Humanitarian Diplomacy at the United Nations

Salla Turunen

Thesis for the degree of Philosophiae Doctor (PhD)
University of Bergen, Norway
2022

UNIVERSITY OF BERGEN

Humanitarian Diplomacy at the United Nations

Salla Turunen

Thesis for the degree of Philosophiae Doctor (PhD)
at the University of Bergen

Date of defense: 09.08.2022

Year: 2022

Title: Humanitarian Diplomacy at the United Nations

Name: Salla Turunen

Print: Skipnes Kommunikasjon / University of Bergen

Scientific Environment

Salla Turunen is Doctoral Researcher and PhD Candidate both at Chr. Michelsen Institute (CMI) and the Department of Comparative Politics at the Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Bergen.

Submitted to the Department of Comparative Politics at the Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Bergen, this PhD research is conducted in collaboration with Chr. Michelsen Institute (CMI) and the Department of Comparative Politics at the University of Bergen.

This PhD dissertation is part of the research project 'Humanitarian Diplomacy: Assessing Policies, Practices and Impact of New Forms of Humanitarian Action and Foreign Policy' funded by the Research Council of Norway (project number 286859) and led by Antonio De Lauri at CMI.

CMI CHR. MICHELSEN INSTITUTE

UNIVERSITAS BERGENSIS

To my parents, vanhemmilleni

Acknowledgements

Perhaps going against the commonly held beliefs of what doing a PhD entails, I have not seen this as a project of blood, sweat, and tears. On the contrary, I have felt gratitude and privilege to pursue this PhD, calling it ‘a love child of mine’. Whereas this piece of research, as any, is intended to increase human knowledge on a given topic, it has also enabled intellectual wanderings and cognitive growth that would otherwise have been out of reach. However, I have not undertaken this journey alone. On the contrary, there is an overwhelming number of people and institutions that should be included at this stage of expressing thanks.

I am the first person from both sides of my family to receive doctoral level education and complete a PhD. To see this dream come true is not only a personal and professional achievement, but also a generational experience. Therefore, I want to begin these acknowledgements by expressing my gratitude for my family. It takes a great deal of love, faith, and imagination to support a family member on an unknown path. This is a skill that my family members have mastered over the years, beginning long before I embarked on this PhD journey.

I would not be here in a position of writing these acknowledgments without two people in particular, my PhD advisers. Antonio De Lauri, you are responsible for bringing me to Norway and opening up this opportunity for me. For this I am grateful, in addition to the close collaboration we have had over the past years. Your entrepreneuriship, open-mindedness, and drive to move efficiently onward have been inspirational and influential in addition to your intellectual contributions. Siri Gloppen, your years of leadership experience as well as your academic, and just as importantly, your social intelligence have given me solid guidance and insight whenever it has been needed. Furthermore, this research would have not been the same without its research participants, current and former practitioners of the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. I want to thank you for your curiosity, time, and contributions in exploring humanitarian diplomacy together with me.

I also express my thanks to Chr. Michelsen Institute (CMI) and the University of Bergen for the fruitful and functioning organizational platforms that have enabled me to complete this degree smoothly. Having been able to stay at CMI has meant that I have had more than an employer – I have had a community. From my previous academic path that preceded this moment, I want to send my thanks to Mikael Sundström, the Director of Studies of my Graduate School at Lund University (LU), as well as LU's Department of Gender Studies, and particularly the former Head of Department, Sara Goodman. Both the Department and Graduate School with their staff, interdisciplinarity, and internationality provided me an academic home that has been highly influential in shaping the professional that I am today.

