simple member before becoming chairman and transforming it into a formidable election tool. President Kocharian, for his part, counted on the support of Prosperous Armenia, a party founded at his request in 2006 by his friend Gagik Tsarukian, a rich and larger-than-life oligarch, nicknamed “Dodi Gago” (stupid toad). The owner of an immense fortune, estimated by some to be worth 500 million dollars, and of around forty flourishing commercial businesses, Mr. Tsarukian was confident of his protégé's victory, believing that he could buy anything.

Despite the generous distribution of emoluments by the oligarch, the Republican Party won a resounding victory in the legislative election on May 12, thanks to its new Chairman and free access to government administrative resources, leaving Prosperous Armenia far behind. In fact, these elections served as “primaries” for the Presidential election in February 2008, and left the chief of state no other choice but to resign himself, in appearance at least, to the verdict at the polls. Suddenly the unofficial Presidential and government spokesmen rushed to confirm that Mr. Sarkisian was the President's “preferred candidate”.

The Republican Party's election tidal wave, occupying over half of the one hundred and thirty one seats at the National Assembly, was not solely due to the fraud that has become a regular feature of elections, but also due to the political failure of an opposition paralysed by the personal ambitions of its leaders, some of whom were manipulated by the Prime Minister's services. Nothing therefore seemed to be in the way of Mr. Sarkisian's carefully prepared climb to the summit of the State.

The unexpected declaration in September 2007 by the first President, Levon Ter-Petrosian, that he was presenting himself as candidate, took the country's leaders by surprise, as they had almost forgotten his existence. During the nearly ten years he spent in the political wilderness, he had carefully abstained from any political activity, completely devoting himself to his university work.

Urged on many occasions by his close friends and colleagues, he indicated that he would take a decision at the appropriate moment, after detailed consideration of all aspects of the political climate. At the end of a

tour throughout the country lasting several weeks, he confirmed that he had realised the extent of extreme unpopularity of the regime in power and popular support for his political comeback. He therefore decided to launch himself into the battle for the Presidency against those he henceforth referred to as the “gang of criminals in power” and “the mafia regime”.

Boycotted by all the media, which was completely controlled by the authorities, he multiplied public meetings, criticizing the regime and presenting his ideas. For him, the greatest crime committed by the government team was to have done nothing in the past ten years to settle the Nagorno-Karabakh problem, a settlement without which Armenia can not develop normally. Recalling his past statements of the need for a compromise solution, and which had caused his downfall, he showed that such an arrangement was now more difficult, even impossible, “Azerbaijan being less and less ready to agree to concessions, since it is in the middle of developing its oil reserves”.

Nicknamed “Levon Effendi” by the government press for, in its view, having adopted a pro-Turkish bias, he took a stand on the most delicate of problems, the Armenian genocide, perpetrated in 1915 under the Ottoman Empire. “Unlike Robert Kocharian”, he maintained, “I consider it inappropriate to make this issue the cornerstone of Armenia’s foreign policy.” He added that “Turkey will have to recognise the Armenian genocide sooner or later, but this will only be possible in a climate of normal and neighbourly relations”. He went even further and stated that the Armenians must rid themselves of their old complexes, which consisted of them constantly seeing themselves as victims. Otherwise Armenia will never become a modern nation.

His public speeches, made available to public opinion thanks to thousands of DVDs distributed throughout the country, and to several videos broadcast on YouTube, began to seem to be a veritable declaration of war on the Kocharian-Sarkisian duo. Recalling the massacre on 27 October 1999, he stated that “the monolithic pyramid of the corrupt and criminal regime in Armenia could not have existed without the tragic disappearance of Karen Demirchian and Vazgen Sarkisian”, and that one of the essential tasks of the new President would be to find the people behind this tragedy.

The “ruthless pillaging” of resources

Mr. Ter-Petrosian, who proclaims out loud what people are whispering, persists in condemning “the corruption that is rotting all levels of society” and the “ruthless pillaging” of the country’s wealth by the team in power and by the oligarchs, who have shared the most profitable sectors of the economy between themselves. The former President succeeded in creating a current of popular opposition amongst young people in particular in just a few months and just through the power of his words. This is what was demonstrated by the eleven days of massive demonstrations of peaceful protests against the results of the Presidential election that preceded the bloody repression of 1 March.

