



World Vision

Principled Humanitarian Action & Ethical Tensions in Multi-Mandate Organizations in Armed Conflict

Observations from a Rapid Literature Review by

Dr Hugo Slim and Miriam Bradley
March 2013

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction
3. Mandate Types
4. First Source of Ethical Tension: Humanitarian Ethics and Development Ethics
5. Second Source of Ethical Tension: Political Liberalism as Development Ethics
6. Third Source of Ethical Tension: Framing War as a Development Problem
7. Fourth Source of Ethical Tension: The Protraction of Crisis
8. Fifth Source of Ethical Tension: Neutrality
9. Agency Policy on Multi-mandate Tensions
10. Comparable Ethical Tensions in Other Professions
11. Conclusions and Recommendations

1. Executive Summary

The great majority of aid organizations working in armed conflict are multi-mandate agencies. This means that ethical problems arising from operating humanitarian programmes from within multi-mandate agencies are systemic rather than incidental or peripheral to global humanitarian action.

This paper explores the particular ethical tensions faced by multi-mandate agencies operating in armed conflict. The paper draws on a rapid literature review of academic and policy documents relating to the subject. It was commissioned by World Vision as part of its investment in the wider research project around humanitarian ethics at the Institute of Ethics, Law and Armed Conflict at the University of Oxford.

The mandating of agencies refers to three different dimensions: a legal mandate; a technical or demographic specialism, and organizational positions along a spectrum of ethical goals. Multi-mandate agencies can be state-mandated, like UN agencies, or self-mandated like World Vision. They work across a range of sectors and demographics, and across a range of ethical goals from humanitarian action, through poverty reduction to social justice. The vast majority of agencies working in armed conflict are multi-mandate organizations.

The paper identifies five sources of ethical tension for multi-mandate agencies. The first is in classic differences of ethical goals between humanitarian and development ethics. The second arises from political liberalism's currently being the ethical goal of international development. The third emerges from a global policy that frames war as a development problem, and so prioritizes development strategies over humanitarian action. This tension is particularly acute in liberal counter-insurgencies. The fourth tension arises in the protraction of conflicts when agencies need to move regularly between relief and development roles over many years. The fifth is a conventional challenge of humanitarian neutrality.

The literature is unanimous that the most intense multi-mandate tensions emerge in armed conflicts or in "mixed emergencies", like the Pakistan floods, that see natural disasters occurring in the same place as an armed conflict. Neutrality, impartiality and independence are the main points of tension in law and practice in these situations, especially when a clash of values between political liberalism and anti-liberal forces drives the armed conflict. In these conflicts, multi-mandate agencies can be "instrumentalized" to consolidate liberal development as COIN, WHAM and stabilization strategies.

Protracted crisis imposes a natural merging of humanitarian and development ethics. The ethical horizon of emergency work inevitably becomes longer when agencies know that acute needs will continue for years. With extended time commitments come extended ethical responsibilities and an organic moral move to deeper developmental values. Knowing that an agency is most likely to remain for five years imposes an ethical responsibility to think about what is best to do this year in view of next year's demands. This deepening of horizon and relationships rightly creates an ethics creep in which moral obligations thicken and programme investments tend more towards capacity-building and development.

Agency policies on how to conceptualize and manage the ethical tensions in multi-mandate operations are under-developed or discretely developed. Operational problems are recognized especially around Afghanistan where tensions are frequently mentioned. But it was hard to find explicit and elaborate policy documents by multi-mandate agencies that address the problems. This lack of material makes it difficult to gauge how agencies are solving multi-mandate problems on the ground.

There are comparable ethical tensions between emergency and development goals in other professions. Public health routinely faces a choice between immediate curative strategies or a more politicized approach to the causes of ill health that focuses on poverty and injustice. Policing faces a choice between “fighting crime” or deeper developmental strategies of community policing that address the causes of crime. Human rights work prioritizes campaigns around rights it can secure in the short term rather than rights that are taboo in certain countries (like homosexual rights) that would see their organizations discredited and risk the wider impact of their mandate and organization.

The paper ends with six recommendations. These focus on ethical analysis, independent funding and local level research.

2. Introduction

This paper explores the particular ethical tensions faced by multi-mandate agencies working in humanitarian operations. The paper draws on a rapid literature review of academic and policy documents relating to the subject, and a brief comparison with other professions that face similarly competing values between emergency and development work.

The paper focuses on five strategic sources of ethical tension that we infer from ethical problems that are being reported. It identifies situations in which they are most likely to arise, and the policies that agencies put forward to manage these tensions. The paper then gives examples of comparable experience of similar ethical tensions in politics, healthcare, human rights and policing.

The paper and its literature review were carried out as part of World Vision's investment in the wider research project around humanitarian ethics at the Institute of Ethics, Law and Armed Conflict at the University of Oxford.

3. Mandate Types

In humanitarian discourse, the term mandate is used to describe and proscribe the different kinds of legitimacy, mission and values held by the wide variety of agencies engaged in humanitarian activities in armed conflict and disaster. The mandating of agencies refers to three different dimensions: a legal dimension; a technical or demographic specialism, and organizational positions along a spectrum of ethical goals. For example, agencies talk of having an official international mandate, a health mandate, a children's mandate, a humanitarian and/or development mandate.

The legal mandates of international agencies working in humanitarian operations are of two main types: state-mandated or self-mandated. United Nations organisations, like UNHCR, UNICEF, UN WFP, UN WHO and UN OCHA, have international mandates that are legally recognized by states. So too do the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, National Red Cross/Crescent Societies and the International Organization for Migration (IOM). These agencies can be described as state-mandated. All other agencies – largely NGOs and CBOs - tend to be self-mandated as voluntary organizations set up as private initiatives seeking public support. Self-mandated agencies are usually registered, recognized and regulated by states to differing degrees but do not carry a formal international mandate. This first sense of the term mandate reflects an idea of international legitimacy grounded in the power of either states or civil society.

The technical mandate of an agency refers to their specialist field of professional practice and their demographic target group. An agency's specialism may be very specific and focus on children and health, or civilians and human rights. The first sense of the term "multi-mandate" comes into play here to describe agencies that have multiple target groups and multiple specialisms. For example, Oxfam, CARE and World Vision work generally on poverty and social justice and so have a diverse target group of women, men, boys and girls. Their concern for a variety of socio-economic conditions leads them into a wide range of different technical specialisms that can include agriculture, health, water supply, education and legal rights. In this technical sense of the term mandate, agencies are

described as multi-mandate to express their diversity of sector or field. The term “multi-sectorial” is a clearer distinction and avoids confusion with the next meaning.

A third sense of mandate distinguishes between humanitarian and development roles. Here, typically, ICRC and MSF will be described as “single mandate” agencies meaning that they work only with an emergency humanitarian mission based in international humanitarian law and humanitarian principles. In contrast, agencies like World Vision, Islamic Relief and Save the Children are described, in a second use of the term, as having a “multi-mandate”. This means they respond to emergency humanitarian crisis as well as the broader longer-term crisis of poverty, human development and social justice. In this wider work they also advocate for political change of various kinds. It is in this sense of a humanitarian/development multi-mandate (HDMM) that people tend to report ethical tensions in agencies that are trying to “balance”, “separate”, “finesse” or “complement” the humanitarian and development aspects of their multi-mandate. It is this sense of multi-mandate – relating to the combined ethical goals of humanitarian action and development in a single organization – that is the focus of this paper.

Most of the literature that problematizes multi-mandates concentrates on the third form of mandate difference – mixed relief and development mandates. It reports strategic tensions, moral conflicts and culture clashes within agencies that work across and between a humanitarian ethic of emergency in humanitarian operations, and a broader political ethic of human development in programmes aiming to reduce poverty, increase social justice and build just national and international societies. A seminal paper on multi-mandate dilemmas, distinguished four different philosophical strands of ethical action that - together or in some combination - underpin the ideology and actions of multi-mandate agencies: the charitable imperative; principles of justice and rights; utilitarian social policy, and pacifism (de Waal 1994, p. 9).