Then there is a list of people and groups that I also wish to express my gratitude towards in completing this PhD. Matthew Gichohi, you have been a friend beyond comparison during this period in my life – the world would be a much better place if everyone was lucky enough to have as insightful and reliable a friend as you. My fellow doctoral researchers both at CMI and universities near and far – particularly Anna Gopsill, Robert Forster (and equally as importantly Rachel and Johannes Forster), Siril Kobbeltvedt Herseth, Lisa-Marie Måseidvåg Selvik, Jana Birke Belschner, Pauline Lemaire, Marianne Tøraasen, and others: heartfelt thanks for sharing this journey with me. Amaranta Thompson, thank you for sending me the call for this position back in 2018, and Rahel Weldeab Sebhatu, thanks for our exchanges along the way – it was among the three of us that I knew PhDs would be the path forward for us all. I wish all of you still on this journey the best of luck, and please remember that I am always only a call, email, or message away.

This PhD has entailed a number of collaborations and group memberships that I have been privileged to have. I express my thanks to CMI's Humanitarianism and Migration, Gender and Rights, and Early Career research groups for continuous and helpful engagements, as well as to the Development and Democracy group and Solstrand seminars, both hosted by the Department of Comparative Politics. Thank you Pernille Jørgensen for astonishing illustrations for some of my published pieces. In addition to my PhD advisers, thank you Cornelius Wright Cappelen, Michael Eugene

Alvarez, and Elin Skaar for your contributions in the finalization process of this dissertation. For timely and reliable copy-editing collaboration, thanks to Elizabeth Stone and others at Bourchier. A warm thanks also to all the guests that we have been delighted to have at the Humanitarian Diplomacy podcast on Spotify, as well as to our various collaborations with the Centre of Competence on Humanitarian Negotiation (CCHN, a joint initiative of World Food Programme, UNHCR, International Committee of the Red Cross, Humanitarian Dialogue and Médecins Sans Frontières).

Finally, an important support system worthy of acknowledgement is a vast one – I am, and this dissertation is, a product of Nordic welfare states. Free and high-quality education systems with a range of qualified educational professionals have privileged me with opportunities beyond the wildest imagination for the majority of people inhabiting this planet. From primary school to bachelor's degree, I have received my education in Finland. I continued to obtain my master's degree in Sweden, and am now completing a doctoral education in Norway. It cannot be stressed enough what value this type of educational and human philosophy of equal opportunities these welfare systems create and enable.

10 January 2022, Bergen, Norway

Salla Turunen

Table of Included Articles

Article Number	Title	Publishing Stage	Research Question	Design and Data Collection
1.	*Humanitarian Diplomatic Practices*	**Published** in the *Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, Brill, 15 (4) (2020), 459–487[1]	How can humanitarian diplomacy be conceptualized through its practices, and what kind of characteristics do these practices have?	Theory and conceptual building/ desk study
2.	*The Principled Pragmatists: Humanitarian Diplomatic Practices at the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)*	**Under review** in *Journal of Humanitarian Affairs*, Manchester University Press	What kind of practices of humanitarian diplomacy do practitioners of OCHA engage in?	Exploratory case study/in-depth interviews
3.	*'Have You Been Recruited Because You Are a Woman or Because You Are Good?' Gendered Humanitarian Diplomats at the United Nations*	**Accepted for publication** in *Diplomatica*, Brill, 5 (1) (2023)[2]	What kind of limitations and possibilities does gender create for the UN's humanitarian diplomats?	Empirical analysis/in-depth interviews

[1] The published paper is reprinted with permission from The Hague Journal of Diplomacy, Brill. All rights reserved. Full article reference: S. Turunen. 'Humanitarian Diplomatic Practices'. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy* 15 (4) (2020), 459–487, doi:10.1163/1871191X-BJA10008.

[2] The paper is under publishing processes and reprinted with permission from *Diplomatica*, Brill. All rights reserved.

Abstract

This dissertation discusses humanitarian diplomacy at the United Nations (UN). Humanitarian diplomacy, a diplomatic engagement practised by humanitarian actors, represents a modality of diplomacy that is not restricted to state-relegated, Westphalian diplomacy. With an expansion of diplomatic space, actors, and professions in line with developments of, for example, globalization, multilateralism, and technology, practices of diplomacy have migrated to a vast variety of social spheres. Humanitarianism represents one of these, albeit diplomatic practices of negotiation, representation, and compromise, among others, have long existed in the field and only recently labelled as 'humanitarian diplomacy'.

