



**Observatoire ARGA**

**ARGA Atlas**

# **THE ARGA MODEL AS A NEW ARCHITECTURE OF INTERNATIONAL PROTECTION:**

## **LAW, ANALYSIS, AND MEDIA AS A UNIFIED SYSTEM FOR THE PROTECTION OF THE PERSON, THE FAMILY, LIBERTY, AND ASSETS**

Author:

Sergei Khrabrykh — President of ARGA, PhD

Organization: Observatoire ARGA, ARGA Atlas

Mailing address: 21 route de l'Aviation, 12 C, 64600 Anglet, FRANCE

Contacts: [info@argaobservatory.org](mailto:info@argaobservatory.org), +33 7 58 49 62 27

Website: [www.argaobservatory.org](http://www.argaobservatory.org), <https://www.arga-atlas.com/>

Anglet, 18 March 2026

## **Purpose of the document:**

To define what the ARGA model consists of as a distinct approach to international protection, why classical legal defense in cross-border cases is increasingly insufficient on its own, and how the combination of law, analysis, and a disciplined media strategy forms a more effective and practically usable architecture of protection in matters involving politically motivated persecution, extradition, abuse of INTERPOL mechanisms, asset protection, and family or corporate conflicts with an international element. This model is built around existing international guarantees and procedures rather than fantasy about some single magic tribunal that fixes everything. It draws especially on the fair-trial guarantees of the ICCPR, the individual-communications route available in States parties to the First Optional Protocol, the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention's complaints and urgent-appeals procedures, the INTERPOL CCF's data-review mandate, and the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. ([OHCHR](#))

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1. Executive Summary
2. Why traditional international protection no longer works in isolation
3. What the ARGA model is
4. The legal layer: from procedural guarantees to international mechanisms
5. The analytical layer: diagnosis of the case as the basis of strategy
6. The media layer: publicity as a tool of protection, not noise
7. The humanitarian, family, and personal layer
8. The corporate and asset layer
9. The step-by-step ARGA architecture: how the model works in practice
10. Conclusion
  - Appendix A. Terminology
  - Appendix B. Matrix of the ARGA architecture
  - Official Sources

## **1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Modern international protection has long ceased to be a field in which one strong complaint, one good lawyer, or one international submission is enough. In cross-border cases, threats usually develop simultaneously in several dimensions: criminal-procedural, extradition-related, migration-related, reputational, corporate, banking, sanctions-related, and family-related. A person may at the same time face the risk of detention, loss of status, destruction of a business, blocking of assets, and public discrediting. It is exactly at this point that the traditional model, in which each problem is handled separately and after the fact, begins to fail. ([OHCHR](#))

The ARGA model starts from a different premise. It treats international protection not as a bundle of disconnected services but as an architecture. In that architecture, law is not displaced or downgraded.

On the contrary, law remains the central axis. But legal work is strengthened by two additional layers: analysis and media. Analysis is needed for precise diagnosis of the nature of the persecution, the structure of risks, the jurisdictional pressure points, and the weak points of the opposing side. The media layer is needed not for theatrical shouting, but for controlled publicity that narrows the space for abuse, raises institutional attention, and changes the balance of force where procedural technique alone is no longer enough. ([OHCHR](#))

This approach corresponds to the structure of the modern international system itself. The ICCPR guarantees equality before courts and tribunals and a fair and public hearing by a competent, independent, and impartial tribunal established by law. The Human Rights Committee may consider individual communications only in relation to States parties to the First Optional Protocol. The Working Group on Arbitrary Detention investigates alleged cases of arbitrary detention through urgent appeals and communications and also considers individual complaints under its regular procedure. INTERPOL's CCF, for its part, is an independent body concerned with whether personal data processed through INTERPOL's channels complies with the Organization's rules, and it receives requests for access, correction, and deletion of such data. The UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights are described by OHCHR as the global standard for preventing and addressing adverse human-rights impacts involving business activity. The simple implication is that no single international mechanism covers the full risk by itself. ([OHCHR](#))

That is why the ARG model does not propose "yet another international instrument." It proposes a new way of assembling existing instruments into a single protective strategy. Its point is not to wait until individual risks materialize one after another, but to construct in advance a system of defense in which law, analysis, and media operate in a synchronized and sequenced way. ([OHCHR](#))