The vast majority of agencies working in humanitarian operations are multi-mandate agencies in this sense. These include most UN agencies, international and national NGOs and of course all government donor agencies like USAID, ECHO, DFID and SIDA. The fact that the overwhelming majority of agencies operating in armed conflicts are multi-mandate agencies makes multi-mandate tensions a systemic rather than incidental feature of contemporary humanitarian action.

The Red Cross/Crescent Movement is increasingly distinguishing itself from multi-mandate agencies by its assertion of its neutral, impartial and independent approach (NIIHA) that is limited in aim and strictly guided by humanitarian principles (British Red Cross, ICRC and Lebanese Red Cross, 2012). MSF pursues the same approach, emphasising its single mandate and operational neutrality and independence.

It is morally logical that many agencies that began as humanitarian agencies should ethically evolve into multi-mandate agencies. Save the Children, IRC, UNICEF, Oxfam, CARE and many others began as humanitarian agencies born from a particular emergency response. A very justifiable extension of ethical ambition organically pulled all these agencies into a wider and more political development ethic. Quite simply, it makes moral sense to try and prevent suffering instead of simply repairing it. For example, a community organization responding to a dangerous road crossing where school children are repeatedly knocked down by speeding cars will soon be morally pulled to extend its activities from simply rushing these children to hospital and waving red flags at speeding drivers. Morality dictates that they should try to do more. Soon they will initiate a system of road-crossing volunteers, and politicize their work to campaign for a zebra crossing and strictly enforced speed limits.

4. First Source of Ethical Tension: Humanitarian Ethics and Development Ethics

This ethical tension in multi-mandates is not a new phenomenon but has been a conscious tension in agencies for many decades, and is traditionally conceptualized as the relief-development tension (Maxwell and Buchanan-Smith 1994). Tension arises from agency mandates that combine humanitarian ethics and development ethics in a single organization and in the same operational space.

Legitimate differences of ethical goal are at the heart of the distinction between humanitarian and development programming. Development ethics are not better than humanitarian ethics, or vice versa. They have different moral goals. Humanitarian ethics is a niche ethics designed to ensure survival and dignity in extreme circumstances. Development ethics is a very broad ethics that addresses the totality of human flourishing in a well governed political society. In their ideal forms, each term has different ethical content and ambition.

Relief intends to relieve suffering in a person or community. Relief involves a narrow, quick and largely reparatory ethical goal that is concerned to protect, bind wounds, stop hunger, quench thirst, end and prevent epidemics, restore livelihood, repair infrastructure, reunite families and restore dignity. Its ethic is largely palliative, restorative and protective. It does not aim to address the root causes of that suffering other than by changing the immediate behaviour of military forces through an advocacy of restraint. A humanitarian ethic focused on emergency relief can be described as an interim care ethics of limited moral scope. This ethic of limited care is best suited to a crisis situation where human beings are living *in extremis* on the edge of survival and where there is only room for manoeuvre to create partial human flourishing. As such, humanitarian work's ethical horizon is now, tomorrow, the next harvest or the end of the war.

Development intends to develop the full potential of a person or community. Development involves a broad, slow-building, creative and liberationist ethical goal that is concerned to plan, design, reform, reorganize, empower, construct, expand, enrich and institute fairness and opportunity¹. Its ethic is largely evolutionary, revolutionary and progressive. Development specifically sets out to address root causes and to transform society, and deploys an advocacy of change. A development ethic can be described as an ultimate or total political ethics that seeks to create the good society. Development's ethical horizon is the good society and a just and prosperous future.

These different goals and ethical horizons naturally lead to a different sense of timing, technique and autonomy in relief and development projects. Relief tries to move fast in its efforts to reach those in crisis on the edge of death. This means humanitarian work can be more directive and tend to adopt more interventionist techniques that reduce the opportunity for autonomy in its target population. Relief's techniques of assessment, social organization, delivery and advocacy can be top-down. At the outset of an operation in particular, relief can work with an operational grammar that treats relief workers as subjects, and people in need as objects in a humanitarian process (Slim, 2009).

Progressive human development practice seeks to do the opposite, and aims to work slowly and structurally on society itself. At its best, development prioritizes people's

¹ It needs to be noted, of course, that many revolutionary development projects deliberately create conflict and crisis as a first purgative stage in the struggle for development.

autonomy in the choices and decisions about their resources and future direction. Developmental techniques as practiced by liberal or liberationist power are deliberately bottom-up and participatory, focused on more indirect processes of facilitation. In development grammar, the professional works in a prepositional relationship “with”, “for” or “alongside” the target group (Slim 2009). The position of choice for development practice is one of catalyst or enabler.

Models that seek to “link” relief and development and resolve their ethical tension use either an integrated or sequential frame. Ideas like developmental relief and rights-based programming try to resolve tensions simultaneously. They argue for an integrative model of practice in which good emergency work always also involves developmental values like participation, empowerment and justice at the same time. This simultaneous model seeks to integrate emergency and development ethics, long-term and short-term goals in humanitarian operations. Other ideas, like the relief-development continuum, rehabilitation and early recovery use a sequential logic to show how values are phased and escalated over the life cycle of a crisis. The sequential model argues that not every ethic can be realized *in extremis* and that ethical development in and after emergencies is progressive. The sequential model uses a gradual paradigm that phases different ethics in line with the “gradual realization” theory of human rights. The integrated model uses a holistic paradigm that values both ethics at all times.

Humanitarian and development agencies are not alone in this philosophical and practical tension around ethical goals. Most large ideological projects – like human rights, communism, democracy, religion and peace – struggle between two paradigms of integration or phasing. For example, Christianity and other faiths struggle as they shift between paradigms of eschatology that are realized, deferred, partial, fulfilled, immediate, postponed, penultimate and ultimate. It is the challenge of the human condition, living within time, to live between now and later and, at the most frustrating times to call out, like Primo Levi, “If not now, when?” This call is frequently heard in emergencies when human suffering is so extreme that the immediate return to a system that respects all rights seems more urgent than ever, even as it is, in reality, harder than ever.

The humanitarian-development tension is ethically genuine and its moral friction arises from how similar emergency and development programming can be rather than how different they are. To do humanitarian action well involves deploying values and techniques that are also a core part of development and social justice programming like respect, community participation, gender recognition and empowerment. These values of dignity, autonomy and social justice have been acknowledged as humanitarian in the Code of Conduct, articles 5-10. In protracted armed conflicts that last for decades, good humanitarian work inevitably means introducing some form of sustainability into health, food, water and income generation projects even though sustainability concerns are more usually associated with development.

Operating these two different ethics simultaneously in the same organization – one of care and one of change – can bring tensions in policy and culture. Agencies have often reported a “two cultures” problem in multi-mandate NGOs in which emergency and development staff think past one another - the former prioritizing short-term speed and urgent need, and the latter valuing long-term goals and processes of development. NGOs also report policy tensions that are often manifest in disputes over modes of action – especially advocacy strategy. Typically, NGOs will report disputes in which those who feel compelled to speak out about the justice of a situation in an armed conflict (atrocities, forced displacement, detention etc) are at odds with those who prioritize the need to “stay and deliver” in caring mode (OCHA, 2011a).

These organizational tensions in culture and policy have resolved somewhat in recent years as humanitarian work has become more rights-based. Humanitarian professionals no longer see themselves as emergency technicians but as part of an international profession that is grounded in the laws of war, the rights of civilians and a growing framework of criminal justice around the conduct of armed conflicts. Theorists have argued that rights-based humanitarian action makes legal and ethical sense, and also reduces relief-development programming tensions (Slim, 2000, 2002, Darcy, 2004). There is a new sense across many multi-mandate agencies that “we are all human rights workers now” or that emergency work in war and disaster is as much about rights and justice as development work². UNICEF and Save the Children see all their humanitarian work in terms of protecting and realizing the rights of the child (Cotterrell 2005) and UN OCHA’s sectorial leadership on the protection of civilians (PoC) is explicitly grounded in law and rights (OCHA 2011b). The recent elaboration of the new field of protection practice has been explicitly rights-based (Slim and Bonwick 2005, ICRC, 2009).