Whereas definitions for humanitarian diplomacy remain far-ranging and actor-dependent, the meaning of the term used in this dissertation is as follows: humanitarian diplomacy entails forms of negotiation, persuasion, and strategizing, among other diplomatic practices, which aim to advance access to and aid delivery of resources and protection for vulnerable populations worst affected by crises, conflicts, and emergencies. It is practised by humanitarian actors who seek to represent, influence, and advocate for a humanitarian polity in a non-humanitarian world against other, non-humanitarian polities, and such humanitarian representation can be considered a cornerstone of humanitarian diplomacy.

This PhD dissertation is located in the discipline of international relations (IR). It is motivated by the exploration of humanitarian diplomacy as a new and illustrative concept that allows novel directions of analysis to examine the current status of international affairs. As such, coining the term captures a potential for questioning and reshaping the conceptual categories of humanitarianism and diplomacy. By merging two different semantic fields together as one, humanitarian diplomacy questions the boundaries of who constitutes diplomatic actors, in which spaces does both humanitarianism and diplomacy take place, and with what kind of acts. By broadening this scope of analysis, humanitarians can be seen as agents that actively shape national

and international politics, dynamics, and relationships. This dissertation explores this agency by seeking to address the following research question: how do humanitarian practitioners engage in humanitarian diplomacy?

Taking an institutional focus on the UN, the organization represents both a diplomatic body and humanitarian actor. However, the UN has been under-researched in terms of humanitarian diplomacy. Whereas scholarly works exist both for diplomacy conducted at and by the UN, and the UN humanitarian interventions, inspecting the UN through the concept of humanitarian diplomacy remains at tentative stages. In contributing to this lacuna of knowledge, this dissertation argues that humanitarian diplomacy at the UN can be illustratively understood as principled pragmatism. The UN humanitarians continuously seek balances between humanitarian principles of neutrality, impartiality, independence, and humanity, and operational realities and restrictions on the ground that impact humanitarian action. From high-level humanitarian decision-making to frontline humanitarian negotiations, the UN humanitarians are forced to come up with practical solutions in reaching vulnerable populations worst affected by crises, conflicts, and emergencies.

The theoretical framework guiding this scientific inquiry draws from practice theory. Reasons for this theoretical choice include its suitability to studies of traditional and non-traditional forms of diplomacy, the contemporary disciplinary interest given ‘practice turn’ in IR scholarship, and the practitioner focus of this dissertation. Further, humanitarian diplomacy translates into harvesting support for humanitarian interventions, whether that support is political, economic, social, and/or logistical, among others. In these processes of gaining such support, humanitarian diplomacy can be reified through certain sets of practices, that include, inter alia, collaboration between different humanitarian actors and stakeholders, and relationship-building in public and political partnerships. Practices, therefore, represent a central concept of this dissertation, understood as socially meaningful patterns of action by international actors – humanitarian practitioners.

This dissertation is a prospective thesis by publication, meaning that it is intended and created as an article-based PhD project. It includes an introductory part for the dissertation ('kappe' in Norwegian), and three qualitative research articles. Whereas these articles can be treated and read independently, these pieces of research thematically intertwine to form a self-standing piece on humanitarian diplomacy at the UN. Article one, 'Humanitarian Diplomatic Practices' published in *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, discusses how humanitarian diplomacy can be reified, understood, and analysed at the level of its practices. It also presents an analytical framework of humanitarian diplomatic practices through five basic characteristics: 'why' humanitarian diplomatic practices take place; 'what' they mean; 'who' they include; 'where' they occur; and 'how' they are done. In article two, 'The Principled Pragmatists: Humanitarian Diplomatic Practices at the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)' under review in *Journal of Humanitarian Affairs*, the analytical framework of the first article is applied empirically into an exploratory case study of OCHA. Article two illustrates how OCHA's humanitarian diplomacy can be seen as a case of 'principled pragmatism', referring to a merge between humanitarian ideals and operational/pragmatic realities of humanitarian action. This second article also begins a targeted discussion of humanitarian diplomacy taking place at one of the leading, yet currently under-discussed, humanitarian diplomatic actors, the UN. Lastly, article three, '"Have You Been Recruited Because You Are a Woman or Because You Are Good?" Gendered Humanitarian Diplomats at the United Nations' accepted for publication in *Diplomatica*, offers a first research intervention of gender analysis to humanitarian diplomacy with an explicit focus on humanitarian diplomats. This study reveals a discrepancy between the UN's global leadership in gender equality and its struggles to achieve such a mission internally. Furthermore, the article discusses that gender inequality among humanitarian practitioners hampers the aim of gender equal humanitarian action.