## **2. WHY TRADITIONAL INTERNATIONAL PROTECTION NO LONGER WORKS IN ISOLATION**

Classical legal defense was built for a simpler map of reality. There is a criminal case, there is counsel, there is a court, and there is an appeal. In modern cross-border matters, that scheme no longer describes the full structure of risk. Today one and the same matter may simultaneously exist as a national prosecution, an extradition request, an INTERPOL data issue, a refusal of residence status, banking de-risking, counterparties' refusal to engage, and an information attack. If each direction is handled separately, without a common design, the defense inevitably lags behind the threat itself. ([OHCHR](#))

International law does not offer a universal supreme court that will clean up the mess in one move. Article 14 ICCPR guarantees fair process, but it does not itself prevent fabrication of a case. The Human Rights Committee route exists only where the First Optional Protocol applies. Special Procedures communications are not a quasi-judicial procedure and do not have the power to enforce their views or recommendations. The CCF provides an important remedy, but its role is specifically tied to access, correction, or deletion of data processed in INTERPOL's Information System. In other words, each mechanism is useful, but each mechanism is structurally limited. ([OHCHR](#))

The practical conclusion is harsh but straightforward. Modern international protection cannot be reactive. It has to be architectural. Otherwise, a lawyer wins one episode and loses the whole structure: the Notice is removed, but asylum fails; extradition is stopped, but the assets are already gone; a strong submission to a UN body is prepared, but the public record has already fixed the person as "a wanted fraudster"; the business still exists formally, but banks and partners have already left. The old approach too often protects only one floor of a burning building. ([OHCHR](#))

### **3. WHAT THE ARGA MODEL IS**

The ARGA model may be defined as an integrated system of international protection in which three elements operate as a single mechanism.

The first element is law. This includes extradition defense, asylum strategy, submissions to UN bodies, INTERPOL defense, arbitrary-detention complaints, fair-trial strategy, asset-protection work, and, where necessary, corporate, sanctions, or investment-protection tracks. The second element is analysis. This is not mere information gathering, but a full diagnostic process: factual map, timeline, motivation of the actors, real nature of the conflict, comparison between the official version and the procedural reality, and identification of signs of politicization, corporate bad faith, fabrication of evidence, or pressure through assets or family. The third element is media. This means controlled and legally disciplined publicity: not disorderly exposure of everything, but a calibrated public layer that narrows the room for abuse, increases the institutional cost of repression, and strengthens attention to the matter in relevant international or expert circles. ([OHCHR](#))

The point of the ARGA model is not to replace counsel with journalists or a UN submission with a video clip. The point is to escape the false choice between “court only” and “publicity only.” In real transnational cases, what works is not either extreme but the correct combination. Where a state or quasi-state opponent uses law, administrative power, informational pressure, and international data channels at the same time, the defense must also be layered. ([OHCHR](#))

In substance, the ARGA model rests on one basic principle: the defense must correspond to the real architecture of the threat. If the threat is complex, the defense cannot remain linear. A surprisingly difficult idea for systems that still like pretending one filing solves everything. ([OHCHR](#))

### **4. THE LEGAL LAYER: FROM PROCEDURAL GUARANTEES TO INTERNATIONAL MECHANISMS**

The legal layer remains the core of the entire structure. Without it, analysis turns into commentary and media turns into atmosphere. Law supplies the criteria of admissibility, violation, proportionality, and remedy. Article 14 ICCPR guarantees equality before courts and tribunals and a fair and public hearing by a competent, independent, and impartial tribunal established by law, and also sets out minimum guarantees in criminal proceedings. For the ARGA model, this means that international protection cannot be built on the abstract phrase “the case is fabricated.” Fabrication has to be translated into internationally legible violations: lack of judicial independence, denial of defense rights, abusive use of absentia procedures, use of improper evidence, arbitrary detention, or persecution for concealed political or corporate reasons. That translation is what makes a case movable in international space. ([OHCHR](#))

Where the State is party to the First Optional Protocol, the Human Rights Committee route becomes a separate procedural track. OHCHR states that the Committee may consider individual communications in relation to States parties to that Protocol. If the issue concerns detention, deprivation of liberty, or the use of criminal prosecution as a coercive device, the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention becomes particularly important. OHCHR explains that the Working Group investigates alleged cases of arbitrary detention through urgent appeals and communications and also considers individual complaints under its regular communications procedure. Complaints and urgent appeals may be submitted by the individual concerned, family members, representatives, or human-rights NGOs. ([OHCHR](#))