The new theory of resilience also intends to integrate humanitarian and development values into a unified ethical goal. Resilience strategy aims to develop individuals, families, communities, cities, systems and states that are resilient in the face of shocks and disaster. This new aid orthodoxy integrates humanitarian and development functions and specifically demands multi-mandate investment and practice from donors and agencies (DFID, 2012, 2011, European Commission 2012, Gubbels 2012, UNICEF 2011). While strategies of resilience work logically and uncontroversially in many natural disasters, they create potential problems for the neutrality of humanitarian action in certain armed conflict where improving political and economic structures can be perceived as giving unfair advantage to one side or another.

5. Second Source of Ethical Tension: Political Liberalism as the Dominant Ethics of Contemporary Development

Development theory is not politically neutral and the current international orthodoxy in development ethics is political liberalism, as opposed to socialism, Islamism or authoritarianism for example. This means that development is already politically aligned when it begins to operate in an armed conflict. The significance and risk of this alignment will depend on whether the context of the armed conflict is generally accepting of liberalism or contests it as a core part of the conflict. The essential liberalism of development ideology today greatly complicates the traditional relief-development tension in humanitarian work because liberalism is itself contested in several conflicts and still read as western imperialism by Islamist and socialist states, various armed groups, or states wary of western hegemony.³

Beneath prevalent international notions of development and human rights sits the fundamental ideology of political liberalism that is shared in whole or in part by most multi-mandate agencies. Liberalism is founded on the moral principles of freedom, equality, rights and law. Development as it is understood, elaborated and paid for by western governments is designed to deliver political liberalism and western security around the world (Duffield 2001,2007). The great majority of INGOs share this political philosophy of liberalism although many inflect it with their own Marxist or religious influences to curb what they see as the social, cultural, environmental or market excesses of liberalism. Ethically, therefore,

² See for example, Oxfam’s corporate position “Oxfam takes a rights-based approach to its development, humanitarian and campaign work,” at <http://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/our-work>

³ Such states would include Iran, Syria, Egypt, Sudan, Venezuela, Cuba, North Korea, Russia and China.

Save the Children, Oxfam or World Vision will prefer political liberalism over political Islamism but may seek to correct the worst effects of the privatization of food supply, the free market in labour or the decadence of liberal culture which generates rampant consumerism and sexual license.

Ethical tensions over development between liberal governments and liberal agencies and NGOs are, therefore, more usually about means than ends. The shared ethical commitment to liberal development and liberal peace across the international development sector creates a political affinity between liberal governments and multi-mandate agencies and NGOs. Ethical tensions between them focus mainly on *how* to bring about liberal development more than on *what* liberal development actually is (Slim, 2004). For example, some NGOs view protective trade restrictions as unfair measures that will hold back universal economic development, or think going to war in Iraq, Afghanistan and Somalia is a misguided strategy that will backfire as a means of achieving just liberal development in those societies.

Unlike liberal development theory, the humanitarian ethic does not encompass a grand political ethics of the good society and is essentially neutral about political goals, but it shares an ethics of individual rights and international rules. In principle, humanitarian ethics poses no contest to any political ideology other than excessive and indiscriminate violence. Violence is usually a means rather than an end in politics and so humanitarian ethics and action addresses only means. Conventionally, humanitarian complaints are about how violence is used and not the ends for which it is used. But, importantly, humanitarian ethics does share liberalism's concern for a rights-based and rule-based world order and so it can appear politically liberal to those who are not.

Significant ethical tensions in multi-mandate agencies arise, therefore, from contests over liberalism. These contests are of two main types. First a conflict over means with liberal donors. Secondly, a conflict over ends and means with anti-liberal parties in a conflict. Accepting funding from liberal governments can create ethical problems when agencies disagree with those governments' means of expanding liberal development. Most of these problems emerge as ethical concerns about association, manipulation or even complicity in liberal projects of war or state-building. But ethical concerns also arise when multi-mandate development operations are at odds with anti-liberal forces. When education, vaccination, governance or livelihood projects are seen as dangerously liberalizing by anti-liberal parties, agencies face ethical problems of staff safety, access and compromising their values – for example, by agreeing not to provide services for women (Afghanistan), halting vaccination projects (Pakistan and Nigeria) legitimizing and capacity-building authoritarian regimes (Syria and Sri Lanka), or providing routine curative care after *Sharia* amputations (Mali).

But it is also evident that anti-liberal forces also seek to co-opt multi-mandate aid into their own WHAM strategies when the opportunity arises. Afghanistan experience makes clear that when the tide began to turn in their favour, Taliban leaders soon began to ask for NGO aid to support populations in areas under their control. In doing so, the Taliban were quick to request development interventions that went beyond immediate humanitarian action (Terry 2011, Valente 2011).

6. Third Source of Ethical Tension: Framing War as a (Liberal) Development Problem

Armed conflict and disasters are now routinely regarded as development problems by aid donors, and by major UN agencies like UNDP (Clark 2013) the World Bank (2011), and by

NGOs. International aid policy consistently implies that states have armed conflicts because they are not liberal enough. Framed as failures of development, both disaster and conflict now logically demand multi-mandate responses that combine humanitarian, development, security and good governance. The whole emphasis of international aid funding is now built around an “integrated approach” that is essentially a multi-mandate driven strategy of political change. This framing tends automatically to subsume humanitarian ethics within liberal development ethics. This makes liberal sense but not humanitarian sense.

A developmental approach to natural disaster and famine has existed for more than 30 years and insists on a political approach to disaster mitigation and prevention that prioritizes multi-mandate approaches (Sen 1981, Cuny, 1983, Blaikie et al 1994). Central to this approach to disasters and famine has been the recognition of political root causes that drive hazard and shape vulnerability. Natural disaster theories of practice are therefore strongly grounded in developmental strategies of political and social change.

Armed conflict is now also seen as a development problem that requires multi-mandate programming, particularly in the dominant aid theory of fragile states. Since the 1990s, armed conflict has been modelled as a process that creates deviation or backwardness from a liberal developmental trajectory. A political approach to the root causes or “drivers” of conflict has become dominant in aid theory in the last 20 years. This requires a multi-sectoral response to conflict from simultaneous political, social, economic and humanitarian interventions to ensure the necessary transformations to create liberal peace (DFID, 2010). In other words, donor policy has taken a political, multi-mandate, multi-sectoral and developmental approach to the problem of armed conflict in the same way as it has to famine and disasters.

Many political economists and social theorists go further to argue that armed conflict is development. They show how most conflicts manifest a struggle over economic resources, resistance against marginalization or a direct contest between western liberalism and alternative local or Islamist politics (Keen 2008, 2012 Cramer 2007, Berdal and Malone 2000). Political entrepreneurs in armed groups and strong governments are seen to lead innovative processes of violent economic and social change through which non-liberal development is shaped. The same theorists then regard western aid as one of several ways to counter non-liberal development. Aid becomes a predatory political way of securing liberal interests around the world (Duffield, 2001, 2007, Matthei 2010). Humanitarian and development aid is, therefore, a key strategy in western conflict management in which development projects and good (liberal) governance can be politically decisive.

The explicit recognition of war as development *process* is one of the reasons why western nations have decided to engage in it so directly and so developmentally – both militarily and through a new “science” of conflict management, post-conflict reconstruction and state-building. In geo-strategic parts of the world, western powers are explicit in their desire to control the developmental drivers of war and disaster to produce the liberal development outcomes that suit them best, and to which they are ethically committed.