The highly influential General Prosecutor Aghvan Hovsepien paid involuntary homage to the charisma of Mr. Ter-Petrosian, when he accused the latter of having “hypnotized” the crowds, in the real sense of the term, going as far as to threaten him with a trial for sorcery...

Faced with increasing popular controversy, victory in the first round of the Presidential election became vital for the authorities in order to avoid taking any risks in a second round (5). Every step was therefore taken to multiply the frauds and the intimidation measures. Against all expectations, the observers of the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) were not able, or did not wish, to recognize the scale of irregularities and considered that the “few violations” that were observed could in no way affect the result of the vote. The OCSE has not tired in its use of this ambiguous formula following each of the elections of the last ten years. Curiously, this does not prevent it to claim that nothing must be done to discourage the few advances made by Armenia in its progress towards electoral democracy.

With its new, poorly elected President, Armenia risks experiencing a period that is troubled and unstable. The “civil society that henceforth knows no fear”, that Mr. Ter-Petrosian boasted he had created in the

Mission in Armenia, 29 March to 3 April 2008

country, will not give up easily. It remains to be seen whether Mr. Sarkisian has the skill and the wisdom to establish a productive dialogue with a new opposition that promises to be formidable.

Jean Gueyras.

Journalist, Paris.

(1) The state of emergency was lifted on March 20, but was replaced by a law that practically prohibited meetings and political demonstrations.

(2) Read « Un “coup” pour rien en Arménie », Le Monde Diplomatique, December 1998.

(3) Read « Impossible troc entre Arménie et Azerbaïdjan », Le Monde Diplomatique, March 2001.

(4) Demoted in 2001 to the position of Deputy General Prosecutor, Mr. Gagik Jahangirian was relieved of his duties for having cast doubt on the integrity of the vote on 19 February and he was arrested shortly afterwards for “bearing unauthorized weapons”. Several high government officials, including a deputy minister of foreign affairs and four top diplomats were also relieved of their duties for having supported Mr. Ter-Petrosian.

(5) The electoral commission announced Mr. Sarkissian as the winner with 52.9 % of votes, and Mr. Ter-Petrosian in second place with 21.5 %.

Annex V:

Map of Yerevan town centre



FIDH represents 155 Human Rights organisations

155 organisations

ALBANIA - ALBANIAN HUMAN RIGHTS GROUP
ALGERIE - LIGUE ALGERIENNE DE DEFENSE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME
ALGERIE - LIGUE ALGERIENNE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME
ALLEMAGNE - INTERNATIONALE LIGA FÜR MENSCHENRECHTE
ARGENTINA - CENTRO DE ESTUDIOS LEGALES Y SOCIALES
ARGENTINA - COMITE DE ACCION JURIDICA
ARGENTINA - LIGA ARGENTINA POR LOS DERECHOS DEL HOMBRE
ARMENIA - CIVIL SOCIETY INSTITUTE
AUTRICHE - OSTERREICHISCHE LIGA FÜR MENSCHENRECHTE
AZERBAIJAN - HUMAN RIGHTS CENTER OF AZERBAIJAN
BAHRAIN - BAHRAIN CENTER FOR HUMAN RIGHTS
BAHRAIN - BAHRAIN HUMAN RIGHTS SOCIETY
BANGLADESH - ODHIKAR
BELARUS - HUMAN RIGHTS CENTER VIASNA
BELGIQUE - LIGUE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME
BELGIQUE - LIGA VOOR MENSCHENRECHTEN
BENIN - LIGUE POUR LA DEFENSE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME
BHUTAN - PEOPLE'S FORUM FOR HUMAN RIGHTS IN BHUTAN
BOLIVIA - ASAMBLEA PERMANENTE DE LOS DERECHOS HUMANOS DE BOLIVIA
BOTSWANA - THE BOTSWANA CENTRE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS - DITSHWANELO
BRASIL - CENTRO DE JUSTICA GLOBAL
BRASIL - MOVIMENTO NACIONAL DE DIREITOS HUMANOS
BURKINA - MOVEMENT BURKINABE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME & DES PEUPLES
BURUNDI - LIGUE BURUNDAISE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME
CAMBODGE - LIGUE CAMBODGIENNE DE DEFENSE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME
CAMBODIA - CAMBODIAN HUMAN RIGHTS AND DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION
CAMEROUN - LIGUE CAMEROUNAISE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME
CAMEROUN - MAISON DES DROITS DE L'HOMME
CANADA - LIGUE DES DROITS ET DES LIBERTES DU QUEBEC
CHILE - CORPORACION DE PROMOCION Y DEFENSA DE LOS DERECHOS DEL PUEBLO
CHINA - HUMAN RIGHTS IN CHINA
COLOMBIA - ORGANIZACION FEMININA POPULAR
COLOMBIA - COMITE PERMANENTE POR LA DEFENSA DE LOS DERECHOS HUMANOS

