Building National Architectures
For the Prevention of Mass Atrocities and Genocide

Learning From Experiences in Asia and Latin America

a) What are the challenges today of building national architectures?

- Having only certain institutions involved can be difficult in achieving government wide support for national architectures (NA)
- There is almost always an aversion to hearing that your state needs NA for genocide prevention – it needs to be explained in clear terms how this responsibility applies to all states and how it might apply to a given state's context
- Fear for retribution for historical atrocities, members of former criminal regimes who are still in government afraid of being prosecuted if an NA for mass atrocity prevention is established – viewed as a threat
- Challenge for next 10 years is delivering on rhetorical commitment of R2P
- Securing strong political commitment
- Avoiding a one-size fits all prescription for states to successfully implement R2P
- Securing resources for prevention
- 2/3 of UN Political mediation budget comes voluntarily by states, no security in funding for preventative diplomacy
- Measuring successful prevention efforts is very difficult
- We cannot yet say this much money will prevent this much violence, drawing direct links between preventative funding and preventing violence
- Need multi-sector approach to prevention
- The 2005 agreement (R2P) didn't anticipate violent extremism and the rise of non-state actors and new technology – spreading hate messages and incitement

b) What have we learned about building national architectures?
• Collaboration by states with similar and/or regional problems can help support each others’ efforts to build or reinforce NA – this was the case in Latin America
• Important to go beyond MFAs – ministries of the interior, defence, human rights institutions
• Allowing countries to pick which institution will be the representative in a network for genocide prevention is helpful
• Must engage all institutions to have comprehensive prevention work via NA
• Important to have common language and understanding of what terms mean, in order to get a whole state on board with mass atrocity prevention NA
• Regional states/neighbours can help by sharing lessons learned – Argentina can help Colombia w/ current peace process through their past experience
• We need to better adapt our approaches to prevention, no one size fits all model
• We need better information and context
• Translate global principles into local contexts and actions
• Embed global principles into everyday of local community
• Top down commitment and bottom up action
• Inclusive national ideologies are best suited to resist mass atrocities
• Tanzania best example of this – look at the states around it compared to its history of mass atrocity
• Rule of law, legitimate security sectors, legislation for non discrimination, international humanitarian law ascension, ensuring constructive diversity management (make it a strength not a weakness), accountability and non impunity, growing economies is a surefire way to reduce atrocity risk
• Need to harmonize national laws with provincial, city, and town laws

c) What could be the contribution of GAAMAC to address these challenges?

• Encourage and support states to secure political support
• Assist states in developing commitment
• Assist states developing national action plans
• Global culture shift – reluctance to ask for help and support, states are too proud to ask for help, need to create a culture where states feel free to ask for help
• International community needs to make a welcoming environment for states to ask for help – look at Kenya in 2013, Referendum of peace agreement in Sudan CPA, Salomon Islands...etc.
• GAAMAC can help disseminate successful practices of certain regions with others

d) Other specific and very relevant issue to be recorded?

• East Asia 1960s had the most mass atrocities of any region in the world
• They have managed to dramatically reduce the number of these, the reasons for which we are still figuring out