In an interview to PBI Mexico, Juan Carlos Gutiérrez, Head of the Interior Ministry’s (SEGOB) Unit for the Promotion and Defense of Human Rights, speaks on the difficulties and challenges regarding the implementation of the Mechanism for the Protection of Human Rights Defenders and Journalists (hereafter Mechanism). The Mechanism arose from the passing of the Law for the Protection of Human Rights Defenders and Journalists. June 2013 marked one year since its publication. In this context, civil society organizations handed in a performance diagnostic of the Mechanism to SEGOB and wrote a letter to the Minister of the Interior, Miguel Osorio Chong, demanding greater political support and the protection of human rights defenders and journalists. The letter also asked for the release of the resources needed for the proper functioning of the Mechanism and for hiring qualified personnel to fill the necessary positions.
In the context of the first anniversary of the Protection Law in June, civil society handed to SEGOB a diagnosis on the functioning of the Mechanism and wrote a letter to Miguel Osorio Chong highlighting some specific points they felt had to be improved. What is your diagnosis of the Mechanism, one year since the passing of the Law?

The civil society diagnosis is very important. Organizations have always had a proactive attitude to strengthen the Mechanism. The Mechanism is in the process of creation. Colombia has had a Mechanism for fifteen years, we have had it for seven months. I would like to clarify that the Law is one year old, but the Mechanism is only seven months old. Evidently there are gaps and challenges, for example the trusteeship, to finish creating the units and to hire personnel. It is often difficult for civil society to understand what it means, for example, to manage a trusteeship, a budget of more than 120 million pesos. There are rules for hiring, of service from the public federal administration, of the trusteeships. They produce obstacles. However, until now we have not failed to protect people. We have more than ten people with bodyguard protection services, and more than fifteen with perimeter patrols. We have infrastructure installed in different places, which really contributes to the protection of organizations and individuals. It is not easy to overcome the neglect that once existed towards defenders. What I want to express is that one year after the adoption of the Law, and seven months after the implementation of the Mechanism, we are moving forward with the confidence that the Mechanism’s team is made up of very committed individuals, many of them recognized human rights defenders and people trained by civil society.

We have always insisted that the work of a human rights defender is critical to building a democratic State and an attack against a defender threatens the rule of law. I remember that in the previous administration, statements made by some senior Army officers questioned the work of human rights defenders and linked them to organized crime. This implies that a discourse of recognition is also part of the protection. What we have done in the Federal Government until now is to maintain a clear line of recognition. It is not the same in the states and, therefore, there exists another issue that may go beyond the challenges of the Mechanism.

The three main points in the letter from civil society were concerned with the lack of staff and the installation of the Prevention, Monitoring and Analysis Unit, the necessity to apply a trusteeship and the necessity for high level political support from the Federal Government. Do you agree with these points or do you have another perspective?

I think the issue is political support. The creation of the Units has been requested and this comes from a bureaucratic logic. The Monitoring and Analysis Unit is supposed to carry out an analysis of context, to establish possible assailants and patterns. We are covering this with risk analysis that you may have a look at. It is a professional risk analysis, that incorporates context, interviews with defenders, international standards. What really is important is the matter of political support. I think the view of organizations is based on only one case, which is a case of temporary neglect by an institution that had to be withdrawn from the protection of an organization. Until now Federal Government authorities, specifically those who provide protection, have acted in a very professional manner. What does this mean? If I have nine or ten organizations or persons protected by bodyguards, I cannot say there is no political support. Often only one case is considered, but it is important to look at other information as well. What I can tell you with certainty is that at this moment we have support. Obviously, this support goes through a process of institutional coordination. The willingness of the coordination is evident. In some cases this willingness is obviously saturated by the internal logics of the institutions. Institutional coordination is complicated. The Mexican State is very complex, with very difficult internal logics. I received this Unit in a serious crisis of

“...The central element that is failing is the lack of willingness on the part of the states. This Mechanism is not able to absolutely protect all defenders and journalists in the country if the states and local agencies are not committed to work.”