COLOMBIA - CORPORACION COLECTIVO DE ABOGADOS
COLOMBIA - INSTITUTO LATINO AMERICANO DE SERVICIOS LEGALES ALTERNATIVOS
CONGO - OBSERVATOIRE CONGOLAIS DES DROITS DE L'HOMME
COSTA RICA - ASOCIACION SERVICIOS DE PROMOCION LABORAL
COTE D'IVOIRE - MOUVEMENT IVOIRIEN DES DROITS DE L'HOMME
COTE D'IVOIRE - LIGUE IVOIRIENNE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME
CROATIE - CIVIC COMMITTEE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS
CUBA - COMISION CUBANA DE DERECHOS HUMANOS Y RECONCILIACION NACIONAL
DJIBOUTI - LIGUE DJIBOUTIENNE DES DROITS HUMAINS
ECUADOR - CENTRO DE DERECHOS ECONOMICOS Y SOCIALES
ECUADOR - COMISION ECUMENICA DE DERECHOS HUMANOS
ECUADOR - FUNDACION REGIONAL DE ASESORIA EN DERECHOS HUMANOS
EGYPT - EGYPTIAN ORGANIZATION FOR HUMAN RIGHTS
EGYPT - HUMAN RIGHTS ASSOCIATION FOR THE ASSISTANCE OF PRISONNERS
EL SALVADOR - COMISION DE DERECHOS HUMANOS DE EL SALVADOR
ESPAÑA - ASOCIACION PRO DERECHOS HUMANOS
ESPAÑA - FEDERACION DE ASOCIACIONES DE DEFENSA Y DE PROMOCION DE LOS DERECHOS HUMANOS
ETHIOPIAN - ETHIOPIAN HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL
EUROPE - ASSOCIATION EUROPEENNE POUR LA DEFENSE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME
FINLANDE - FINNISH LEAGUE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS
FRANCE - LIGUE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME ET DU CITOYEN
GEORGIE - HUMAN RIGHTS CENTER
GRECE - LIGUE HELLENIQUE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME
GUATEMALA - CENTRO PARA LA ACCION LEGAL EN DERECHOS HUMANOS
GUATEMALA - COMISION DE DERECHOS HUMANOS DE GUATEMALA
GUINEE - ORGANISATION GUINEENNE POUR LA DEFENSE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME
GUINEE-BISSAU - LIGA GUINEENSE DOS DIREITOS DO HOMEM
HAITI - COMITÉ DES AVOCATS POUR LE RESPECT DES LIBERTÉS INDIVIDUELLES
HAITI - CENTRE OCEANIQUE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME

