

**Research Grant Proposal**  
**Submitted to**  
**Binghamton University Institute for Genocide and Mass Atrocity Prevention (I-GMAP)**  
**March 25, 2017**

**Research Project Title:**

***Preventing Mass Atrocities by Promoting the Rights of Indigenous Populations: A Study of Country and Regional Network Efforts, Accomplishments and Lingering Challenges in Latin America***

**Co PI's:**

Nadia Rubaii, Associate Professor of Public Administration  
Susan Appe, Assistant Professor of Public Administration

**Award Requested:**

\$10,000 - \$15,000, depending on availability of funds

**Project Description Linked to Award Criteria**

We propose to study national and regional policies, practices and institutional structures focused on protecting the rights of indigenous peoples as a tool for preventing mass atrocities within Latin America. The goal is to better understand and continually improve the practices of countries within the region, to inform other countries around the world and international organizations, and to contribute to building and testing theories regarding the special issues surrounding indigenous peoples' rights in genocide prevention and the role of networks within the realm of genocide and mass atrocity prevention (GMAP). This proposal has been developed and the research would be conducted with the approval and assistance of the Latin American Network for Genocide and Mass Atrocity Prevention (*La Red Latinoamericana para la Prevención del Genocidio y Atrocidades Masivas*) and of the Auschwitz Institute for Peace and Reconciliation (AIPR).

Much of the literature on genocide and mass atrocities focuses on: analyzing the contributing factors to incidents of mass atrocities; critiquing the actions or, in many cases, the inactions of various international actors; documenting consequences to victims, witnesses, economies and international security; and evaluating the effectiveness of various post-atrocity, transitional justice and reconciliation efforts. The legal definition of genocide and United Nations' policies articulating a Responsibility to Protect (R2P) assert domestic and international obligations, and address both prevention and response. While R2P has generated growing public interest and academic literature, including the establishment of a new journal *Global Responsibility to Protect*, a Routledge book series, and other books with reputable presses, there is more limited scholarly analysis of how best to approach *prevention* or what tools are most effective (Sharma

& Welsh, 2015). We can however draw upon the more established body of research on conflict prevention (see for example, Lund, 1996; Rubin, 2004).

Conducting research on prevention of mass atrocities faces several challenges. First, mass atrocities are high-impact/low-probability events and thus the absence of their occurrence is difficult to attribute to any particular prevention effort. Because it is inherently difficult to measure the effectiveness of prevention efforts, research in this area struggles to meet the expectations of moving beyond mere descriptive accounts. Second, as is the case with any complex social problem, mass atrocities are the result of a multitude of factors, many of which may require fundamental changes in attitudes and behaviors over long periods of time. As noted by Reike, Sharon & Welsh (2015), “preventive action needs to cast a wider net than curative action, and therefore should encompass so-called structural factors” (p. 26). The concept of a ‘problem analysis triangle’ drawn from the field of criminal justice, in which crime is understood as the interaction among three dimensions including perpetrators’ incentives, the victims’ vulnerability, and the situations’ permissiveness, suggests that prevention may need to address all three elements (Reike, et al, 2015). As such, the most effective prevention measures may appear to have more general goals and not be explicitly or publically defined as serving the purpose of preventing mass atrocities. In this way, more general human rights policies play a role in prevention of mass atrocities although the extent to which they are defined and understood in those terms varies widely.

Beyond the emphasis on prevention, this research seeks to address two other gaps in the existing literature on GMAP, one related to geographic focus and the other linked to the use of regional networks. Most scholarly research on GMA and GMAP which is published in English highlights examples from Europe, Asia and Africa, and gives relatively little attention to Latin America. For example, Waller’s (2016) *Confronting Evil: Engaging Our Responsibility to Prevent Genocide*, makes passing reference to Argentina and Guatemala, but the cumulative references to any Latin American country amount to less than one page in the 400+-page book. Similarly, in the 2013 book “*A Problem from Hell: American and the Age of Genocide*” which is targeted to a more general audience, former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Samantha Power makes the case that the United States has repeatedly failed to act to prevent or halt, or in some cases has been complicit in encouraging post-World War II acts of genocide, but the 600+-page manuscript uses no examples from Latin America. And in the pages of *Genocide Studies and Prevention*, the official journal of the International Association of Genocide Scholars (IAGS), which publishes three issues per year, we have to go back to 2013 to find an article focused on any country within Latin America (<http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/gsp/>).

