

intersessionality and protest

a review of
United Nations
standards



CELS



ACCIÓN
JURÍDICA



CIVICUS

intersectionality and protest

a review of United Nations standards

Table of Contents

1. Introduction: **Intersectionality and the Right to Protest**
2. **Why an intersectional perspective?**
3. **Standards on the Right to Protest: A Framework for Exploration**
4. **Review of Standards and Opportunities for the Application of Intersectionality**
5. Recommendations: **Contributions Toward a New Interpretation of Protest Protection Standards from an Intersectional Perspective**

Introduction

Intersectionality and the Right to Protest

The right to social protest is under threat. Governments worldwide are implementing measures to prevent people from using public spaces and digital platforms to voice their demands. In Latin America, repression, criminalization, and stigmatization are the primary tools used to target protesters. These actions inflict direct harm on individuals while simultaneously seeking to delegitimize movements, instill fear, and discourage political participation. Ultimately, the goal is to silence public debate, as analyzed in [Silencing dissent through fear](#),¹ a 2024 report by CELS on the situation in Argentina.

However, restrictions on the right to protest do not affect all individuals equally. Women and LGBTIQ+ persons who take to the streets face specific forms of violence that vary depending on the context in which they occur. As documented in the report [The right to protest: the need for an intersectional and transfeminist approach](#),² in Latin America, these forms of violence can include stigmatization based on gender identity or perceived societal roles; verbal, physical, and sexual assault; criminalization through the misuse of criminal law; and legal barriers to the exercise of the right to protest.

These situations cannot be analyzed solely through the lens of gender. They are exacerbated when intersecting identities come into play, affecting women and LGBTIQ+ persons who are Black, Brown, Afro-descendant, migrants, persons with disabilities, rural workers, Indigenous peoples, or those living in poverty in rural areas or marginalized urban neighborhoods. These differentiated forms of violence are the result of historical and structural inequalities that shape power dynamics and perpetuate discrimination against these social groups.

International and regional protection mechanisms have strengthened standards safeguarding the rights to assembly, freedom of expression, and freedom of the press. These bodies have recognized the need for specific actions to protect groups at greater risk, such as women and LGBTIQ+ persons.

This report examines these instruments through an intersectional lens to understand how oppression operates across different contexts and communities, and, more importantly, how these mechanisms are implemented. It aims to contribute to the development of international standards that ensure all individuals can equally exercise their right to use public and digital spaces to express their demands.

¹ See CELS, *Silencing dissent through fear*, 2024, available at: <https://www.cels.org.ar/web/en/publicaciones/silencing-dissent-through-fear-restrictions-on-civic-space-in-argentina/>

² See CELS: *The right to protest: the need for an intersectional and transfeminist approach*, July 2022, available at: <https://www.cels.org.ar/web/en/publicaciones/the-right-to-protest-the-need-for-an-intersectional-and-transfeminist-approach/>

Why an Intersectional Perspective?

Conceptual Dimensions, Origins, Scope, and Challenges in Application

Protest takes many forms, arises from diverse causes, and brings together a wide range of people. It can manifest as a street demonstration, a self-organized concert, a performance, an online action, or a march. Participants include individuals, families, civil society organizations, labor unions, political parties, and other forms of collective organization. While they share common causes, they also represent a multitude of differences. The management of public demonstrations involves both state and non-state actors, including law enforcement agencies, judicial and prison systems, security institutions, and organizations that serve as observers or provide medical assistance.

Given this diversity, a segmented approach—whether based on gender, race, class, childhood, disability, or other factors—would fail to account for the experiences of many individuals with intersecting identities who take part in protests. Moreover, such an approach would reinforce the marginalization perpetuated by systems that already exclude those who do not represent the majority. It is therefore essential to adopt a perspective that recognizes and upholds the full diversity of those exercising their right to protest. An intersectional approach is crucial to ensuring that all voices are acknowledged and protected.