Methodologically this dissertation employs both a desk study approach and empirical data collection. Article one represents a desk study for conceptual building for which empirical data was not collected, rather, it draws from current existing research on humanitarian diplomacy and practice theory. Then, articles two and three

draw from research interviews. The author conducted nineteen interviews with current and former OCHA staff members. Whereas these interviews are limited in number, they represent one of the largest samplings in studying humanitarian diplomacy, and the interviewees' work experience with OCHA spans 30 different countries. These interviews were semi-structured, and all but one of the research interviews have been treated as anonymous throughout the study. These interviews provide rare research insights into humanitarian diplomacy, as the existing research in the field collects, displays, and quotes interview data to a limited extent.

Prior to the inclusion of these three research articles, the introductory part ('kappe') of this dissertation is organized as follows: Section one defines and frames the three key concepts used in this dissertation, those of humanitarianism, diplomacy, and humanitarian diplomacy. Section two illustrates how the three research articles included contribute to answering the main research question of this dissertation, and provides an overview discussion of the articles more in detail. Section two also includes a conversation on researcher positionality as a central factor guiding this research and its interests. Section three situates the conducted research within the axes of disciplinary location in IR, philosophy of science, theoretical framework, and the inclusion of gender perspective in studying humanitarian diplomacy. Section four serves as a literature review, capturing the current state of the art in the field of related studies. Section five sheds light on the research design used in this dissertation in terms of case selection, data collection, and ethical considerations, while section six concludes the introduction with a focus on the main findings and suggestions for future research.

The main findings include a phenomenological argument that humanitarian diplomacy can be seen as its own, independent form of diplomatic engagement with ideologies, characteristics, and practices that sets it distinctively apart from other forms of diplomacy (article one). In exploring the empirical context of the UN, the dissertation provides *an* understanding of humanitarian diplomacy, without an attempt to exhaust all forms of humanitarian diplomacy, inside and outside of the UN. The approach captured in this dissertation finds that humanitarian practitioners – guided by

humanitarian principles – gain grounds for pragmatic compromise, practical dealings, and access to political spheres through diplomatic engagement (article two). The inclusion of gender in the analysis of humanitarian diplomats at the UN showcases how gender as a social attribute defines opportunities and limitations for practitioners, underlining a masculine premise of humanitarian diplomacy and female exceptionality, which fit into the institutional, gendered context of the UN (article three).

In addition to the main findings, this dissertation contributes to an emerging scholarly field on humanitarian diplomacy in five ways: 1) Conceptualization of humanitarian diplomatic practices; 2) Theoretical expansion of practice theory to include humanitarian diplomacy; 3) Introduction of gender analysis to the field; 4) A novel case study selection and focus on the UN and OCHA; and 5) Showcasing data collection on humanitarian diplomacy with humanitarian practitioners. In addition to research contribution, the dissertation seeks to cater for practitioner-audiences in making sense of their own humanitarian diplomatic engagement. This includes notions of how humanitarian diplomacy manifests in the world, what kind of engagement it entails, and what potential its institutionalization could offer.