The mass atrocities in Latin America have generally been less visible on an international scale and often have not been labeled as genocide for three principle reasons. First, in the cases in which there have been systematic of killings, disappearances, mass detentions, and torture in Latin American countries, the targeted groups have usually been selected on the basis of political or ideological differences rather than religion, nationality or ethnicity. This has made it easier for the world community to label these atrocities as domestic political matters. Second,

in the instances where the targeted group is an ethnic group – generally indigenous populations living in the remote regions – the methods of destruction of that cultural group have been slower and more indirect, via environmental and economic policies which effectively destroy habitat and eliminate cultural traditions over time. Finally, when there is scholarly attention to these issues it tends to be written in Spanish and not translated for the wider English-speaking audience. Thus, while the official journal of the IAGS referenced above has minimal coverage of atrocities in Latin America, the IAGS website provides an extensive bibliography of Spanish-language publications (see <http://www.genocidescholars.org/bibliography-spanish-0>). Even in this context, however, the coverage within that bibliography is largely focused on past atrocities in Argentina, and does not reflect attention to other countries in the region or to prevention.

Latin America represents an important area for study of prevention efforts not only because it is largely absent from the mainstream English-language GMAP literature, but also because of its leadership in acting on a regional level. R2P policies place initial responsibility within individual countries, and then extend the responsibility to international community if government officials within a country are committing the offenses or fail to act. Within the three level framework of atrocity prevention articulated by Reike, et al (2015), a regional approach represents the middle or systemic level of action in which a subset of states sharing risk factors engage in structural prevention, in contrast to the more generic actions directed to all UN member states or the more targeted direct actions taken within individual states already exhibiting evidence of preparation to commit crimes. Since the 1970s, Latin American countries have demonstrated leadership in this middle realm by collaborating as part of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights and the Inter-American Court of Human Rights (Serrano, 2015). Latin America is currently home to the largest regional network of government officials explicitly trained in GMAP and dedicated to working within their countries and on a regional scale to promote prevention, namely the Latin American Network for Genocide and Mass Atrocity Prevention (what we hereafter refer to as the Latin American Network or simply the Network), a Network supported by the Auschwitz Institute for Peace and Reconciliation, the UN Office of the Special Advisor for Genocide Prevention and R2P, and the Stanley Foundation.

As designed, the Latin American Network utilizes a more proactive, prevention-focused, and mutually-supportive alternative to R2P's reactionary, response-focused and external accountability approach. Former UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon has called the Latin American Network an effective "partnership for prevention." Networks have been studied extensively within the fields of public administration and organizational theory, among others, but there are no existing studies on the role of networks in GMAP; similarly, none of the published scholarship in *Genocide Studies and Prevention* examine the role of networks in prevention. Because of its mission, structure, and operational practices, the Latin American Network provides an ideal setting for studying the role of networks in genocide prevention. And given the importance and diversity of indigenous populations within and across Latin American countries, examining how the individual countries and the regional network are working to prevent genocide through indigenous rights is particularly relevant.

The Network was established in 2012 as the first regional entity with an explicit focus on human rights and discrimination issues as they relate to atrocity prevention. As of 2017, the Network consists of 18 member states: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, México, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela. Together they seek to improve and standardize prevention practices within member states and to position Latin American states to become leaders in prevention on the international scene. Although it is an independent regional network of government representatives, the Network maintains a relationship with the Auschwitz Institute for Peace and Reconciliation (AIPR) which provides Technical Secretary services to the Network. Beyond the Network's permanent representatives from the 18 member states who convene annually, there are a growing number of government officials within each member country who have participated in the AIPR Lemkin Seminar trainings and who have committed to incorporating the lessons, principles and practices of GMAP into their respective positions. Each year, the Lemkin Seminar participants must return to their respective countries and recruit the participants for the following year. In this way, the Latin American Network reflects a similar model of institutionalization articulated by the R2P national focal points approach (Serrano, 2015) however on a regional scale in addition to within individual states. Thus, the Network promotes cooperation both on a regional level and within individual countries; the extent to which this approach is advancing prevention efforts is worthy of research.