This new paradigm of conflict as development, or as opportunity for liberal development, naturally politicizes agencies with ethical goals and methodologies that work beyond humanitarian aid to develop political society and public goods. Their ethical and technical affinity with western liberalism means many multi-mandate NGOs naturally become the agency of choice for western liberal power. The close political fit between liberal governments and liberal NGOs has led to two fundamental questions for multi-mandate NGOs:

1. How much do NGOs share the liberal ethics of western donor governments around the *ends* and *means* of a just society?
2. How far can multi-mandate NGOs legitimately and practically distance themselves from liberal donor governments when these governments are a party to the wars in which liberal NGOs are adopting a humanitarian role?

The struggle to answer these two questions in practice on the ground in different countries has been at the root of most international NGO and academic anxiety in recent UN, NATO and Coalition wars in Afghanistan, Somalia, Iraq and Kosovo.

7. Fourth Source of Ethical Tension: The Protraction of Crisis

Protracted crisis is making multi-mandate programming increasingly common. Although situational labelling may be politically inspired, the long continuity of crisis for vulnerable populations facing recurring hunger, flood and conflict make it inevitable that UN agencies and NGOs are usually doing both emergency and development work in any given year. And vulnerable people want them to do both. In protracted crises, merging emergency and development ethics is a logical and ethical response to people's needs and becomes an agency's *de facto* role.

Relief and development differ as ideal types but, in practice, the reality of protracted crisis brings them closer together in a way that is logical, ethical and ambiguous. The force of time deepens operational values and extends moral responsibility to merge both "fields" in such a way that their separate ethics and technique gradually overlap. Quite simply, ethical demands thicken and increase the better you know people, the more you do with them and the longer you are with them.

Sheer length of time thus closes the moral gap between relief and development in many humanitarian crises. In most armed conflicts, agencies may work with the same community in the same crisis for many years. Sri Lanka, Somalia, Northern Uganda, Darfur, Zimbabwe, DRC are places where an emergency ethic has been required for decades and the term "chronic emergency" has taken root. In such settings, the ethical horizon of emergency work inevitably becomes much longer.

With these extended time commitments come extended ethical responsibilities and an organic moral move to deeper developmental values. Knowing that my agency is most likely to be here next year imposes an ethical responsibility on me to think about what is best to do this year in view of next year's demands. Knowing more and more about the conditions and needs of the people around me gives me new programming options that I would not have understood if my agency had only spent a year with them. If I know I will be working closely with these communities for the next few years, then the directive ethos of emergency work must rightly shift towards a more just form of relationship that respects their dignity and increases their autonomy. Mandate expansion is inexorable as the two single mandate agencies – ICRC and MSF – routinely find. Their hardest moral problems are usually about mandate restraint and "responsible exit" in the face of naturally expanding moral demands (MSF, 2006, Harroff-Tavel 2003).

The deepening of both horizon and relationship creates a natural ethics creep. It creates 'a fine line between the provision of life-saving assistance and the promotion of measures to avoid future crises, between emergency response and the tackling of structural inequalities—in short, between humanitarian action and development, or, in a broader sense, politics' (Donini et al. 2008, p. 7). This thickening of responsibility and obligation is

particularly significant for indigenous agencies like churches, local NGOs and Red Cross/Crescent societies who cannot leave a crisis because they are part of the society in crisis. Unlike exogenous NGOs, they do not have detached exit dilemmas but only entrenched staying dilemmas. These are usually resolved by taking on more not less.

The advantages of a thickening of ethics between mandates (which sees their goals, values and techniques increasingly merge over time) are obvious for communities and agencies. For the community concerned, a greater merger means a more total engagement with all aspects of their wellbeing and development, and an advocacy that works for justice rather than restraint alone. Likewise, a multi-mandate agency is also able to be more fully itself. As the two ethics of its mandates merge, an agency can play to its full strengths and satisfy all constituents in its organization.

But if this merging of humanitarian and development ethics is logical, ethical and advantageous, it is also politically dangerous because the deepening of agency-community commitments can look like a clear breach of humanitarian neutrality. To warring parties, agencies can seem to be getting closer to strategic communities or enemy populations and doing more for them. This seems like taking sides or conferring military or economic advantage.

7. Fifth Source of Ethical Tension: Neutrality

Most agencies delivering humanitarian aid are multi-mandate. Most tensions in multi-mandates are reported in armed conflict, particularly from NATO's counter-insurgency in Afghanistan. These tensions hinge around neutrality and political co-option of humanitarian and development by warring parties. This becomes more acute when multi-mandate agencies and warring parties share certain liberal political ethics.

The literature is unanimous that the most intense humanitarian/development multi-mandate tensions emerge in armed conflicts or in "mixed emergencies", like the Pakistan floods, that see natural disasters occurring in the same place as an armed conflict. This is because disasters are less politically contested arenas of action than war.

Neutrality and impartiality are the main points of tension in law and in practice. Article 23 of the Fourth Geneva Convention states clearly that aid can be withheld if there is evidence that through this aid "a definite military advantage may accrue to the military efforts or economy of the enemy". Alongside this, Common Article 3 that relates specifically to non-international armed conflict states that "an impartial humanitarian body, such as the International Committee of the Red Cross, may offer its services to the Parties to the conflict." Both these laws refer directly or implicitly to the principle of aid impartiality and neutrality that are also essentially affirmed in Articles 2 and 3 of the NGO Code of Conduct. This soft law Code is intended for use in natural disasters but its influence has extended as a *de facto* ethical guide in armed conflict too.

The humanitarian principle behind the law on neutrality is that while aid can help and develop the capacity of individual civilians in conflict, it cannot help and develop the capacity of the parties to the conflict. In most conflicts, development tends to be biased towards state power and to work through statist structures and ministries (Macrae and Harmer, 2004, p13). Neutrality is thus a very difficult balance to strike especially when conflicting parties are usually determined that aid should develop their capacity. Typically, warring parties are interested in aid neutrality for their enemy but not for themselves. Current NATO counter-insurgency aid strategy is a classic example of this. Aid being mediated

through NATO controlled areas in Afghanistan is regarded as legitimate but aid going via the Taliban is not and is subject to tight counter-terrorist legislation. The same dynamic was also evident in Somalia where neither Al Shabaab nor Western powers could accept that aid would be applied neutrally by their respective enemies in the mixed emergency of 2011. This resulted in the restriction of food aid by both sides, with devastating results (Slim, 2012).

The developmental approach to war lacks agreement in practice because of these risks of political side taking. Armed conflicts are violently contested arenas in which new aid resources, improved infrastructure and popular support can be decisive, and so are fiercely fought over.⁴ Development investments are politically desirable after disaster but are politically suspect as ideologically and militarily “transformative” in armed conflict. This is particularly true in armed conflicts that are fought as insurgencies and counter-insurgencies (COIN) where winning the hearts and minds (WHAM) of a contested population becomes the main purpose in conflict. Donini’s (2008, p31) conclusion sums up the problem: “the incorporation of humanitarian action into the political and world-ordering agendas of key donors and the UN Security Council entails growing costs, both in terms of principle and practice.”

Not surprisingly, most literature around ethical problems in multi-mandate operations has emerged from discussion of the moral problems of operating a multi-mandate in Iraq, Afghanistan, Somalia and Pakistan – particularly when UN agency or NGO operations are largely financed by one party to the conflict. So-called belligerent donors have explicitly identified both humanitarian and development aid as decisive instruments of COIN and WHAM (Donini, 2012). Humanitarian agencies find ethical problems around relief/development multi-mandate operations particularly salient in these aid contexts that are dominated by belligerent donor policies of stabilisation and integrated missions that are primarily designed to pacify, stabilize and liberalize a contested state. Many of these ethical problems became embodied and symbolized around NATO countries’ Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs).