HAITI - RÉSEAU NATIONAL DE DÉFENSE DES DROITS HUMAINS
INDIA - COMMONWEALTH HUMAN RIGHTS INITIATIVE
IRAN - DEFENDERS OF HUMAN RIGHTS CENTER
IRAN - LIGUE IRANIENNE DE DEFENSE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME
IRAQ - IRAQI NETWORK FOR HUMAN RIGHTS CULTURE AND DEVELOPMENT
IRLANDE - COMMITTEE ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE
IRLANDE - IRISH COUNCIL FOR CIVIL LIBERTIES
ISRAEL - ADALAH
ISRAEL - ASSOCIATION FOR CIVIL RIGHTS IN ISRAEL
ISRAEL - BTSELEM
ISRAEL - PUBLIC COMMITTEE AGAINST TORTURE IN ISRAEL
ITALIA - LIGA ITALIANA DEI DIRITTI DELL'UOMO
ITALIA - UNIONE FORENSE PER LA TUTELA DEI DIRITTI DELL'UOMO
JORDAN - AMMAN CENTER FOR HUMAN RIGHTS STUDIES
JORDAN - JORDAN SOCIETY FOR HUMAN RIGHTS
KENYA - KENYA HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION
KIRGHIZISTAN - KYRGYZ COMMITTEE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS
KOSOVO - CONSEIL POUR LA DEFENSE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME ET DES LIBERTES
LAOS - MOUVEMENT LAOTIEN POUR LES DROITS DE L'HOMME
LEBANON - PALESTINIAN HUMAN RIGHTS ORGANIZATION
LEBANON - FOUNDATION FOR HUMAN AND HUMANITARIAN RIGHTS IN LEBANON
LETTONIE - LATVIAN HUMAN RIGHTS COMMITTEE
LIBAN - ASSOCIATION LIBANAISE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME
LIBERIA - LIBERIA WATCH FOR HUMAN RIGHTS
LIBYA - LIBYAN LEAGUE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS
LITHUANIAN - LITHUANIAN HUMAN RIGHTS LEAGUE
MALAYSIA - SUARAM
MALI - ASSOCIATION MALIENNE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME
MALTA - MALTA ASSOCIATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS
MAROC - ASSOCIATION MAROCAINE DES DROITS HUMAINS
MAROC - ORGANISATION MAROCAINE DES DROITS HUMAINS
MAURITANIE - ASSOCIATION MAURITANIEENNE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME
MEXICO - COMISION MEXICANA DE DEFENSA Y PROMOCION DE LOS

DERECHOS HUMANOS
MEXICO - LIGA MEXICANA POR LA DEFENSA DE LOS DERECHOS HUMANOS
MOLDOVA - LEAGUE FOR THE DEFENCE OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN MOLDOVA
MOZAMBIQUE - LIGA MOCANBICANA DOS DIREITOS HUMANOS
NETHERLAND - LIGA VOOR DE RECHTEN VAN DE MENS
NICARAGUA - CENTRO NICARAGUENSE DE DERECHOS HUMANOS
NIGER - ASSOCIATION NIGERIENNE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME
NIGERIA - CIVIL LIBERTIES ORGANISATION
NOUVELLE CALEDONIE - LIGUE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME DE NOUVELLE CALEDONIE
OCCUPIED PALESTINIAN TERRITORIES - RAMALLAH CENTRE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS STUDIES
OCCUPIED PALESTINIAN TERRITORIES - AL HAQ
OCCUPIED PALESTINIAN TERRITORIES - PALESTINIAN CENTRE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS
PAKISTAN - HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION OF PAKISTAN
PANAMA - CENTRO DE CAPACITACION SOCIAL
PERU - ASOCIACION PRO DERECHOS HUMANOS
PERU - CENTRO DE ASESORIA LABORAL
PHILIPPINE - PHILIPPINE ALLIANCE OF HUMAN RIGHTS ADVOCATES
POLYNESIE - LIGUE POLYNESIENNE DES DROITS HUMAINS
PORTUGAL - CIVITAS
RDC - ASSOCIATION AFRICAINE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME
RDC - GROUPE LOTUS
RDC - LIGUE DES ELECTEURS
RÉPUBLIQUE CENTRAFRICAINE - LIGUE CENTRAFRICAINE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME
RÉPUBLIQUE CENTRAFRICAINE - ORGANISATION POUR LA COMPASSION ET LE DÉVELOPPEMENT DES FAMILLES EN DÉTRESSE
RÉPUBLIQUE DOMINICAINE - COMISION NACIONAL DE LOS DERECHOS HUMANOS
RÉPUBLIQUE TCHÈQUE - HUMAN RIGHTS LEAGUE
ROUMANIE - LIGUE POUR LA DEFENSE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME
RUSSIA - CITIZEN'S WATCH
RUSSIA - MOSCOW RESEARCH CENTER FOR HUMAN RIGHTS
RWANDA - ASSOCIATION POUR LA DEFENSE DES DROITS DES PERSONNES ET LIBERTES PUBLIQUES