The concept of “intersectionality” was introduced in 1991 by legal scholar Kimberlé Crenshaw in her study of how gender and race interact to shape specific forms of violence against Black women in the United States.³ Crenshaw’s work built on longstanding critiques by racialized and working-class women of mainstream white feminism, arguing that a gender-only approach ignores the oppression experienced through other conditions, identities, and contexts. Since then, Crenshaw and other feminist theorists have developed intersectionality as a tool for analyzing how individuals are shaped by multiple systems of power that intersect and reinforce one another.⁴

This analytical tool made a significant impact not only on feminism but also on the field of law. Crenshaw’s initial argument highlights how the legal system—both in judicial doctrine and in strategic litigation led by social movements—often overlooks the conditions of social groups that experience oppression through more than one system of power.⁵ She also warns that legal and policy strategies based on a segmented approach ultimately reinforce the subordination imposed by other intersecting systems. In response, intersectionality emerges as a framework that recognizes both the

³ Kimberlé Crenshaw, “Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity politics, and violence against women of color”, *Stanford Law Review*, vol. 43, no. 6 (1991), 1241-1299.

⁴ The definition reexamines the proposal by Patricia Hill Collins (*cf.* Patricia Hill Collins, *Black Feminist Thought. Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*, 2da. ed., Routledge: New York (2000)).

⁵ Crenshaw, p. 1252.

differences and commonalities among social groups, enabling the development of mechanisms for collaboration and collective action.

Over more than 30 years, intersectionality has gained widespread recognition. Various international and national human rights mechanisms have adopted the concept,⁶ expanding it to encompass experiences beyond gender and race. However, its application in legal frameworks has revealed shortcomings that limit its explanatory power.⁷

First, intersectionality has often been understood as the sum of the discrimination a person experiences due to their various identities and conditions. This perspective assumes that inequalities arise from individual attributes—such as sex, ethnicity, religion, or sexual orientation—stacking one upon another. However, this cumulative view fails to account for how systems of power create specific privilege-oppression dynamics between groups within a given context. Thus, applying an intersectional perspective is not about identifying which group faces the most discrimination but rather about analyzing the relationships of privilege and subordination that exist both within and between different social groups.

Second, the adoption of intersectionality has often been reduced to listing the multiple identities and conditions that characterize a population. In other cases, it is understood merely as an exercise in identifying differences and similarities between groups. These approaches fragment the way individuals' experiences are conceptualized, making it harder to develop effective courses of action. Instead, an intersectional perspective should focus on outlining concrete steps to address inequalities sustained by overlapping systems of power.

Third, it is important to recognize the trivialization of the concept of intersectionality. Although it has been theoretically acknowledged in both the private and public sectors and increasingly incorporated into the design of policies and programs, this has not prevented a misleading perception of integrated problem-solving. The widespread use of the term has largely remained at the level of superficial correctness, without meaningful progress in truly understanding the realities of people affected by multiple systems of oppression or in adapting institutional structures to different contexts in a meaningful way. In recent decades, this has become one of the most visible barriers to the practical application of intersectionality as a tool for institutional transformation.

⁶ See Gerardo Contreras and Isabel Arellano, "Notes on the lives of intersectionality within institutions", *About Gender – International Journal of Gender Studies*, vol. 11, no. 22(2022): 187-220, y Jens T. Theilen, "Intersectionality's Travel to International Human Rights Law", *Michigan Journal of International Law*, vol. 45, no. 2 (2024): 233-274.

⁷ See more on this critique by Gauthier de Beco, "Harnessing the full potential of Intersectionality Theory in International Human Rights Law: Lessons from Disabled Children's Right to Education", in *Intersectionality and Human Rights Law*, edited by S. Atrey and P. Dune (London: Hart Publishing, 2020).

Standards on the Right to Protest: A Framework for Exploration

The standards governing the right to protest within the Universal Human Rights System encompass a range of instruments, from international treaties to interpretations by conventional and extra-conventional mechanisms or special procedures. Among these, the right to protest is enshrined in several key documents, including the **Universal Declaration of Human Rights** (Article 20), the **International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights** (Article 21), the **Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women** (Article 5), the **International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination** (Article 7), the **United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples** (Article 18), the **Convention on the Rights of the Child** (Article 15.1), and the **Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities** (Article 29).