Keywords

gender – humanitarian diplomacy – humanitarian practitioners –
international relations (IR) – interviews – practice theory – the United Nations (UN)
– the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)

Contents

Scientific Environment ..... **i**

Acknowledgements ..... **v**

Table of Included Articles ..... **ix**

Abstract ..... **xi**

Abbreviations ..... **xxiii**

1. Introduction: Humanitarianism + Diplomacy = Humanitarian Diplomacy **1**

1.1 Humanitarianism 5

1.2 Diplomacy 10

1.3 Humanitarian Diplomacy 12

2. Answering the Research Question: Overview of the Research Articles **21**

2.1 Article One: 'Humanitarian Diplomatic Practices' 22

2.2 Article Two: 'The Principled Pragmatists: Humanitarian Diplomatic Practices at the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)' 26

2.3 Article Three: "Have You Been Recruited Because You Are a Woman or Because You Are Good?" Gendered Humanitarian Diplomats at the United Nations 28

2.4 Positionality: Practitioner-Turned-Researcher Approach 30

3. Situating the Research **36**

3.1 Disciplinary Location: International Relations 37

3.2 Philosophy of Science: A Constructivist Interpretation 41

3.3 Theoretical Framework: Practice Theory 45

3.4 Inclusion of Gender 57

4. State of the Art – Humanitarian Diplomacy and Humanitarianism as Diplomacy 71

4.1 Humanitarianism as Diplomacy – State Perspectives 72

4.2 Humanitarian Diplomacy – Art of Humanitarian Organizations and Institutions 77

5. Research Design 83

5.1 Case Study Selection: The UN and OCHA 84

5.2 Opportunities and Limitations: Reflections on Data Collection and Methodology 91

5.3 Ethical Considerations 100

6. Main Findings and Suggestions for Future Research 103

6.1 Looking Ahead 108

References 115

Appendix 139

Email Invitation to Research Participants 139

Consent Form for Research Participation 141

Interview Guide 147

List of Other Publications Authored/Created During the PhD 151

Article One: 'Humanitarian Diplomatic Practices' 157

Abstract 158

1 Introduction 159

2 Defining Humanitarian Diplomacy 165

3 Humanitarian Diplomatic Practices 171

3.1 'Why': Practices Are Embodied Performances That Express Preferences or Beliefs while Representing an Institution or Discourse 175

3.2 'What': Practices Are Socially Recognised as Competent through Standards and Meaning, and Practices Can Be Done Correctly or Incorrectly ... 176
3.3 'Who': Practices Embody, Enact and Reify Background Knowledge and Are Intersubjective in Nature ... 179
3.4 'Where': Practices Are Patterned with Iteration in Socially Organised Contexts ... 180
3.5 'How': Practices Have Two Simultaneous Dimensions: Material and Discursive ... 182
4 Conclusion ... 184
References ... 187

Article Two: 'The Principled Pragmatists: Humanitarian Diplomatic Practices at the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)' ... 197

Abstract ... 198
1 Introduction ... 199
1.1. Methodological Note ... 202
2 Humanitarian Diplomatic Practices at OCHA ... 205
2.1 'Why': OCHA's Humanitarian Diplomatic Practices Stem from Humanitarian Principles, Yet Face Pragmatism in Operational Implementation ... 205
2.2 'What': OCHA's Humanitarian Diplomatic Practices Are a Part of Humanitarian Action, and Enable Humanitarian Negotiation and Mediation ... 209
2.3 'Who': OCHA's Humanitarian Diplomatic Practices Include Official and Non-Official Actors ... 212
2.4 'Where': OCHA's Humanitarian Diplomatic Practices Occur across the Organisational Levels ... 215
2.5 'How': OCHA's Humanitarian Diplomatic Practices Advance Humanitarian Aims by Diplomatic Means ... 217
3 Conclusion ... 220
References ... 222

Article Three: '"Have You Been Recruited Because You Are a Woman or Because You Are Good?" Gendered Humanitarian Diplomats at the United Nations' ... 229

Abstract ... 230
1 Introduction ... 231
1.1 Methodological Note ... 236

2 From Outward to Inward:
Gendered Humanitarian Diplomats at the United Nations 239
2.1 A Divided Staff: A Qualitative Questioning of the Quantitative 244
2.2 Operational Humanitarian Diplomacy 249
3 Conclusion 255
References 257