1 Interview from July 2013. At time of publication, the Mechanism had been operating for 11 months.
legitimacy, organization, trust, personnel and lack of sensitivity to the issue. I think that we must be more prudent in the analysis, to understand the structural phenomena of the State. The challenge is to have, by the end of December, a fully working Mechanism with a trusteeship and established and professionalized Units. We have implemented a monthly dialogue system with the organizations in order to assess how we are doing. Something very positive is that the Mechanism has a Governing Board and an Advisory Council where civil society is present. The Subsecretary (for Legal Affairs and Human Rights at SEGOB, Lia Limón) met four times with the Council in six months and we have consistently met with the Board. It is positive that the problems are resolved through dialogue. I encourage organizations to take the baton, for if we only question the Mechanism we will delegitimate it. It is necessary to be careful with criticisms. The central element that is failing is the lack of willingness on the part of the states. Most of the cases are at the state level. So far, the organizations have not incorporated in their work, analysis or discourse, the necessity for state will. If we accept and understand that the only entity responsible for protecting defenders is this Mechanism, we are taking a giant challenge to which we will not be able to respond. This Mechanism is not able to absolutely protect all defenders and journalists in the country if the states and local agencies are not committed to work. We have told the states that there is joint responsibility. This involves opening a discussion to revise the Federal Law, which currently does not oblige the states to act. The Law is based on cooperation agreements that are not binding. We have to work together to open a debate on joint responsibility with the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Can this joint responsibility be achieved through a General Law?

We would have to assess this. Either a General Law or to work on an agreement with CONAGO (National Council of Governors) and for now to move forward with this agreement. We have a representative in CONAGO, we have asked them several times that they incorporate the subject of protection of human rights defenders in their discussions.

Apart from the possibility of a new Law, can the Unit put forward another plan or policy to increase the participation of the states? It seems that the problem has been identified, we would like to know whether there are other elements that could support more state commitment.

We need to build a plan that allows us to generate more advocacy actions in the states. It is important to say that in every case discussed in the Government Board, we summon the highest authorities of the state that is involved. Several states have already attended and it is necessary to continue this practice. Invitations are sent to Secretaries of Government so that the highest authorities come. We have an important strength with the Mechanism and it is important to maintain this strength. The criticisms that the organizations have been making should be focused so that we construct a strategy to work with state governments together. We must motivate CONAGO to take on the subject of the Mechanism. We need to really move forward to link the State Commissions (of human rights), which are completely lost in this subject. I have thought about suggesting that in every case we invite the presidents of the State Commissions to attend the Mechanism. This would be important because a State Commission should be a key actor in the promotion of protection measures. On the other hand, we are considering starting a federal campaign on the protection of human rights defenders, which would take place before the end of the year. We are looking into what would be the objectives of the campaign but it would be a national media campaign including television and radio.

I suppose part of the complexity of working with the states is that there are so many and each one is different from the other.