While these instruments provide important legal foundations, most were drafted before the concept of *intersectionality*—or even the notion of it—was recognized in legal doctrine. Moreover, as living instruments, these treaties are subject to ongoing reinterpretation by the United Nations.

For this reason, this report prioritizes the analysis of standards issued by conventional and extra-conventional mechanisms. The selection process followed three key criteria. First, only standards issued since 2020 were considered, allowing for an examination of the most recent interpretations that respond to the current global context. This includes the impact of the feminist movement, the role of technology in both enabling activism and restricting rights, the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic, and the rise of neo-conservative groups.

Second, a representation-based approach was used to analyze standards that focus on the right to protest for specific populations, including women, gender-diverse persons, Afro-descendant and negatively racialized persons in general. Notably, it is concerning that neither the **CEDAW Committee** nor the **Special Rapporteur on Violence Against Women and Girls** has issued any standards related to the right to protest for women.

Finally, the work done by the **Special Rapporteur on the Rights to Freedom of Peaceful Assembly and of Association** was prioritized, as it is the key extra-conventional mechanism specializing in protest rights. Specifically, three of its annual reports to the UN General Assembly and the Human Rights Council were selected for analysis

a. Standards Analyzed

Conventional Mechanism:

- **Human Rights Committee:** General Comment No. 37 on the Right of Peaceful Assembly (Article 21) (2020).

Extra-Conventional Mechanisms:

- **Human Rights Council:** *The Promotion and Protection of Human Rights in the Context of Peaceful Protests* (A/HRC/RES/50/21, 2022).
- **Special Rapporteur on the Rights to Freedom of Peaceful Assembly and of Association:**
 - *Commending Women's Participation in Activism and Civil Society: The Enjoyment of the Rights to Freedom of Peaceful Assembly and of Association by Women and Girls* (A/75/184, 2020).
 - *The Essential Role of Social Movements in Building Back Better* (A/77/171, 2022).
 - *Model Protocol for Law Enforcement Officials to Promote and Protect Human Rights in the Context of Peaceful Assemblies* (A/HRC/55/60, 2024).
- **International Independent Expert Mechanism to Advance Racial Justice and Equality in Law Enforcement:** *Promotion and Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of Africans and People of African Descent in the Face of Excessive Use of Force and Other Human Rights Violations by Law Enforcement Officials* (A/HRC/54/69, 2023).
- **Independent Expert on Protection Against Violence and Discrimination Based on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity:** *Protection Against Violence and Discrimination Based on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity in Relation to the Rights to Freedom of Expression, Peaceful Assembly, and Association* (A/HRC/56/49, 2024).

b. Analysis Framework

The documents were analyzed for this report using a tool designed to operationalize the definition of intersectionality.⁸ This tool consists of a five-stage matrix that helps identify how legal norms portray the intersection of social structures and create specific relationships of oppression and privilege between groups. It also emphasizes recognizing intersections that foster (or fail to foster) alliances between social movements experiencing common forms of oppression.

⁸ The instrument was first presented at the workshop "*Intersectionality as a Feminist Methodology to Study the Right to Protest Cases*," organized by CELS in June 2024. This space was essential for conducting an initial pilot and identifying areas for improvement in the tool.

The phases and key questions are the following:**Phase 1. Identify the Intersectionality Trajectory (Preliminary Analysis)**

- *Does the standard explicitly mention the concept of intersectionality? If so, does it define it? How?*
- *What analytical perspectives are explicitly stated in the standard? Gender, ethnic-racial, human rights, multiculturalism, among others?*

Phase 2. Identify the Social Groups with Similar or Different Characteristics

- *Which groups are mentioned or described by the standard?*
- *Does the standard provide a list or enumeration of social categories that apply to the impacted individuals? If so, what identities or experiences are excluded?*
- *Are the identities listed presented as a "hyper-oppressed" group?*
- *Does the standard use the term "vulnerable group" or "group in a vulnerable situation"? If so, does it do so in an essentialist or non-essentialist manner?*