Conflicts subjected to a policy of stabilization that strategically integrates humanitarian, security, development, human rights and state-building strategies are seen as especially problematic but vary by context. A good deal of analysis on stabilisation reports tensions between the pursuit of humanitarian, development and security objectives (Bailey 2011; Gordon 2010; Menkhaus 2010). But analysis of different stabilisation experiences indicates that the success of stabilisation, and its impact on humanitarian action and principles, varies across different contexts. The way stabilisation activities are perceived by humanitarian agencies and the level of agency involvement in stabilization activities are context specific. Resented in Afghanistan, stabilization was more accepted in Haiti.

Stabilisation in Haiti, though much criticised, was successful in reducing violence and increasing certain measures of stability (Muggah 2010). Some humanitarian actors felt that military actors had insufficient understanding of humanitarian mandates and principles, and some resented having different agendas (humanitarian, development, and security) collapsed or forcibly integrated. Nonetheless, stabilisation was broadly accepted by the humanitarian community. Mixed-mandate agencies cooperated more visibly with military and police elements than the ICRC and MSF. Mixed-mandate agencies relied more on military actors for their own security, and stabilisation activities were seen to have expanded agency space through the use of force. Even ICRC staff hinted at common objectives and suggested

⁴ This is also true in disasters where politicians’ use disaster response to vie for popularity or re-election. But the principle of development remains constant in such contest.

that stabilisation activities had extended rather than shrunk agency space. Haiti can be categorized as a “lesser situation of violence”, and the absence of conventional warfare made close civil-military cooperation more feasible than elsewhere (Muggah 2010, p. 458).

In counter-insurgencies, stabilisation has been seen to have more controversial impacts on humanitarian action. Where stabilisation is aimed at regime change or is employed as a COIN strategy, humanitarian actors have found cooperation with political and military elements under a stabilisation framework particularly problematic. In contexts such as Afghanistan, Iraq and Somalia, humanitarian agency perspectives on stabilisation initiatives are more mixed and often more critical (Donini, 2012).

But NATO counter-insurgencies are not the only ones to have created ethical problems for multi-mandate agencies. Insurgencies and counter-insurgencies in Mozambique, Sri Lanka, Northern Uganda, Sudan and Ethiopia’s Ogaden region have posed problems. In each of these conflicts, humanitarian agencies have been planned into (or out of) insurgency and counter-insurgency strategy so that their relief and development resources can be used to win hearts and minds (Afghanistan), or consolidate a new demographic *status quo* that has been militarily achieved (Darfur and Sri Lanka). Agencies in Syria are already reporting similar ethical tensions from being locked into government or rebel structures and strategy. Mali’s armed conflict will produce similar moral conflicts and co-option risks.

Literature reports that UN and NGO multi-mandate aid operations are therefore manipulated or “instrumentalized” (Donini, 2012). This is done by restrictions based on interpretations of IHL or by accelerated programmes of development inspired by COIN strategy that aims for “quick wins” and high WHAM impact. NGOs and humanitarian academics report a kind of systemic coercion that sees NATO political strategy and donor funds from NATO governments shaping a development policy environment that is deliberately using NGO resources for political and military advantage.

Most value clashes inside agencies tend to occur over means rather than ends, method more than goals. Friction usually arises over which “mode of action” an agency should be in at a given time. For example, tension may rise when an agency wants to move from an advocacy of restraint to an advocacy of change. Is it wise to be naming and shaming people suspected of violating human rights (denunciation) when we still need access to help very vulnerable communities? The case of support to the ICC in Darfur is an exemplar of this tension. Alternatively, developmental colleagues may be urging humanitarian staff to shift from a substitution model of service provision to an empowerment model of enablement and self-help. Or vice versa, humanitarian colleagues may urge development teams that the time for community development is over and people urgently need more top-down substitution to survive.

Ethical tension also arises in situations in which it is hard to read the way in which aid plays into local politics and conflict. Impact ambiguity arises from a problem of knowledge in which the political consequences of aid are veiled and uncertain. NGOs engaged in humanitarian and developmental programming are conscious that their presence, resources and projects can have an impact on the conflict. As yet, the literature does not make clear whether humanitarian or multi-mandate aid is more likely to support a warring party more effectively.

In other situations, ambiguity arises because of a close similarity between NGO and counter-insurgency ethics. NGOs can experience understandable moral confusion because they share many of the same liberal development goals as western counter-insurgency. While their humanitarian ethic seeks to be neutral and impartial, their ethic of

development and justice agrees strongly with COIN attempts to liberalize societies. The most obvious example is in the area of women's rights and girls' education in Afghanistan. The principle of gender equality and equal access to public goods is a deeply cherished goal of development and social justice for most dual-mandate NGOs. As such, they have significant moral overlap with liberal counter-insurgency. They share ethical ends, if not means (Slim, 2004). For NGOs in these situations, "living their values" can look like, and probably is, taking sides in the conflict.

Literature is unclear about the security implications of being multi-mandate as opposed to singularly humanitarian in approach. The recent increase in violence against aid workers has arisen mainly in places where liberal counter-insurgency is confronting Islamist insurgency. In these contexts, there is evidence that 49% of the targeting of aid workers was for political reasons in 2008. But while it is clear that agency staff were targeted, initial comparisons did not suggest that faith-based or multi-mandate organizations were being marked out as particularly threatening compared to single mandate agencies (Stoddard et al 2009, p4/5). A later study in Afghanistan in 2011, presents similar findings saying that NGO security is determined by the protective measures they take more than by their mandates, noting also that projects best accepted by armed opposition groups (AOG) are those which address the distinct needs of the community and are agreed with them, regardless of agency mandate (Valente 2011). This may suggest a security advantage for multi-mandate agencies that can be responsive to a wider variety of community felt needs.

The political labelling of conflict situations creates operational ambiguity in which donor funding lines prioritize development and give strategic advantage to multi-mandate organizations. Situations that still involve significant armed conflict have been labelled "post-conflict" like Afghanistan (Donini, 2012) "early recovery" like Darfur (Young, 2012) or "post-emergency" like South Sudan (Poole and Primrose, 2010). These labels indicate political intention more than they do the reality on the ground but mean that agencies are required to frame their projects as developmental not humanitarian programming, even when they are working with communities in an acute emergency situation.

9. Agency Policy

A quick literature review of publicly available agency documents reveals relatively little explicit mention of these tensions or of how agencies handle them. The major exception being in debates around humanitarian action in Afghanistan, where tensions are frequently mentioned. But generally, there seems to be very little NGO and UN policy material devoted to the problem. This lack of material makes it difficult to gauge how agencies are solving multi-mandate problems.

Some agencies are more explicit than others in their reasons for incorporating multiple strands into their mandate but most have not addressed the problem publicly. Save the Children make explicit justifications for a dual humanitarian-development mandate (Bookstein 2007, p. 149; Save the Children 2010, p. 11). Oxfam is explicitly concerned with human rights, poverty, unequal power relations and justice – and committed to a joined up approach to humanitarian action, campaigning and long-term development. World Vision aims to transform communities, respond to disasters and advocate for global change. UNICEF has a development pillar and a humanitarian pillar and a specific mandate for the protection of children's rights (as defined in the UNCRC).

Most agencies note important “complementarities” their multi-mandate offers that enable them to relate more quickly, fully and realistically to people’s total needs. As seen above, in protracted emergencies agencies can expand to meet a wider range of longer-term needs. The pre-positioning of an NGO doing development in a country where war or disaster strikes is viewed as a strategic advantage and makes for a faster and more informed humanitarian actor. This may be particularly applicable in the case of a sudden onset disaster (e.g. an earthquake or a flood) that can result in a high number of casualties requiring urgent treatment in a very short space of time. For example, World Vision International was already working in Haiti when the earthquake struck in January 2010 (Irwin and Sattler 2011). By contrast, MSF has prioritised natural disasters since its inception in 1970 and quickly recognised that if medical assistance was not up and running within the first forty-eight hours, victims trapped under rubble and those who had sustained multiple trauma would not survive (Brauman and Vidal 2011, p. 220). Despite efforts to build rapid response capacity, it was not until the earthquake in Pakistan in 2005 that MSF operated on casualties for the first time.