Abbreviations

AECID	The Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation (‘La Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo’)
ASEAN	The Association of Southeast Asian Nations
CARE	CARE (Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere) International
CCHN	The Centre of Competence on Humanitarian Negotiation
CMI	Chr. Michelsen Institute
EC	The European Commission
ECHO	The Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations, formerly known as the European Community Humanitarian Aid Office
EEA	The European Economic Area
EIGE	The European Institute for Gender Equality
EU	The European Union
FAO	The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
HUMDIPLO	Research project ‘Humanitarian Diplomacy: Assessing Policies, Practices and Impact of New Forms of Humanitarian Action and Foreign Policy’
HWN	Humanitarian Women’s Network

ICRC	The International Committee of the Red Cross
IFRC	The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
IHL	International Humanitarian Law
ILO	The International Labour Organization (The United Nations)
IR	International Relations
MSF	Médecins Sans Frontières
NESH	The National Committee for Research Ethics in the Social Sciences and the Humanities (‘Den Nasjonale Forskningsetiske Komité for Samfunnsvitenskap og Humaniora’)
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NSD	The Norwegian Centre for Research Data (‘Norsk Senter for Forskningsdata’)
RCN	The Research Council of Norway (‘Forskningsrådet’)
UAE	The United Arab Emirates
UN	The United Nations
UN CEB	The United Nations System Chief Executives Board for Coordination
UN DHA	The UN Department of Humanitarian Affairs
UNDP	The United Nations Development Programme
UN DPA	The United Nations Department of Political Affairs
UNDRO	The Office of the UN Disaster Relief Coordinator

UNFPA	The United Nations Population Fund
UNGA	The United Nations General Assembly
UN GLOBE	Collective of current and former UN staff members “fighting for the equality and non-discrimination of gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, and intersex staff in the UN system and its peacekeeping operations”
UNHCR	The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	The United Nations Children's Fund
UNIHP	The United Nations Intellectual History Project
UN OCHA	The United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
UNSC	The United Nations Security Council
UNSCR	The United Nations Security Council Resolution
UN Women	The United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women
USG	Under-Secretary-General of the United Nations
WFP	The World Food Programme (The United Nations)
WHO	The World Health Organization (The United Nations)

Out beyond ideas
of wrongdoing and rightdoing,
there is a field.
I'll meet you there.

– Jalāl ad-Dīn Mohammad Rūmī, 13th century

1. Introduction: Humanitarianism + Diplomacy = Humanitarian Diplomacy

This PhD dissertation is about a new, anti-Westphalian approach to conceptualizing diplomacy. Diplomacy has been traditionally understood as state-related activity, representative of states' national interests and relations against, or in line with other states' national interests and relations. This notion of diplomacy as state-relegated activity has been questioned increasingly in studies of diplomacy that examine the plurality of forms in which modern-day diplomatic engagement takes place. Diplomacy of today can be seen as transprofessional, meaning that diplomacy has migrated to other, non-state spheres of life as a reflection of extended and intensified global relations, networks, and interconnections.[3]

One of these realms outside the state-owned forms of diplomacy is *humanitarian diplomacy*. Humanitarians – aid practitioners – engage in diplomatic practices as they seek to represent and deliver aid to vulnerable populations affected by conflicts and disasters. These diplomatic practices include, for example, dialogue, negotiation, compromise, information gathering, and establishing and maintaining partnerships for interventions. Humanitarians engage in these practices driven by an interest in gaining access to populations in need in order to distribute resources, such as food and medicine, in form of humanitarian aid. Further, humanitarians do not operate in a political vacuum from their counterparties, and at times, these stakeholders force humanitarian practitioners to engage in traditional modes of diplomacy to achieve their humanitarian aims.[4]

Whereas humanitarians have conducted these types of practices of diplomacy, such as humanitarian negotiation, since the beginning of what can be labelled as 'humanitarianism', only recently has such engagement been increasingly referred to as

[3] C. M. Constantinou, N. Cornago and F. McConnell. 'Transprofessional Diplomacy'. *Brill Research Perspectives in Diplomacy and Foreign Policy* 1 (4) (2016), 1–66.
[4] A. Clements. *Humanitarian Negotiations with Armed Groups: The Frontlines of Diplomacy* (1st ed.) (London and New York: Routledge, 2020).