The complexity has to do with respect for state sovereignty and autonomy in this process. What we have noted is that there is a lack of attention, and furthermore the lack of confidence that many defenders and
journalistas tienen en muchos estados. Necesitamos trabajar para recuperar esta confianza. Las agencias de protección del estado, como la policía estatal y munical, en muchos casos deben estar involucradas en la protección de los derechos humanos y periodistas que viven en su territorio. Esta es una enorme desafío; tener que generar confianza en las agencias del estado. Dicho esto, con la excepción del Distrito Federal, casi no hay confianza en ninguna entidad estatal y esto es un problema porque corremos el riesgo de sobrecargar el Mecanismo. El pronóstico es que a final del año tendremos entre 150 y 180 casos en el Mecanismo. Hemos tenido una semana de ingreso de aproximadamente 5 casos, alrededor de 20 cada mes. Es necesario evaluar este pronóstico de los números y la capacidad institucional del Mecanismo federal si no podemos contar con el apoyo de las agencias del estado y las Comisiones Estatales. Puede ser muy complicado. Otro desafío que el Mecanismo debe trabajar es la coordinación con las organizaciones que tienen proyectos de apoyo a los defensores y que tienen los recursos para proteger a esos defensores. La sociedad civil ya tiene algunas capacidades establecidas, la infraestructura en algunos casos, los recursos financieros para proyectos y el apoyo de cooperación que son necesarios para este proceso. Esto no significa que no hay responsabilidad estatal. Pero aparte del único deber que tiene el estado para proteger, sería interesante ver cómo podemos trabajar juntos. Por ejemplo, si hay una persona que necesita dejar su estado y hay una organización que tiene un refugio, podemos trabajar juntos para ayudar a esa persona y ponerla en ese lugar. De esta manera compartimos la protección. Recientemente tuvimos un caso exitoso donde se conseguía el traslado de dos migrantes de una cierta área. El Gobierno Federal hizo lo necesario para trasladar a esos individuos y una organización los alojó en un sitio seguro, porque ellos tenían los medios para hacerlo. Así que otro desafío que debemos abordar es la organización de la sociedad civil. En muchos casos es mucho más fácil proporcionar los recursos a una organización que tiene los fondos para ayudar con este proceso que atravesar el burocracia que establece el Estado. Creo que existe un desafío crucial y uno que genera un debate sobre colaboración.

¿Ya has hecho alguna petición a la sociedad civil y a los estados. ¿Tienes alguna petición específica o comentario a diferentes actores que puedan ser importantes para el funcionamiento fluido del Mecanismo?

Creo que es muy importante alentar a las instituciones responsables de investigar. La mejor protección es una investigación adecuada. El Mecanismo no puede proteger si no hay una investigación adecuada. El Estado, los abogados y los agentes federales deben estar comprometidos en la fortalecimiento de la investigación. Si no hay voluntad de combatir la impunidad, no es posible mejorar la protección.

"La protección más importante es una investigación adecuada. El Mecanismo no puede proteger si no hay una investigación adecuada. Las autoridades del estado, los abogados y las autoridades federales deben estar comprometidas en la fortalecimiento de la investigación. Si no hay voluntad de combatir la impunidad, no es posible mejorar la protección."
defenders. And it does not contradict the work of the Mechanism. The organizations must continue to use international bodies because this helps to pressure the State to commit ourselves more. It is important to mention that a precautionary measure does not imply that the Mechanism does not have to provide protection, rather they are two complementary instruments. The fact that one is in the Mechanism does not mean that you can’t also have a precautionary measure. I participated in the writing of the Law as civil society and I have always defended that if you have a precautionary measure, you can also be in the Mechanism, protected by both bodies. Now the central issue is that several organizations have, in a factual manner, rejected such protection and have instead privileged the protection of a precautionary measure. This is not a convenient attitude as it discredits the Mechanism. I can’t say “because the Mechanism failed, now I want precautionary measures”. No, because the Mechanism has not failed, the Mechanism is there and it is working. Then there is the problem of implementation. I cannot be attending ten monthly implementation meetings for one case alone because that is schizophrenic. I am working in protection actions for the Mechanism and at the same time in actions for the precautionary measures. Therefore the issue is to find ways that allow us to implement the precautionary measures ordered in conjunction with the Mechanism because they should be complementary.

For more information on the Mechanism, see:

- [PBI Mexico web page on the Mechanism](#)
- [PBI Mexico Briefing on the creation and implementation of the Mechanism](#)
- [Letter from civil society organizations one year after the publication of the Law](#)
- [Letter from international organizations one year after the publication of the Law](#)
- [PBI interview with Agnieszka Raczynska, Executive Secretary of the National Network of Civil Human Rights Organizations “All Rights for Everyone” (Red TDT).](#)