At its founding, the Latin American Network identified three lines of action and research as focal points and priorities to advance prevention: 1) transitional justice; 2) indigenous peoples' rights, and 3) anti-discrimination, more broadly. Within each of these areas, there is an emphasis on capacity building, policy development, and education through regional cooperation. The Network has already partnered with other individuals, universities, and organizations for research on the first area with extensive attention currently directed to research based in Colombia. The Network has begun the process of investigating the second main line of research and is open to our assistance, support and research collaboration in this endeavor.

This second area of priority acknowledges that effective prevention may require focusing on the original populations which may be victims of genocide and mass atrocities through a variety of indirect actions which gradually decimate their cultures, languages, traditions, and lands. Indigenous peoples face an additional challenge as a result of the diversity of their histories, languages, and practices, and their varying levels of isolation from and interaction with those whose heritage is linked to historical invasion and colonization of these countries. The United Nations policies and the academic scholarship on indigenous rights focus on issues of self-determination, culture, religion, language, education, participation, development, land, and resources, among others (see, for example, the UN *Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*, various reports from the International Indian Treaty Council, as well as Bevenuto, 2015; Garcia-Alex & Hitchcock, 2009).

With support from an I-GMAP research award, we will undertake a two-phase research process.

In Phase I we will conduct a region-wide analysis of the status of indigenous people's protections as a tool for mass atrocity prevention, documenting, comparing, and contrasting the extent to which and manner in which countries address this issue. In Phase II, we will focus on more in-depth analysis of selected case studies.

Our work within Phase I will be directly linked to information that will soon be gathered through the Latin American Network. The permanent members of the Network are currently finalizing a questionnaire which will be administered in each of the member countries in April or May of 2017. The questionnaire builds upon a report of the United Nations' Special Assessor's Office for Genocide Prevention which provides a framework for analysis, a general regional assessment, and recommendations for how to incorporate prevention strategies. The questionnaire seeks to gather the country-level information that the UN report lacks about the extent to which countries are incorporating UN recommendations as they relate to indigenous peoples' rights. Given the range of institutional structures that individual countries have developed to handle indigenous rights, the permanent representative to the Network in each country will be responsible for ensuring that the questionnaire is delivered to the appropriate officials within the relevant agencies. We will be involved in the analysis and interpretation of the results collected from the questionnaire. The first stage of this research will generate a comparative table illustrating basic information about the status of policies, practices, and institutional arrangements for original peoples' rights across the region, and an assessment of countries' activities and accomplishments in relation to the UN framework.

Based on our analysis of the information gathered through the questionnaire and additional document research, we will then select countries which can be considered "successes" or having "promising practices" for more in-depth case studies. At this stage, our research will transition to on-site archival and field research conducted within the selected countries. The goal will be to determine what lessons can be learned to inform other countries in the region and more generally. We will examine records of the debates (within government and within the popular media) surrounding consideration and adoption of relevant laws, speak with key actors within and outside of government about their roles (in support of or opposition to) the laws, identify how the issues were framed and how the particular organizational arrangements and legal provisions reflect the national context of each country. Our emphasis at this stage will not simply be on the formal components of the law, but also the challenges and successes in implementation and enforcement. We will be attentive to disparities between the policies and the reality, and the extent to which prevention is an explicit focus of the various indigenous rights policies and actors.