'humanitarian diplomacy'. This PhD research is motivated by the phenomenological emergence of such a label, and I study it in relation to international relations (IR) scholarship: Understanding the current state of international and national affairs entails understanding their processes and phenomena with identifiable and illustrative concepts, such as humanitarian diplomacy. Therefore, exploring what can be considered humanitarian diplomacy provides an avenue to analysing and identifying international relations from an under-discovered point of view. In other words, humanitarian diplomacy as an emerged term illustrates something about humanitarian modus operandi in a manner that has been previously either disguised or out of reach, thus inviting an unexplored analysis to current knowledge and already existing literature.

Simultaneously, the term humanitarian diplomacy ontologically questions both humanitarianism and diplomacy. As an example of the former, conceptualizing humanitarianism through diplomacy and humanitarians as diplomats – rather than proponents, supporters, advocates, or something else – shifts focus in relation to agencies and operational contexts. For example, whereas humanitarianism is often seen as field-driven action, humanitarian diplomacy suggests a broadening of locations and spaces in which humanitarianism takes place. As an example of the latter, categorizing humanitarians as diplomatic actors, and their practices as diplomatic acts, challenge ideas of who and what constitutes diplomatic actors and action.[5] It opens for a more pluralistic understanding of navigating and managing international relations, particularly in relation to conflict settings as conflicts promulgate the majority of humanitarian needs.[6]

The overarching research question posed in this PhD dissertation thus is: How do humanitarian practitioners engage in humanitarian diplomacy? I explore this question within a theoretical framework of practice theory. It is a theoretical category that is broadly developed in the social sciences, and also applied in IR scholarship.

[5] Clements, *Humanitarian Negotiations with Armed Groups*.
[6] According to the World Bank, 80 per cent of humanitarian needs are due to conflicts: *World Bank, Fragility, Conflict and Violence: Overview* (2020), https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/fragilityconflictviolence/overview.

Practice theory covers a variety of approaches that focus on exploring and explaining the social world through practices – identifiable acts, procedures, and methods of doing. Whereas diplomacy is one of the most researched areas in practice theory,[7] humanitarian diplomacy has not been previously examined with it. Consequently, I offer a new contribution to the theory building by expanding its reach to an under-explored modality of modern diplomatic engagement, humanitarian diplomacy.

This PhD dissertation is a part of a larger research project 'Humanitarian Diplomacy: Assessing Policies, Practices and Impact of New Forms of Humanitarian Action and Foreign Policy' (HUMDIPLO), funded by the Research Council of Norway (RCN), hosted at Chr. Michelsen Institute (CMI), and led by Research Professor Antonio De Lauri. The HUMDIPLO project investigates what changes humanitarian diplomacy and its overlap with foreign policy bring to the humanitarian field. In line with the rest of the HUMDIPLO research framework, this dissertation examines the dynamics in creating the humanitarian space and the politics of compromise that is necessary to access populations in need in complex emergencies.

In terms of empirical exploration, the HUMDIPLO research framework has a twofold interest in both humanitarian organizations/institutions and state actors. The selected cases for research include the International Committee of the Red Cross, the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), and 'new' global humanitarian donors of Qatar, Turkey, and the United Arab Emirates. This dissertation covers the case study of OCHA, which is the main UN coordination