Phase 3. Question the Systems of Power Involved

- *In what context was the standard or resolution issued?*
- *Does the standard focus on systems of oppression? If so, which systems of power are explicitly mentioned by the standard? Why?*
- *Which systems are missing? What might be the reason for this omission?*

Phase 4. Identify the Privilege-Oppression Matrix

- *Does the standard offer mechanisms, discourses, or incentives to address rights violations of individuals exacerbated by the intersection of their characteristics? If so, what are they?*
- *Which interests or systems of power does the standard respond to?*
- *Does the standard exacerbate or perpetuate the subordination of a group based on their shared characteristics?*

Phase 5. Map the Alliances or Tensions Between Groups

- *How does the standard promote alliances and collaborations between movements?*
- *How does the standard generate tensions between the demands of different groups?*

Review of Standards and Opportunities for the Application of Intersectionality

Through the comprehensive use of the aforementioned matrix, four shortcomings in the application of an intersectional approach to the protection of the right to protest were identified. First, the approach proposed by the reviewed documents lacks depth when applying the perspective of intersectionality. In cases where it is mentioned, it tends to be presented in a cumulative manner, overlooking a perspective that takes into account the specific experiences of certain groups. Second, the approach is not used to analyze the positions of those in power. As a result, it does not question how the intersection of privileges perpetuates systems of oppression. Third, the standards do not provide enough clarity regarding concrete recommendations on actions that States should implement to ensure full access to the right to protest. Finally, while these documents emphasize the importance of civil society in promoting the right to protest, they fail to incorporate an intersectional perspective on these actors.

1. A Limited Approach to Intersectionality: The Insufficiency of the Cumulative Approach

One of the main issues identified in the analysis is the superficial application of the intersectional perspective, which manifests in different ways.

First, only one of the seven reviewed instruments includes a definition of "intersectionality." This sole standard, the report of the **International Independent Expert Mechanism to Advance Racial Justice and Equality in Law Enforcement**, defines it as the "combination of one or more forms of discrimination based on other identities."

Two additional documents—produced by the **Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and association** and the **Independent Expert on protection against violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity**—apply the concept but do not explicitly clarify the framework used in their analysis. Given the specificity and length of these documents, incorporating such clarifications may be challenging. However, it is crucial to emphasize the importance of explicitly referencing intersectionality to ensure a comprehensive and effective application of the concept.

The remaining four standards analyzed do not mention "intersectionality" at any point. The absence of an explicit definition or reference to the concept results in a superficial approach that fails to outline concrete measures states should take to mitigate the effects of oppression in relation to identified intersections. This omission, in turn, reinforces the existing disadvantages experienced by certain groups.

A detailed analysis of the standards reveals, secondly, that the approach used tends to be cumulative. Many documents present intersectionality through a listing of identity categories—such as “women, children, Indigenous peoples, migrants, Afro-descendants, persons with disabilities”⁹—or specific conditions, such as “religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, disability.”¹⁰ This aggregate approach homogenizes and simplifies the diverse lived experiences of individuals. It also reinforces the notion that, by accumulating multiple identities or conditions, these groups are inherently “marginalized” or “particularly vulnerable.”

References to “groups in situations of vulnerability”¹¹ or “discriminated and marginalized groups”¹² appear in the documents to highlight that these individuals may face greater risks during protests (e.g., unlawful use of police force) or require special protection due to structurally disadvantageous conditions. However, this vulnerability-focused approach risks portraying these groups as lacking agency for transformation. It reinforces stereotypes of victimization, which can hinder the integration of their struggles into broader movements. Moreover, it reveals that the recommendations issued to States do not adopt a transformative approach; instead, they tend to uphold protective and paternalistic measures.

This type of approach can lead to a hierarchical ranking of different categories, prioritizing some over others, and even risk establishing a so-called “tolerable” level of rights violations. Such an assessment of oppression directly contradicts the concept of intersectionality. From an intersectional perspective, there is no “excess” of vulnerability or “acceptable threshold” of oppression, as different forms of discrimination—whether based on gender, race, class, or sexual orientation—do not simply add up in a linear fashion, nor can they be weighed on a single scale. Instead, systems of oppression intersect, producing unique and complex lived experiences.