Because we are interested in understanding how such laws protecting the rights of indigenous populations can be a tool for prevention of mass atrocities and how regional networks such as the Latin American Network can facilitate prevention, we will also be particularly attentive to documenting to what extent: 1) Network members were active in the process of promoting or enforcing the protections for indigenous populations; 2) Network members work with other government officials at all levels, with civil society organizations, and with their counterparts in

other member countries with respect to these laws; 3) Network members apply principles, practices and strategies learned during the Lemkin Seminars to these efforts; and 4) Network members and others in these countries explicitly understand these protections for original populations to be a tool of mass atrocity prevention and have engaged in corresponding educational efforts. In recognition of the importance of cooperation between government, human rights organizations, and other civil society actors to prevent violence (Serrano, 2015), we will also be attentive to what extent and in what ways Network members are working across sectors in promoting the rights of indigenous populations as a prevention strategy.

### **Project Feasibility and Support**

We are confident that, with support from an I-GMAP research grant, we will be able to complete this research and contribute to the scholarship and practice of genocide and mass atrocity prevention.

We have been in regular communication and have developed this proposal in consultation with Eugenia Carbone, the Technical Secretary for the Latin American Network who is also the Director of Latin American Programs for the AIPR. She is based in Buenos Aires, Argentina, and has pledged her assistance and support in helping us connect with the proper individuals in the Network and access the necessary materials to effectively conduct this research (see attached letter of support).

Both PI's are fluent in Spanish and have lived for periods of time, taught courses and workshops, presented at conferences, and conducted field research in various Latin American countries. We have existing contacts in government, civil society, and universities in Latin America which we can rely on in addition to the Network contacts. We have published about Latin America in both English and Spanish, and we have experience preparing materials in the various formats identified as project deliverables.

### **Project Deliverables**

To have the greatest impact possible and to reach both academic and practitioner audiences, we intend to present the findings of our research in four distinct formats represented by at least four, most likely more, individual products. Specifically, we intend to prepare:

1. A report in Spanish targeted for the members of the Latin American Network for the Prevention of Genocide and Mass Atrocities which can inform their improved effectiveness within countries and at the level of regional collaboration. This report will identify both good practices as well as opportunities for improvement, will provide detailed analysis of the survey results, and will be prepared solely for internal use by the Network's permanent representatives. We expect to present this report both in written format and in person at the fall 2018 meeting of the permanent representatives.
2. A more general report in both Spanish and English versions for publication on the AIPR

website which will speak to the lessons learned about important considerations in the use of regional networks to support the work of the prevention of genocide and mass atrocities.

3. Academic articles targeted to journals within several genres, specifically: those with a particular focus on genocide and mass atrocities which may not have previously looked closely at the issue of regional networks (such as *Genocide Studies and Prevention* or *Global Responsibility to Protect*); those with an emphasis on the countries or Latin American region generally; those focused on network analysis which generally have not examined this issue (*Estudios Politicos* or *Latin American Research Review*); and those dedicated to the relations between public and nonprofit organizations (such as *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, or *Public Administration Review*). In recognition of the sensitive nature of our research topic and our privileged access to both the survey data intended for use solely within the Network and our access to representatives of Network member states, all articles will be presented to the Network's Technical Secretary/AIPR for approval by the permanent representatives in advance of submission for publication.
4. One or two case studies for use in academic classes and possibly for use in the subsequent Lemkin Seminars. The format of these case studies will be contingent upon our ability to secure additional funding. At a minimum, we will prepare traditional written case studies. We will also apply for support from the Lois B. DeFleur International Innovations grant program (Binghamton University); if we secure this funding we will select one of the country examples and produce a multi-media teaching case format with video, audio, photographic, and other web content. If those funds are not forthcoming, we will also explore the possibility of participation in the Hubert Project Fellows program if they have another round of fellowships in 2018. As with the academic articles, the case studies will also be shared with the Network's Technical Secretary/AIPR for review by the permanent representatives before publication and distribution.

The material for all types of products will be gathered during the period of the award, however only the first two deliverables will be delivered at the end of the award period. The others will be in various stages of development and will be finalized after the award period. The multimedia case will only be developed if supplemental funds are secured to support the additional travel and the production costs.

Except where prohibited by copyright laws or restricted by confidentiality concerns of the Network, all products produced in conjunction with the project will be made available for posting on the IGMAP website; in the case of copyright protected articles, a full citation will be provided for reference.