If the matter involves international police data and its consequences, the legal layer necessarily extends to INTERPOL. The CCF is described by INTERPOL as an independent body ensuring that personal data processed through INTERPOL's channels conforms to the Organization's rules. INTERPOL's own materials specify that requests may be made for access, correction, or deletion of data processed in INTERPOL's Information System, and the request is then examined for admissibility and substance by the Secretariat and the Commission. The legal point here is simple: not every abusive national case can be solved through INTERPOL, but where INTERPOL data becomes part of the pressure structure, it must be challenged in the place designed for that purpose. ([Interpol](#))

This is why the ARGA model does not reduce a case to one channel. It builds a legal layer as a system of connected routes in which each mechanism is used for its real function rather than for fantasy. In practice, that is rarer than it should be. Humans do love filing the wrong thing in the wrong place and calling it strategy. ([OHCHR](#))

## **5. THE ANALYTICAL LAYER: DIAGNOSIS OF THE CASE AS THE BASIS OF STRATEGY**

One of the central problems of weak international defense is that it starts too late and too formally. First the complaint is drafted, then the arguments are searched for, and then chronology is bent into shape around the filing. That method is excellent for producing paper and dangerous for producing results.

The ARGA model starts from diagnosis rather than filing. The analytical layer answers the questions without which legal work becomes shallow or internally contradictory.

The first question is the real nature of the conflict. Is it genuinely a criminal matter, or a corporate dispute, debt struggle, asset conflict, elite redistribution, politically motivated neutralization, retaliation, or some hybrid in which criminal law is used as an outer shell for other objectives? The second question is where the pressure points really are. Sometimes the key risk is not conviction or extradition, but the fact that the person has already ceased to be serviceable for banks, partners, migration authorities, or investors. Sometimes the opposite is true: externally the case looks reputational, while the real danger lies in imminent detention or a quietly developing extradition track. The third question is who is acting and how. ARGA analysis always builds a map of actors: formal initiator, procedural executor, real beneficiary, state or quasi-state structures involved, and the interests intersecting in the case. The fourth question is sequence. A timeline is not a decorative appendix. It is often the key instrument exposing the artificial nature of the persecution. The fifth question is language. The same case cannot be described identically to the CCF, the WGAD, an asylum authority, a compliance department, and the public domain. Analysis translates one factual body into several institutional languages without breaking the case internally. ([OHCHR](#))

This is where the ARGA model differs from the primitive idea of "draft a complaint from a template." The analytical layer does not merely service the paperwork. It builds the strategy. In transnational cases, strategy is almost always worth more than one filing, even a polished one. ([OHCHR](#))

## **6. THE MEDIA LAYER: PUBLICITY AS A TOOL OF PROTECTION, NOT NOISE**

The most common error about publicity is to treat it either as absolute poison or as universal medicine. Both views are crude.

The ARGA model assumes that the media layer proves nothing by itself in legal terms, but can radically alter the environment in which the matter develops. Publicity may reduce the likelihood of gross abuse, make concealed pressure harder, increase international attention, raise the institutional price of repression, and supply an external context to a case. But that benefit exists only under one condition: media work must be embedded in legal strategy rather than wrecking it. Bad publicity can destroy a case just as effectively as bad legal drafting. It creates contradictions, reveals the defensive position too early, politicizes what still has to be proved, and irritates institutions that need disciplined factual material rather than theatrical outrage. ([spsubmission.ohchr.org](https://spsubmission.ohchr.org))

For that reason, in the ARGA model the media layer is governed by three rules. First, legal cleanliness: not everything is made public, only what does not undermine procedural routes or create new risks. Second, evidentiary discipline: publicity is built around verifiable facts, chronology, inconsistencies, institutional questions, and risk of abuse, not around slogans. Third, audience targeting: the human-rights field, investigative journalism, business audiences concerned with sanctions and compliance, and formal institutions all require different forms of communication. In this sense, media in the ARGA model is not an accessory to the case. It is an external protective layer designed to strengthen law, not compete with it. ([spsubmission.ohchr.org](https://spsubmission.ohchr.org))

## **7. THE HUMANITARIAN, FAMILY, AND PERSONAL LAYER**

One of the most underestimated problems of international protection is that too many strategies think in overly abstract terms. They see only the Notice, the warrant, the extradition package, the sanctions risk, or the corporate dispute. But international persecution almost never strikes only one procedural subject. It strikes the surrounding life structure: family, children, housing, documents, ability to move, access to treatment, access to banking, and the ability to maintain minimum stability.