Humanitarian assistance can also be used as a vanguard project that helps gain acceptance from communities and armed actors that then enables more political justice programming. For example, in the Nariño region of Colombia, Oxfam’s territorial rights programme was built up slowly by gaining acceptance from communities and armed actors from its humanitarian position. Oxfam used tangible entry points such as food security, the provision of water filters, and public health awareness as wedge projects to open up land rights programme (Oxfam GB Programme Policy Team 2011).

Single mandate agencies speak out routinely to emphasise their specific humanitarian mandate. ICRC and MSF deliberately and explicitly maintain much narrower humanitarian mandates. MSF’s defines itself as an ‘international, independent, medical humanitarian organisation that delivers emergency aid to people affected by armed conflict, epidemics, healthcare exclusion and natural or man-made disasters’.

MSF takes the view that in a context such as Afghanistan, humanitarian aid and development assistance are incompatible but Save does not (Hofman and Delaunay 2010). While acknowledging that development projects may compromise humanitarian principles, Save the Children believes that mixed mandate agencies have a role to play both in the provision of emergency assistance in Afghanistan, and in helping the existing government to build capacity (Save the Children 2010, p. 11).

Some academics suggest that multi-mandates and humanitarian pluralism are not wise, and that humanitarian action is better pursued in single-mandate agencies. Political co-option of development interventions during the War on Terror led some to argue for humanitarian purism and a rigid distinction of mandates (Rieff 2002). Others taking a similar view have also argued that single mandates would increase bureaucratic and operational efficiency across the UN and NGO system (Weiss, 1999, 2012).

It is hard to know if tensions in Afghanistan are exceptional or if multi-mandate friction in other settings is under-reported. Mandate tensions may be underreported for two reasons. First, evaluations are not tasked to pose and answer mandate questions and challenges. Second, given the need to generate funding to maintain programming, agencies may be reticent to admit to problems, particularly if this might suggest stopping some activities.

Oxfam and Save do make general statements about potential tensions and offer some suggestions as to how to overcome them. Oxfam anticipates tensions above all in fragile and conflict-affected contexts, where ‘there is a balancing act to be achieved between a

long-term development agenda, reconstruction, and more immediate humanitarian needs' (Oxfam GB Programme Policy Team 2011, p. 4). Specific tensions are not discussed, and neither are means to manage, leverage or avoid those tensions. But it is noted that tensions between different strands of programming need "active management", and emphasis is given to detailed contextual and risk analysis.

Save the Children suggests development work may compromise humanitarian principles in some (unspecified) circumstances. In particular, they site the ability of a mixed-mandate agency to provide humanitarian assistance impartially based on assessed need. This is similar to the concerns identified by MSF. However, rather than advocate for strict adherence to humanitarian principles at the cost of taking action in pursuit of other objectives, Save opts for a more nuanced situational approach. Where these tensions arise, 'NGOs must make hard choices that require delicate judgement about what actions are in the best interests of beneficiaries' (Save the Children 2010, p. 11). Decision-making should be based on humanitarian principles (Save the Children 2010, p. 31), but it is not clear that decisions should always prioritise humanitarian principles over other priorities for an agency that has an ethical trump in the "best interests of the child".

World Vision agrees with Oxfam and Save on the need for good analysis of context, needs, potential threats to humanitarian principles, and likely outcomes of different courses of action. The HISS-CAM tool (Clements and Thompson 2009), originally designed to assist staff in determining appropriate levels of interaction with armed actors in 'exceptional' circumstances, is also deemed useful in making decisions about ethical dilemmas more generally. The tool encourages systematic analysis and balancing of principles and pragmatism, emphasising humanitarian principles and a 'do no harm' methodology. But it does allow for potential diversion from humanitarian principle: 'Within the context of development work, which is underpinned by long-term considerations that aim to assist communities to overcome poverty and injustice, any compromise of these principles clearly requires the highest level of justification and a consideration of mitigating options' (Clements and Thompson 2009, p. 26).

Humanitarian principles might be expected to provide policy and operational clarity in multi-mandate tensions at field level but, in practice, principles seem more manipulated than respected. There is very little hard empirical data on the application and impact of humanitarian principles. Most analysis of humanitarian principles is perceptions-based from interviews with aid recipients, agency staff and donors (NRC 2012, Donini 2008). This reports that humanitarian principles are rhetorically espoused by donors and affirmed by European public opinion. In practice, however, donor aid flows are not impartial and needs-based but gravitate instead to big geo-political conflicts and counter-insurgency support where they are subsumed into "integrated" multi-mandate WHAM strategies. Agencies seem to use principles tactically - mainly to bolster access and acceptance negotiations at community level. They seldom confront donors directly with a principled stand. With the exception of MSF, there are no major reports of agencies refusing to apply for donor funding because they deem it un-principled. It is also possible that only ICRC has the international mandate, status and capability to stick rigorously to the principle of neutrality (Terry, 2011).

10. Comparable Ethical Tensions in other Professions

Multi-mandate agencies are not alone in pursuing a range of ethical goals in a single organization. Politics is the quintessential multi-mandate profession, and recent

developmental policies of “stabilization” illustrate liberal politics in action the field of armed conflict. This section also looks briefly at human rights organizations, public health, policing and nursing. All of these professions offer analogies in which organizations balance emergency and development goals in a single organization.

Politics orders or reconciles a range of different values and interests that may often conflict. Values like liberty, equality, competition, privacy, justice, individualism, welfare, freedom and authority need to be constantly negotiated in liberal politics. Many political theorists think these values are incomparable and that, like apples and oranges, it is impossible to weigh their respective values equally against one another. For example, “judgements about the level of surveillance appropriate to concerns about terrorist attack involve considerations of security, liberty, community, individual welfare, tolerance and justice. There is no single right way of making these values fit together into a response.” (Philp, 2010). There is an intricate literature in political philosophy about the challenges of ranking, choosing and deciding between incomparable goods (Stanford, 2013). As a result of its multiple goals, politics is widely understood as an arena of conflict resolution that is characterised by incommensurable goals, and played out from constrained positions that determine (and limit) what politicians can actually achieve at any one moment. In this respect, multi-mandate NGOs and their range of humanitarian and development choices are highly comparable to the political profession.

Human rights agencies routinely face values clashes in their own practice. Most relevant are dilemmas relating to values conflicts between human rights norms and local cultural norms, and tensions between particular modes of action and cooperation with local organisations (Bell and Carens 2004). For example, promoting gay and lesbian rights in Nigeria is in tension with local norms. Rather than emphasising these issues (and potentially damaging ongoing work on other rights), one option is to tolerate, without respecting, negative views on the more controversial human rights, and to combine this with longer term, educational activities that aim to increase acceptance of controversial norms over time so they then become ripe for public campaigning. The danger of such a sequential approach to rights is that it sends a message that gay and lesbian rights (or other controversial rights) can be sacrificed for the pursuit of mainstream rights.

Human rights tactics (modes of action) can also operate in tension with one another and create now/later ethical tensions in human rights agencies. Work on certain locally taboo rights, like sexual orientation, is often postponed or pursued discreetly because it can disrupt activism on wider rights. Certain human rights tactics, notably shaming, can insult national identity and inhibit positive cooperation with local organisations. Human rights agencies tend to respond contextually by trying to understand ‘the conditions under which “shaming” facilitates progress and those under which it impedes cooperation with Southern NGOs’ (Bell and Carens 2004, p. 315). These tensions are analogous with multi-mandate values clashes. They suggest that where there are multiple means to a given end, careful situational analysis is required to understand the conditions under which particular means to one goal facilitate or impede the achievement of other goals.