Ultimately, the cumulative and hierarchical dimensions present in these standards hinder a comprehensive analysis of the demands made by politically engaged groups that articulate their claims and experiences through an intersectional lens. For instance, women and other identities engaged in care work often face stigmatization when participating in protests, as their role is perceived as incompatible with political activism.¹³ The report *In Praise of Women's Participation in Activism and Civil Society*:

⁹ Human Rights Council. *Promotion and Protection of Human Rights in the Context of Peaceful Protests* (2022). A/HRC/RES/50/2021, preamble, page 3.

¹⁰ Report of the International Independent Expert Mechanism to Advance Racial Justice and Equality in Law Enforcement. *Promotion and Protection of the Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of Africans and People of African Descent Against Excessive Use of Force and Other Human Rights Violations by Law Enforcement Officers* (2023). A/HRC/54/69, paragraph 15.

¹¹ Human Rights Committee. *General Comment No. 37: Article 21 – Right of Peaceful Assembly* (2020).

¹² Human Rights Council. *Promotion and Protection of Human Rights in the Context of Peaceful Protests* (2022). A/HRC/RES/50/2021.

¹³ See CELS: *The Right to Protest: The Need for an Intersectional and Transfeminist Approach*, July 2022, available at: <https://www.cels.org.ar/web/en/publicaciones/the-right-to-protest-the-need-for-an-intersectional-and-transfeminist-approach/>

The Enjoyment of the Rights to Freedom of Peaceful Assembly and Association by Women and Girls does mention domestic workers. However, it fails to acknowledge the specific barriers imposed by classist and racist structures that limit their ability to exercise their rights.

Finally, it is important to understand that, from this first step in developing a comprehensive understanding of what intersectionality entails, it is crucial to recognize the need for clear provisions that focus on concrete recommendations for States and the ways in which these will be monitored.

2. The Need to Analyze Power Structures Through an Intersectional Lens¹⁴

One largely unexplored aspect in the reviewed documents is the application of an intersectional perspective to those who exercise oppression. As previously discussed, intersectionality is primarily used to examine how dynamics of oppression affect victims—albeit with significant limitations. However, it is equally crucial to recognize its potential as a tool for analyzing power dynamics among and within the actors responsible for managing protests. Just as intersecting factors of oppression marginalize certain groups and create distinct experiences of discrimination, intersecting privileges reinforce dominant positions and perpetuate power structures. Identifying these intersections would allow for a deeper exploration of the origins and mechanisms through which systemic violence leads to human rights violations in protest contexts.

For example, the *Model Protocol for Law Enforcement Officers to Promote and Protect Human Rights in the Context of Peaceful Assemblies* suggests that the presence of "more female officers" can help prevent sexual violence against women during protests. However, this assumption overlooks the reality that existing racist, classist, and sexist institutional logics often expose female officers to heightened risks, positioning them simultaneously as both enforcers of repression and as individuals occupying subordinate ranks within police institutions.

It is therefore essential to analyze systems of oppression from an intersectional perspective to gain a more comprehensive understanding of how power structures operate over oppressed groups and how they are upheld through intersecting privileges. While certain structures of power can be inferred in the reviewed standards, they are neither explicitly identified nor critically examined.

A deeper analysis is necessary—one that not only considers the consequences of oppression for victims but also interrogates the structural dynamics that sustain these systems. Such an approach would provide insight into how power inequalities are produced and maintained, enabling a more precise identification of intervention points

¹⁴This section should be understood in light of the limitations of intersectionality in practice and the contradictions in analyzing power structures from this perspective. The focus should be on how these structures are restructured to emphasize the struggles of historically oppressed groups.

to dismantle oppressive structures. Integrating intersectionality into both the analysis of victims' experiences and the examination of those who exercise oppression would lead to more effective, inclusive, and transformative policies and standards.