That is why the ARGA model includes a humanitarian and family layer not as a sentimental appendix, but as a mandatory part of strategy. If a person has no safe jurisdiction, no stable migration position, no disciplined documentation, no clear family plan, and no contingency plan in case of detention, even the most brilliant international submission may be useless at the decisive moment. The model therefore begins protection not when a communication is filed, but when the person ceases to be totally exposed. Sometimes the first step is not an international letter at all, but the right relocation decision, the stabilization of residence status, the recording of family ties, medical vulnerabilities, or humanitarian factors that later become critical in asylum, extradition, or non-refoulement contexts. ([OHCHR](https://ohchr.org))

This matters especially where the case may look “economic” on paper but is already evolving into a threat of detention, family rupture, loss of status, and destabilization of the person’s whole living structure. The law notices these things eventually. Reality notices them first. ([OHCHR](https://ohchr.org))

## **8. THE CORPORATE AND ASSET LAYER**

One of the strengths of the ARGA model is that it does not detach personal defense from protection of assets and corporate position. In many cases these are the same story expressed in different languages.

Where criminal prosecution is used as a pressure tool against a business, protection of the person and protection of the asset are strategically inseparable. Where a Notice, sanctions adjacency, AML toxicity, or reputational risk makes an asset formally existent but practically unusable, the matter again stops being “purely criminal” or “purely proprietary.” It becomes hybrid. The UN Guiding

Principles on Business and Human Rights are described by OHCHR as the global standard for preventing and addressing adverse human-rights impacts involving business activity, and OHCHR situates them within the “Protect, Respect and Remedy” framework. For the ARGA model, that matters because the corporate and asset dimension cannot be treated as external to rights protection where business structures, banks, counterparties, and compliance systems have already become spaces of practical pressure, exclusion, and harm. ([OHCHR](#))

The corporate layer in the ARGA model therefore includes not only disputes over title as such. It also includes compliance-risk evaluation, risk of secondary pressure through banks and counterparties, possible investment-arbitration routes, risk of administrative or quasi-state displacement from ownership, and analysis of how personal persecution is being used as infrastructure for later seizure of assets. This is where the architecture becomes especially visible: it refuses to separate artificially what reality has already fused. ([OHCHR](#))

## **9. THE STEP-BY-STEP ARGA ARCHITECTURE: HOW THE MODEL WORKS IN PRACTICE**

At the practical level, the ARGA model can be described as a sequence of linked stages.

The first stage is primary diagnosis. The nature of the threat is defined, a map of actors is built, a timeline is assembled, the jurisdictions are listed, procedural risks are identified, migration status is assessed, asset exposure is checked, the media environment is reviewed, and urgency is measured. The second stage is stabilization. This means creating a minimum zone of safety for the client and the family through urgent humanitarian, migration, and documentary steps designed to prevent irreversible damage. The third stage is legal qualification and routing. At this point one determines which routes actually apply: extradition defense, asylum, UN Special Procedures, WGAD, Human Rights Committee, INTERPOL CCF, investment protection, or corporate and compliance mechanisms. The fourth stage is evidence architecture. This is not just “attach documents,” but structure facts so they work in several institutional languages without contradiction. The fifth stage is institutional action. Here the actual filings, complaints, requests for deletion of data, submissions to UN mechanisms, and defensive positions on assets or status are launched. The sixth stage is controlled media activation. Publicity is switched on not automatically, but when and in the form that strengthens the case. The seventh stage is long-term accompaniment. International protection almost never ends with one favorable decision. Even a positive CCF, WGAD, or court outcome does not automatically repair the reputational, migration, banking, or corporate damage. The architecture therefore assumes continuity rather than one-off reaction. ([OHCHR](#))

That is the difference between architecture and a list of services. Services can be purchased separately. Architecture has to be built. Humans, for reasons best known to their species, usually notice this only after the improvised version collapses. ([OHCHR](#))

## **10. CONCLUSION**

The ARGA model as a new architecture of international protection is a response to the increasing complexity of transnational persecution itself. Today, pressure on a person rarely appears in only one procedural form. It manifests at once through law, data, extradition, migration, assets, compliance, family, reputation, and publicity. A defense that tries to answer this linearly will almost always lose in speed and in coverage. ([OHCHR](#))

The strength of the ARGA model lies not in inventing “new law,” but in a new logic for combining existing legal, analytical, and media tools. Law supplies legitimacy and procedural footing. Analysis

supplies precision, sequence, and strategic depth. Media supplies an external layer of visibility and restraint. Together they create not improvisation, but a system. The practical conclusion is plain: international protection in the twenty-first century must be understood not as one petition, one lawsuit, one interview, or one proceeding before INTERPOL, a UN body, or a court. It must be understood as an architecture for preserving the person, the family, liberty, status, reputation, and assets in a situation where a complex and multi-level system of pressure is already at work. That is the sense in which the ARGA model deserves to be described as a new architecture of international protection. ([OHCHR](#))