## **Proposed Timeline**

April - May 2017 Continued conversations with the Technical Secretary of the Latin American Network to refine the focus of the study and to provide input on the questionnaire to the extent appropriate given the that the Network is already close to finalizing the instrument.

June 2017 Professor Rubaii will meet in person with representatives of the member countries of the Network and with the Technical Secretary during the AIPR Lemkin Seminar in Poland.

July - Sept 2017 Review and analysis of questionnaire results. Collection and review of additional supporting government documents gathered through web searches and materials provided by the Network's Technical Secretary and member country representatives.

October 2017 Professors Rubaii and Appe will attend the meeting of the Network's Permanent Members (tentative dates Oct 14-16, location in Latin America TBD).

November 2017 – May 2018 Field visits. Observations. Interviews. Analysis.

June – August 2018 Preparation of deliverables #1 and #2. Work on deliverables #3 and #4.



**Proposed (Tentative) Budget**

|  |  |                                    |
|--|--|------------------------------------|
| Attendance at LAN Permanent Member Annual Meeting (October 2017) | Assumes RT airfare of \$900 per person x 2 people, shared lodging for 2 nights, and meals for 2 days.  | \$2,000.00                         |
| Field Research for In-Depth Case Studies                         | International airfare and expenses for lodging (shared), meals and in-country ground transportation to conduct field research in the countries selected for case studies. Depending on the amount awarded, this would allow for field research in 2 or 3 countries, including meetings with government and NGO officials in the capital city as well as in the regions with the largest or most vulnerable indigenous populations. | \$7,000.00 – 13,000.00 *           |
| Miscellaneous Expenses   | To cover any costs associated with accessing documents, copying, or scanning costs, possible translation services involving indigenous languages, and other incidental expenses over the 15 month period of research.  | \$ 1,000.00                        |
| <b>TOTAL</b>   |  | <b>\$10,000.00 - \$15,000.00 *</b> |

\*Note: We have tried to work within the constraints of \$10,000 based on an understanding that this is generally the maximum amount allowable under a I-GMAP research grants, however \$15,000 is needed to fully engage in the field research across three countries and to ensure that our country selection is based on the data from Phase I of the research rather than on cost considerations. Because the countries and dates of travel are not finalized, these figures represent estimates based on using current costs of airfare from Ithaca, NY, to the capital cities of several potential countries. As a point of reference to illustrate that the budget estimates are conservative we can refer to the following: RT airfare to Buenos Aires, Argentina is \$1,500 per person; RT airfare to Quito, Ecuador is \$750 per person; RT airfare to Tegucigalpa, Honduras is \$2,200 per person; RT airfare to Lima, Peru is \$1,200 per person, RT airfare to La Paz, Bolivia is \$2,500. In country expenses can be kept to a minimum by sharing lodging in basic accommodations, but the field research will require at least a week in each country and there will be some in-country travel outside the capital city.

## **Plans for Seeking Additional Funding**

Assuming receipt of the I-GMAP Research Grant, several supplemental sources of funds will also be sought and utilized:

First, as Co-Director of the I-GMAP, Professor Rubaii has been invited to attend the Lemkin Seminar, Latin American Edition, in June 2017, as an observer. The Provost's Office has already paid for the airfare (\$1,500) and has committed to paying the \$3,500 seminar registration fee.

Second, we have already prepared an application for a grant from the Lois B. DeFleur International Innovations program which would allow us to expand upon one of the case studies developed as part of this project and develop it in a multimedia format for use in teaching across courses in multiple disciplines.

Third, we will draw upon support from the CCPA Latin American Partnership (LAP) Fund to allow us to present our research at academic conferences. These funds are limited to \$1,000 so they are not able to cover travel expenses for costly field research, however they are a useful supplement.

Finally, during the period of the award, we will explore opportunities for external funding through governmental and foundation sources. The field research we will be able to conduct with support from the I-GMAP award will allow us to gather the more detailed information required for an effective application for external funds. We are confident that the topic of the research has potential for external funding.