3. The Intersectional Perspective as a Means to Ensure Effective State Protection

Another key issue insufficiently addressed in the reviewed documents is the role of the State in responding to the specific forms of marginalization experienced by different groups. While the standards recognize the need for special protection for vulnerable groups, they lack clarity on the concrete actions States must take to ensure this protection is effective.

For instance, the documents affirm that States have an obligation to ensure accountability for human rights violations in protest contexts and to provide reparations and guarantees of non-repetition for victims. However, they fail to specify how these measures should be designed and implemented through an intersectional lens.

For example, General Comment No. 37 on Article 21 regarding the right to peaceful assembly merely states that States must "ensure" that laws and their interpretation do not result in discrimination in the enjoyment of this right based on "race, color, ethnic origin, age, sex, language, property, religion or belief, political or other opinion, national or social origin, birth, minority status, Indigenous status or other status, disability, sexual orientation or gender identity, or other grounds."¹⁵ However, it does not provide any specific recommendations or tools on how States can effectively achieve this protection.

Similarly, while the Model Protocol recommends measures that security forces should adopt when planning operations concerning "persons and groups in situations of vulnerability," these measures are not sufficiently concrete to ensure effective implementation. For instance, rather than merely stating that "strategies should be developed,"¹⁶ the recommendations could outline specific standards that States must meet, including how to assess their effectiveness, which indicators to use, and how frequently to review the results.

This approach remains insufficient because, although it acknowledges that human rights violations are specific to the intersection of various forms of oppression, the standards do not provide detailed guidance on the concrete measures that States must adopt to safeguard the rights of the most affected groups.

For these standards to be effective, it is not enough to simply state that rights violations become more severe when multiple forms of oppression overlap. Clear proposals and

¹⁵ Human Rights Committee. *General Comment No. 37: Article 21 – Right of Peaceful Assembly* (2020), para. 25.

¹⁶ *Model Protocol for Law Enforcement Officials to Promote and Protect Human Rights in the Context of Peaceful Protests*. A/HRC/55/60 (2024), para. 65.

best practices are also necessary to implement public policies aimed at identifying and addressing these specific experiences of marginalization.

4. Civil Society and Social Movements: Intersectionality in Struggles

The intersectional approach provides a framework for examining both the power structures that sustain oppression and the social actors and strategies used to advance human rights. However, the standards analyzed tend to reproduce a fragmented and non-analytical perspective on the groups leading these struggles. As a result, they fail to foster alliances and collaborations among the diverse actors that make up social movements.¹⁷

Civil society and its various actors are recognized as key players in the promotion of human rights. However, the standards analyzed fail to account for how structural inequalities shape power dynamics within civil society itself. In principle, these standards treat all civil society actors as equals, without acknowledging that not all organizations have the same resources, access to institutional spaces, or capacity to influence public decision-making.

For example, international organizations—primarily based in the Global North—tend to wield greater influence in human rights discussions, particularly in planning and monitoring demonstrations. In contrast, grassroots organizations with limited structures and, in many cases, lacking formal legal recognition—especially those representing historically marginalized communities, such as Indigenous women or negatively racialized LGBTQ+ individuals—frequently face systemic barriers to meaningful participation in these spaces.

This imbalance underscores the need to incorporate an intersectional perspective when analyzing civil society organizations and the expectations placed on their capacity for action.

Another critical issue requiring review is the conflation of civil society organizations—understood by the United Nations primarily as non-governmental organizations (NGOs)—with social movements. The analyzed standards tend to treat them as equivalent, despite their distinct modes of action and influence.

For example, the struggle for LGBTQ+ rights is often spearheaded by social movements composed of individuals, grassroots organizations, neighborhood associations, labor unions, faith-based groups, and other collectives. These movements not only face resistance based on sexual orientation or gender identity but also encounter systemic barriers rooted in racism, classism, and xenophobia. As highlighted in the 2024 report by the Independent Expert on protection against violence and discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity, restrictions on the

¹⁷ These include NGOs (referred to by the United Nations as “civil society”), trade unions, labor organizations, activist networks, and individuals.

right to peaceful assembly in such contexts often manifest through targeted persecution that undermines collective efforts.

