

INTERNATIONAL ROUND TABLE – Brussels, 12 & 13 December 2017

SPEAKER'S CONTRIBUTION

Luis Enrique Eguren, Founder and Senior Adviser of Protection International

Critical ideas/inputs for Strand 2

Critical reflection on how current protection regime is shaped – for example whether discourses and practices on the security and protection of HRDs sideline the obligation of states to respect and protect the right to defend human rights and generally what limitations current frameworks have)

Key ideas / inputs / lines of thought:

- *National mechanisms for the protection of HRD: Do we need such a long Declaration for these Mechanisms? If a few HRD are “at risk”, we can provide security measures and the problem is solved. What is the fuss about it? Or has someone replaced the spirit and contents of the Declaration with some bullet-proofed vests and panic buttons?*
- *The right to defend rights vs. the securitization of the defence of human rights. And whose security are we talking about, states security or HRD’s security?*
- *The risk approach: A tactical tool or an end in itself? Probably we are stretching the risk approach beyond its limitations. We should reflect about when does risk becomes a (new) burden on HRD’s shoulders. And we should clarify the outcomes and limitations of the risk approach.*
- *Beyond the risk approach:*

-Who has the power to define holistic approaches to the protection of HRD? We are using a power position to impose “holistic approaches” to the protection of HRD.

-If we are searching for “collective” approaches to the protection of HRD, does this mean that there are “individual” approaches to protection? Probably such a thing does not exist. Can we think protection in a different way? We should explore relational and practice approaches to the protection of HRD.