## **Statement of Agreement with Terms of Award**

We understand and accept the conditions of the award. Specifically, we agree to submit a report of activities and accomplishments no later than August 30, 2018, to provide a blog post and photos for use in social media, work with Ryan Yarosh to promote the idea of an article for *The Conversation*, and to participate in the I-GMAP conference as appropriate. Additionally, Professor Appé will incorporate material from the research into the master's level class she will teach in spring 2018 on International NGOs, and Professor Rubaii will do so in her doctoral seminar on Power and Policy for Social Change (offered each fall semester); both PIs would be willing to speak in other I-GMAP affiliated courses as invited. Additionally, we will provide copies of all published materials (academic and professional) which stem from this research, and will cite the Institute and Binghamton University as a source of funds.

## References

Benvenuto, J. (2015). What Does Genocide Produce? The Semantic Field of Genocide, Cultural Genocide, and Ethnocide in Indigenous Rights Discourse. *Genocide Studies and Prevention: An International Journal*, 9(2): 26-40.

Garcia-Alix, L. & Hitchcock, R.K. (2009). A Report from the Field: The Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples – Implementation and Implications. *Genocide Studies and Prevention: An International Journal*, 4(1):99-109.

Lund, M.S. (1996). *Preventing Violent Conflict*. Washington, DC: US Institute for Peace

Power, S. 2013. *“A Problem from Hell”: America and the Age of Genocide*. NY: Basic Books.

Reike, R., Sharma, S.K., & Welsh, J.M. (2015). Conceptualizing the Responsibility to Protect. In Sharma & Welsh (Eds). *The Responsibility to Prevent: Overcoming The Challenges to Atrocity Prevention*. UK: Oxford University Press, pp. 21-37.

Rubin, B. (2004). *Blood on the Doorstep: The Politics of Preventive Action*. New York, NY: The Century Foundation Press.

Serrano, M. (2015). National Focal Points for R2P: Institutionalizing the Responsibility to Prevent. In Sharma & Welsh (Eds). *The Responsibility to Prevent: Overcoming The Challenges to Atrocity Prevention*. UK: Oxford University Press, pp. 83-100.

Sharma, S.K. & Welsh, J.M., Eds. (2015). *The Responsibility to Prevent: Overcoming The Challenges to Atrocity Prevention*. UK: Oxford University Press.

Waller, J. 2016. *Confronting Evil: Engaging Our Responsibility to Prevent Genocide*. Oxford University Press.

**From:** [Eugenia Carbone](#)  
**To:** [Nadia M Rubaii](#)  
**Cc:** [Susan M Appe](#)  
**Subject:** AIPR/Secretaría Técnica de la RED.  
**Date:** Thursday, March 30, 2017 12:30:12 PM

---

Estimada Nadia;

Un gusto estar en contacto contigo y ver plasmado en un documento las conversaciones e ideas que fueron surgiendo de nuestras conversaciones previas.

Al respecto y como Secretaría Técnica de la Red Latinoamericana para la Prevención del Genocidio y Atrocidades Masivas del Auschwitz Institute for Peace and Reconciliation manifestamos nuestro apoyo al proyecto y estaremos pendientes de llevar adelante las gestiones de asistencia técnica y vehiculización de acciones por ante la RED.

Quedo atenta a las próximas comunicaciones!

Saludos

Eugenia Carbone.-

--

María Eugenia Carbone  
Directora de Programas para América Latina y Secretaria Técnica de la  
Red Latinoamericana para la Prevención de Genocidio y Atrocidades Masivas  
Auschwitz Institute for Peace and Reconciliation  
2 West 45th St., Ste. 1602  
New York, NY 10036  
t: 212 575 2605  
f: 212 575 2655  
**Teléfono en Buenos Aires: 54 11 4328 2455**  
**Celular de Buenos Aires: 54 9 11 6054 9174**

[eugenia.carbone@auschwitzinstitute.org](mailto:eugenia.carbone@auschwitzinstitute.org)

[www.auschwitzinstitute.org](http://www.auschwitzinstitute.org)

[www.facebook.com/genprev](https://www.facebook.com/genprev)

[www.twitter.com/genprev](https://www.twitter.com/genprev)

Building a World That Prevents Genocide