Public health routinely faces a classic conflict between individual and collective rights in resource allocations and clinical practice. Ethical tension often arises in choices between distributing health resources to maintain the health of the general population, or respecting the rights and autonomy of particular individuals who require expensive treatment (Barrett et al. 2008; Baum et al. 2009). This utilitarian choice is analogous to situations in which the pursuit of humanitarian goals is deemed incompatible with the pursuit of broader social justice, development or human rights goals – forcing a choice between the individual and the greater good. Public health never entirely resolves this tension but lives with it,

deploying the judgement of professionals to “call it” in most cases. Individual practitioners often make the decision in particular cases without reference to a specific ethical framework or code, and draw instead on informal sources such as their own professional experience and consultation with colleagues and other experts (Baum et al. 2009, p. 372). Properly balancing individual rights against the greater good requires evidence as to what the benefits and burdens of a particular course of action will be – in particular for the wider population. Such evidence is often unavailable or poor quality. In general, Brauman favours a bias towards individual care because wider epidemiological calculations are uncertain and argues that the choice to sacrifice the individual to the greater good is not the medical practitioner’s decision. He suggests it is a decision that should be made by the relevant communities rather than scientific experts (Brauman 2001). This idea has broader implications beyond health care, and points to potential community involvement in making decisions as to how to resolve the tensions identified between different strands of mixed mandates.

Public health also faces a problem about how explicitly political and developmental it should become in its approach. Social status is known to be a major determinant of health outcomes, but it is unclear whether the field of public health should therefore extend to push for political measures to decrease social inequality. The medical model focuses on clinical risk factors, risk behaviour or, more generally, proximate causes of health disparities and outcomes, but does not address the structural inequalities and social justice issues that drive disparities in health outcomes (Iton 2008, p. 337). In practice, the medical model has tended to win out over the public health model (at least in the US) both in terms of privileging individual autonomy over populations, and in terms of limiting the scope of public health interventions. But tensions between the two have persisted throughout the twentieth century and beyond (Brandt and Gardner 2000; Iton 2008). This “root causes” choice is very similar to choices that governments and multi-mandate agencies make about the allocation of resources to humanitarian or development goods.

Forensic medicine is another area of health characterised by multiple goals that may be in tension with one another in a similar way to humanitarian neutrality. In violent cases, medics collect and analyse medical evidence for use in the legal system, but they are also responsible to provide impartial medical care to victims and perpetrators of crime. Responses to sexual assault often involve multiple objectives and multiple actors. Within sexual assault response teams, conflicts are sometimes observed between victim advocacy, healthcare provision and law enforcement (Logan et al. 2007, p. 76). In these teams, successful outcomes are best ensured by clearly defined and differentiated roles for all team members, including a clear distinction between patient advocacy and victim advocacy (Logan et al. 2007, p. 77). The role of victim advocate may put the individual at odds with other members of the team on particular issues – because their role includes intervening where they witness inadequate or insensitive responses from different service providers. (Logan et al. 2007, p. 77). This is analogous to conflicts between humanitarian care of suspected perpetrators, their victims and the passing of human rights information to legal authorities, like the ICC. It may suggest that clearly differentiated roles in a single agency or between several agencies are best, and that dividing rather than combining mandates is ethically more efficient.

Policing experiences tensions between emergency and developmental approaches to crime, and routinely experiences policy dilemmas. There is a strategic tension between a policing focused on law enforcement, and community policing focused on crime prevention through community engagement and citizen participation (Nicholl 1999). This compares well to the relief-development tension in humanitarian ethics. Policing dilemmas include decisions about resource allocation between the two approaches, but also involve means-ends dilemmas around conflicting objectives and methods. For example, preferential allocation of

resources to the widespread application of *zero tolerance* enforcement tactics take away resources to develop community partnerships or interagency cooperation to tackle the causes of crime. (Nicholl 1999, p. 32). In addition, the harsh methods of enforcing zero tolerance may well undermine the relationships, trust and softer methods for preventing crime. Thus the means of a short-term emergency strategy can undermine the means and ends of a longer-term developmental strategy. Information sharing, trust, mutual respect and agreed plans are seen as the best way to ensure that these two different policing goals are met alongside one another, rather than undermining one another. (Nicholl 1999, p. 35).

11. Conclusion

Ethical tensions within mixed humanitarian and development mandates are not new. They are also pervasive because multi-mandate agencies make up the majority of aid agencies in armed conflict. But in today's armed conflicts these ethical tensions are often rendered more extreme by the fact that expansionist political liberalism dominates today's development orthodoxy, and is contested as a main cause of liberal-Islamist conflicts. In other words, contemporary wars are actually about different views of development, just as they were during the Cold War. This means that operating a liberal development mandate, like most multi-mandate agencies, can play right into the dynamic of a conflict.

Alongside this geo-political tension, more classical problems of neutrality, protraction and relief/development ethics continue to put strain on humanitarian policy and practice. Managing these tensions requires constant and prudential judgement along the following lines.

1. Gauge which ethical tensions are classical tensions between emergency and development ethics that can be resolved technically, or more politically charged tensions in a conflict over liberal development.
2. Use humanitarian principles and the Code of Conduct much more explicitly to communicate limited humanitarian ethical goals and to gain acceptance for them in conflicts that clash over development itself. In doing so, ground agency actions in International Humanitarian Law. Use IHL, human rights law and religious ethics to negotiate over hard issues like girls' education, vaccination and gender balanced staffing.
3. Take less money from the parties to a conflict if belligerent funding is leading to instrumentalization or damaging perceptions, and build alternative sources of independent funding.
4. Carry out more field research in specific localities to understand how parties in the conflict and local communities view the ethics and value of a multi-mandate approach, as compared to a NIIHA approach.
5. Engage more deeply and explicitly with ICRC on the value, risks and complementarity of multi-mandate and NIIHA strategies.
6. Develop clear policies around the ethics, value and risk of multi-mandate strategies in armed conflict, and communicate these clearly to staff, donors, warring parties and affected communities.

Bibliography

- Bailey, S. 2011. Humanitarian action, early recovery and stabilisation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. *HPG Working Paper*. London: Humanitarian Policy Group.
- Barrett, D. H. et al. 2008. Strengthening public health ethics at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *Journal of Public Health Management and Practice* 14(4).
- Baum, N. M. et al. 2009. Ethical issues in public health practice in Michigan. *American Journal of Public Health* 99(2), pp. 369-374.
- Bell, D. and Carens, J. H. 2004. The ethical dilemmas of international human rights and humanitarian NGOs: reflections on a dialogue between practitioners and theorists. *Human Rights Quarterly* 26(2), pp. 300-329.
- Berdal, M and D. Malone, 2000, Greed and Grievance: Economic Agendas in Civil Wars, Lynne Rienner, Boulder.
- Bookstein, A. 2007. The need for principled, dynamic humanitarianism. In: MSF ed. *Humanitarian stakes: MSF Switzerland's review on humanitarian stakes and practices*. Geneva: Médecins Sans Frontières Switzerland, pp. 144-151.
- Brandt, A. M. and Gardner, M. 2000. Antagonism and accommodation: interpreting the relationship between public health and medicine in the United States during the 20th century *American Journal of Public Health* 90(5), pp. 707-715.
- Brauman, R. 2001. Questioning health and human rights. *Human Rights Dialogue* 2(6).
- British Red Cross, ICRC and Lebanese Red Cross, 2012, Principles in Action in Lebanon, British Red Cross, London.
- Clark, H. 2012, Conflict and Development – A UNDP Perspective, Address at University of Oxford, February, podcast at www.elac.ox.ac.uk
- Clements, A. and Thompson, E. 2009. Making the tough calls: decision-making in complex humanitarian environments *Humanitarian Exchange* 44, pp. 24-26.
- Collinson, S. et al. 2010. States of fragility: stabilisation and its implications for humanitarian action. *HPG Working Paper*. London: Humanitarian Policy Group.
- Cotterell, L. 2005. Approaches to Human Rights in Humanitarian Action, Humanitarian Policy Group at <http://www.odi.org.uk/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/4345.pdf>
- Cramer, C, 2006, Civil War is not a Stupid Thing: Accounting for Violence in Developing Countries, Hurst, London.
- Darcy, J. 2004. Human rights and humanitarian action: a review of the issues. *A background paper prepared for the workshop on Human Rights and Humanitarian Action convened by the IASC Sub-Working Group and co-hosted by UNICEF, the UN High Commission for Human Rights and ICVA*. London: Overseas Development Institute.
- de Waal, A. 1994. *Humanitarianism unbound? Current dilemmas facing multi-mandate relief operations in political emergencies*. London: African Rights.