## APPENDIX A. TERMINOLOGY

### **Architecture of international protection**

Not one mechanism and not one procedure, but a connected system of legal, analytical, humanitarian, and media actions arranged in sequence. Its logic is derived from the fact that existing international mechanisms are specialized and partial rather than universal. ([OHCHR](#))

### **Legal layer**

The set of national and international procedures aimed at stopping persecution, restoring procedural guarantees, and protecting the client's status, liberty, and rights. This includes fair-trial guarantees under the ICCPR, treaty-body communications where available, Special Procedures interventions, WGAD procedures, and INTERPOL data remedies where relevant. ([OHCHR](#))

### **Analytical layer**

A system of case diagnosis including the timeline, map of actors, motivation of the initiators, jurisdictional pressure points, risk matrix, and translation of facts into different institutional languages. Its existence is implied by the fragmentation of available remedies and procedures. ([OHCHR](#))

### **Media layer**

Controlled publicity built on legally verifiable facts and aimed at reducing abuse and increasing institutional attention. It is relevant because Special Procedures communications and broader human-rights engagement also function through visibility, communications, and reporting rather than only through adjudication. ([OHCHR](#))

### **Humanitarian layer**

The block of measures aimed at preserving the person and family environment, stabilizing status, recording vulnerability, and preventing irreversible harm before, during, and after legal proceedings. Its necessity follows from the fact that international mechanisms often operate more slowly and more narrowly than the risks themselves. ([OHCHR](#))

### **Integrated protection**

An approach in which different mechanisms are not used chaotically in parallel, but as parts of one strategy. The need for this follows from the specialization and limits of the available mechanisms, from the Human Rights Committee route to WGAD, Special Procedures, and the CCF. ([OHCHR](#))

## APPENDIX B. MATRIX OF THE ARGA ARCHITECTURE

### **Law**

Task: to create procedural and institutional protection. Risk without this block: the case remains in the territory of moral assessment without legal force. Core tools: extradition defense, asylum, CCF proceedings, UN Special Procedures, WGAD, treaty-body routes, corporate and investment mechanisms, national courts. ([OHCHR](#))

## **Analysis**

Task: to identify the real nature of the conflict and build the strategy.  
Risk without this block: filings are formulaic, routes are chosen incorrectly, and the materials contradict one another.  
Core tools: timeline, actor map, risk mapping, evidence analysis, forum selection, conflict qualification. ([OHCHR](#))

## **Media**

Task: to alter the external environment and raise the cost of abuse.  
Risk without this block: the case remains invisible and easily manipulated, or chaotic publicity destroys the legal position.  
Core tools: analytical publications, interviews, investigative support, targeted international communication, reputation management. ([OHCHR](#))

## **Humanitarian and family block**

Task: to preserve the person and surrounding life structure before, during, and after the legal fight.  
Risk without this block: even a legally successful case does not prevent destruction of life, status, or family stability.  
Core tools: migration and status planning, documentation of vulnerabilities, family strategy, emergency preparedness. ([OHCHR](#))

## **Corporate and asset block**

Task: to prevent personal persecution from becoming infrastructure for seizure of assets.  
Risk without this block: the person is formally protected but economically destroyed.  
Core tools: asset protection, corporate restructuring, compliance and sanctions-risk assessment, arbitral and compensation routes where relevant. The normative bridge here is supplied by the UN Guiding Principles and their “Protect, Respect and Remedy” logic. ([OHCHR](#))

# **OFFICIAL SOURCES**

1. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.
2. Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.
3. OHCHR, Human Rights Committee, Individual Communications.
4. OHCHR, Working Group on Arbitrary Detention.
5. OHCHR, WGAD Complaints and Urgent Appeals materials.
6. OHCHR, Special Procedures of the Human Rights Council.
7. OHCHR, What are Communications?
8. INTERPOL, Commission for the Control of INTERPOL’s Files (CCF).
9. INTERPOL, How to submit a request to the CCF.
10. INTERPOL, Frequently Asked Questions of the CCF.
11. INTERPOL, CCF Procedural Guidelines for Applicants.
12. OHCHR, Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights.

13. OHCHR, introductory materials on the Protect, Respect and Remedy framework.