Moreover, the analyzed standards portray social movements in a fragmented manner, as if their actions and efforts were confined to a single, narrowly defined political agenda. This is particularly evident in the 2022 report of the Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and association, which lists the contributions of women's movements solely in relation to advancing gender equality, without acknowledging their broader impact on democracy and political life. Similarly, the report describes the racial justice movement without referencing its contributions to economic justice or environmental activism.

Therefore, there is a pressing need to adopt a more comprehensive approach that acknowledges how power dynamics operate not only within the State and society at large but also within civil society itself. This recognition is crucial, as international standards should actively encourage collaboration and strategic alliances among diverse civil society actors.

Recommendations

Contributions Toward a New Interpretation of Protest Protection Standards from an Intersectional Perspective

United Nations mechanisms must develop standards that are applicable to a wide range of States with diverse social, cultural, economic, and political contexts. This breadth of applicability makes it challenging to address human rights issues with the level of specificity needed to reflect the heterogeneous realities in which these standards will be implemented. In this regard, incorporating an intersectional perspective is essential to ensure that these standards remain relevant and effective across different contexts.

To strengthen the development of protest-related standards through an intersectional lens, the following recommendations are proposed:

- ✓ **Adopt a common definition of “intersectionality”** within the United Nations system through a guiding document.
- ✓ **Produce a document** that underscores the importance of the intersectional perspective and promotes its use as a best practice in the drafting, interpretation, and application of human rights standards at the universal, regional, national, and local levels.

- ✓ **Apply an intersectional perspective to protest standards and related mechanisms** by ensuring the concept is used in a manner that is neither cumulative nor solely focused on vulnerabilities, but one that also recognizes power structures as well the agency of groups that experience different kinds of oppression.
 - ✓ **Issue specific recommendations to States** on concrete measures for adopting an intersectional perspective in legislation, judicial processes, and public policies that protect the right to protest, starting with the acknowledgement of the need for disaggregated information to enhance decision-making.
 - ✓ **Integrate an analysis of power dynamics into UN documents**, applying it not only to civil society actors (including non-governmental organizations and social movements) but also to those who exert oppression, recognizing the intersection of privileges in the management of protests across different national and regional contexts.
 - ✓ **Develop specific protest-related standards within mechanisms dedicated to the rights of women and girls**, and those aimed at the dynamics of oppression experienced by Afro-descendants and Indigenous populations, among others, addressing the current gap in this area and proposing guidelines that respond to the specific intersections of oppression affecting these populations.
-

This report was developed by CELS in partnership with ILEX-Acción Jurídica between August 2024 and January 2025 as part of the project **Protection of the Right to Protest through an Intersectional Perspective**, funded by CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation.

CIVICUS is a global alliance of civil society organizations and activists dedicated to strengthening citizen action and civil society worldwide. Founded in 1993, CIVICUS strives to amplify marginalized voices, particularly from the Global South, and has members in over 175 countries (www.civicus.org).

ILEX-Acción Jurídica is an organization led by Afro-Colombian lawyers and Afro-LGBT individuals from different regions of Colombia. It works to achieve racial justice in Colombia, Latin America, and the Caribbean through legal mobilization, research, and strategic communications, all from an intersectional perspective and under the leadership of Black Afro-Colombian individuals.

CELS is a human rights organization founded in 1979 during the last military dictatorship in Argentina to seek truth and justice for crimes against humanity committed by State terrorism. More than four decades later, its agenda has broadened: nowadays, it is an organization that promotes rights and equality in democracy. Through litigation, research, and communication, it operates at both national and international levels (www.cels.org.ar).

General Coordination Juliana Miranda and Victoria Darraidou

Research Coordination Cynthia Palacios Reckziegel and Geras Contreras

Production and Writing Bárbara Juárez, Cynthia Palacios Reckziegel, Eliana Alcalá, Florencia Ini, Geras Contreras, Wanny Hinestroza

Editing Clara Uranga and Vanina Escales

Cover design Mariana Migueles

English Translation Sarah Smith