Development Initiatives 2007. Earmarking and visibility in humanitarian assistance (draft report). Development Initiatives.

DFID, 2010. Building Peaceful States, DFID, London.

DFID, 2011. Saving Lives, Preventing Suffering and Building Resilience: The UK Government's Humanitarian Policy, DFID, London.

DFID. 2012. Promoting Innovation and Evidence-Based Approaches to Resilience and Responding to Humanitarian Crises: A DFID Strategy Paper, DFID, London.

Donini, A. et al. 2008. Humanitarian agenda 2015: the state of the humanitarian enterprise (final report). Medford, MA: Feinstein International Center.

Donini, A. 2012. The Golden Fleece: Manipulation and Independence in Humanitarian Action, Kumarian, New York and London.

Duffield, M. 2001. Global Governance and the New Wars: The Merging of Security and Development, Zed, London.

Duffield, M. 2007. Development, Security and Unending War, Polity, Cambridge.

European Commission, 2012. The EU Approach to Resilience: Learning from Food Security Crises, European Commission, Brussels.

Gordon, S. 2010. The United Kingdom's stabilisation model and Afghanistan: the impact on humanitarian actors. *Disasters* 34, pp. S368-S387.

Gubbels, P. 2012. Ending the Everyday Emergency: Resilience and Children in the Sahel, Save the Children and World Vision, London and Milton Keynes.

Harroff-Tavel, M. 2003. Do Wars Ever End? The Work of the ICRC When the Guns Fall Silent, *International Review of the Red Cross*, Vol 85 (851), ICRC, Geneva.

Hofman, M. and Delaunay, S. 2010. Afghanistan: a return to humanitarian action.

ICRC, 2009. Protection Standards, Geneva.

Irwin, B. and Sattler, M. 2011. Two years on: Haiti earthquake response. World Vision International.

Iton, A. B. 2008. The ethics of the medical model in addressing the root causes of health disparities in local public health practice *Journal of Public Health Management Practice* 14(4), pp. 335-339.

Keen, D. 2008. *Complex emergencies*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Keen, D 2012, *Useful Enemies: When Waging War is More Useful than Winning Them*, Yale University Press.

Leader, N. 2000. *The politics of principle: the principles of humanitarian action in practice*. London: Overseas Development Institute.

Logan, T. K. et al. 2007. Sexual assault nurse examiner program characteristics, barriers, and lessons learned. *Journal of Forensic Nursing* 3(1), pp. 24-34.

Macrae, J. and Harmer, A. 2004. Beyond the continuum: an overview of the changing role of aid policy in protracted crises. In: Harmer, A. and Macrae, J. eds. *Beyond the continuum: an*

overview of the changing role of aid policy in protracted crises. London: Humanitarian Policy Group, pp. 1-13.

Macrae, J. and Leader, N. 2001. Apples, pears and porridge: the origins and impact of the search for 'coherence' between humanitarian and political responses to chronic political emergencies. *Disasters* 25(4), pp. 290-307.

Mattei, U. 2010, Emergency-Based Predatory Capitalism: The Rule of Law, Alternative Dispute Resolution and Development, in Fassin, D and Pandolfi, M. *Contemporary States of Emergency: The Politics of Military and Humanitarian Emergencies*, MIT Press, Boston.

Maxwell, S and M. Buchanan-Smith. 1994. *IDS Bulletin Vol 24 (4), Linking Relief and Development*, Institute of Development Studies, Sussex.

Menkhaus, K. 2010. Stabilisation and humanitarian access in a collapsed state: the Somali case. *Disasters* 34, pp. S320-S341.

Muggah, R. 2010. The effects of stabilisation on humanitarian action in Haiti. *Disasters* 34, pp. S444-S463.

MSF, La Mancha report....

Nicholl, C. G. 1999. *Community policing, community justice, and restorative justice: exploring the links for a balanced approach to public safety*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services

NRC, 2012. *Tools for the Job: Supporting Principled Humanitarian Action*, NRC, Oslo.

Oxfam GB Programme Policy Team 2011. *Programming in fragile and conflict-affected countries: programme policy guidelines*. Oxford: Oxfam GB.

Poole, L. and Primrose, J. 2010. *Southern Sudan: Funding according to need*. Wells: Development Initiatives.

Rieff, D. 2002. *A bed for the night: humanitarianism in crisis*. London: Vintage.

Save the Children 2010. *At a crossroads: humanitarianism for the next decade*. London: Save the Children UK.

Sen, A. 1981. *Poverty and famines: an essay on entitlement and deprivation*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Slim, H. 1997. Relief agencies and moral standing in war: principles of humanity, neutrality, impartiality and solidarity. *Development in Practice* 7(4), pp. 342-352

Slim, H. 2000. Dissolving the difference between humanitarianism and development: the mixing of a rights-based solution. *Development in Practice* 10(3-4), pp. 491-494.

Slim, H. 2004. *With or Against: Humanitarian Agencies and Coalition Counter-Insurgency*, Hd Centre, Geneva.

Slim, H. 2009, *The Grammar of Aid, Introduction to Collaboration in Crises: Lessons in Community Participation from Oxfam International's Tsunami Research*, Oxfam International, Oxford.

Slim, H. 2012. *Synthesis Report: IASC Real-Time Evaluation of the Humanitarian Response to the Horn of Africa Drought Crisis in Somalia, Ethiopia and Kenya*, IASC, New York.

Slim, H and A. Bonwick. 2005. Protection: An ALNAP Guide for Humanitarian Agencies, ODI, London.

Stoddard, A. et al. 2009. Providing aid in insecure environments: 2009 update. *HPG Policy Brief 34*. London: Humanitarian Policy Group.

Stoddard, A. et al. 2006. *Providing aid in insecure environments: trends in policy and operations*. London: Humanitarian Policy Group, Overseas Development Institute.

Terry, F. 2002. *Condemned to repeat? The paradox of humanitarian action*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Terry, F. 2011. The International Committee of the Red Cross in Afghanistan: Reasserting the Neutrality of Humanitarian Action, *International Review of the Red Cross*, Vol 93, Number 881, Geneva.

Thompson, E. 2008. Principled pragmatism: NGO engagement with armed actors. Monrovia, CA: World Vision International.

UNICEF, 2011. UNICEF Humanitarian Action for Children: Building Resilience, UNICEF, New York.

UNOCHA, 2011a To Stay and Deliver: Good Practice for Humanitarian Actors in Complex Security Environments.

UNOCHA, 2011b. Reference Guide: Normative Developments on the Coordination of Humanitarian Assistance in the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council since GA Resolution 46/182.

Weiss, T. G. 1999. Principles, politics, and humanitarian action. *Ethics and International Affairs*, pp. 1-22.

Weiss, T.G, 2012, Humanitarian Business, Polity, Cambridge.

Young, H. 2012, Antonio Donini, The Golden Fleece: Manipulation and Independence in Humanitarian Action, Kumarian, New York and London.