RWANDA - COLLECTIF DES LIGUES POUR LA DEFENSE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME
RWANDA - LIGUE RWANDAISE POUR LA PROMOTION ET LA DEFENSE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME
SENEGAL - RENCONTRE AFRICAINE POUR LA DÉFENSE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME
SENEGAL - ORGANISATION NATIONALE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME
SERBIE - CENTER FOR PEACE AND DEMOCRACY DEVELOPMENT
SUDAN - SUDAN HUMAN RIGHTS ORGANISATION
SUDAN - SUDAN ORGANISATION AGAINST TORTURE
SUISSE - LIGUE SUISSE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME
SYRIA - DAMASCUS CENTER FOR HUMAN RIGHTS STUDIES
SYRIE - COMITE POUR LA DEFENSE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME EN SYRIE
TAIWAN - TAIWAN ALLIANCE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS
TANZANIA - THE LEGAL & HUMAN RIGHTS CENTRE
TCHAD - ASSOCIATION TCHADIENNE POUR LA PROMOTION ET LA DEFENSE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME (ATPDH)
TCHAD - LIGUE TCHADIENNE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME
THAILAND - UNION FOR CIVIL LIBERTY
TOGO - LIGUE TOGOLAISE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME
TUNISIE - ASSOCIATION TUNISIENNE DES FEMMES DÉMOCRATES
TUNISIE - CONSEIL NATIONAL POUR LES LIBERTES EN TUNISIE
TUNISIE - LIGUE TUNISIENNE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME
TURKEY - HUMAN RIGHTS FOUNDATION OF TURKEY
TURKEY - INSAN HAKLARI DERNEGI / ANKARA
TURKEY - INSAN HAKLARI DERNEGI / DIYARBAKIR
UGANDA - FOUNDATION FOR HUMAN RIGHTS INITIATIVE
UNITED KINGDOM - LIBERTY
USA - CENTER FOR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS
UZBEKISTAN - HUMAN RIGHT SOCIETY OF UZBEKISTAN
UZBEKISTAN - LEGAL AID SOCIETY
VIETNAM - COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS & QUE ME : ACTION FOR DEMOCRACY IN VIETNAM
YEMEN - HUMAN RIGHTS INFORMATION AND TRAINING CENTER
YEMEN - SISTERS' ARABIC FORUM FOR HUMAN RIGHTS
ZIMBABWE - HUMAN RIGHTS ASSOCIATION

The International Federation for Human Rights (FIDH) is an international non-governmental organisation dedicated to the world-wide defence of human rights as defined by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948. Founded in 1922, the FIDH has 155 national affiliates in all regions. To date, the FIDH has undertaken more than a thousand international fact-finding, judicial, mediation or training missions in over one hundred countries.

FIDH

17, passage de la Main d'Or - 75011 Paris - France
 CCP Paris : 76 76 Z
 Tél. : (33-1) 43 55 25 18 / Fax : (33-1) 43 55 18 80
 E-mail : fidh@fidh.org
 Web-site : <http://www.fidh.org>

Director of publication: Souhayr Belhassen
 Editor-in-chief: Antoine Bernard
 Assistant of publication: Céline Ballereau-Tetu
 Imprimerie de la FIDH - Dépôt légal décembre 2008 - N°499/2
 Fichier informatique conforme à la loi du 6 janvier 1978
 (Déclaration N° 330 675)