[7] See, for example, D. E. Banks. 'Fields of Practice: Symbolic Binding and the Qing Defense of Sinocentric Diplomacy'. *International Studies Quarterly* 63 (3) (2019), 546–557; C. Bueger and F. Gadinger. *International Practice Theory* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018); Cornut, J. 'To be a diplomat abroad: Diplomatic practice at embassies'. *Cooperation and Conflict* 50 (3) (2015), 385–401; C. Lequesne. 'EU foreign policy through the lens of practice theory: A different approach to the European External Action Service'. *Cooperation and Conflict* 50 (3) (2015), 351–367; I. B. Neumann. 'Returning Practice to the Linguistic Turn: The case of diplomacy'. *Millennium* 31 (3) (2002), 627–651; V. Pouliot. *International Security in Practice: The Politics of NATO-Russia Diplomacy* (vol. 113) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010). Pouliot, V. *International Pecking Orders: The Politics and Practice of Multilateral Diplomacy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016); Sending, O. J., V. Pouliot and I. B. Neumann. 'The Future of Diplomacy: Changing Practices, Evolving Relationships'. *International Journal* 66 (3) (2011), 527–542. O. J. Sending, V. Pouliot and I. B. Neumann, eds. *Diplomacy and the making of world politics* (vol. 136) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015); T. Wille. 'Representation and Agency in Diplomacy: How Kosovo Came to Agree to the Rambouillet Accords'. *Journal of International Relations and Development* 22 (4) (2019), 808–831; G. Wiseman. 'Diplomatic Practices at the United Nations'. *Cooperation and Conflict* 50 (3) (2015), 316–333.

body for humanitarian action.[8] My main interest in examining OCHA as an exploratory case study is to illustrate humanitarian diplomacy taking place at the UN, a major actor in humanitarian diplomacy.[9] In particular, my exploration investigates the practitioners, practices and ideologies included in the UN humanitarian diplomacy.[10] However, and as discussed in more detail later, this dissertation provides an understanding of, first, humanitarian diplomacy at the UN, and second, more generally as a form of interaction in international affairs. I do not attempt to claim a ubiquitous conceptualization or rationalization of the phenomenon, which would be futile against the plurality of humanitarian diplomacy.

This dissertation is a prospective thesis by publication, meaning that it is intended and created as an article-based PhD project.[11] It includes an introductory part for the dissertation ('kappe' in Norwegian), and three research articles. Whereas these articles can be treated and read independently, these pieces of research thematically intertwine to a self-standing piece on humanitarian diplomacy at the UN, thus composing a whole larger than the sum of its parts.[12] I seek to showcase this bigger entity, a complete dissertation, with the combination of this introductory section and the articles themselves.

In doing so, I begin with the 'kappe', and its disposition goes as follows: First, in what remains of this section I begin by briefly defining and situating three central concepts – basic pillars – of the dissertation, which are humanitarianism, diplomacy, and humanitarian diplomacy. Second, I present an overview of the three included research articles, and how responding to their research questions contributes to answering the overall research question of the dissertation. This section is, therefore,

[8] Self-definition of OCHA's mandate: 'OCHA is the part of the United Nations Secretariat responsible for bringing together humanitarian actors to ensure a coherent response to emergencies. OCHA also ensures there is a framework within which each actor can contribute to the overall response effort.' https://www.unocha.org/about-ocha/history-ocha.
[9] W. Maley. 'Humanitarians and Diplomats: What Connections?' In M. Acuto ed., *Negotiating Relief: The Politics of Humanitarian Space* (London: C. Hurst & Co. Ltd. 2014), 201–210.
[10] For more discussion on this rationale, see subsection 5.1 Case Study Selection: The United Nations & its Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA).
[11] L. P. Nygaard and K. Solli. *Strategies for Writing a Thesis by Publication in the Social Sciences and Humanities* (London: Routledge, 2021).
[12] Ibid.

already elaborated with some of the research findings. I also discuss my positionality as practitioner-turned-researcher in this section as a central motive and influence for the overall research. Third, I showcase the bigger entity by discussing broader frames of the PhD dissertation, including disciplinary location within IR; philosophy of science with my basic, underlying ontological and epistemological assumptions for the research; theoretical framework of practice theory and the rationale for inclusion of gender analysis as a part of the research. Fourth, as a literature review, I present an argument for the current state of the art of research on humanitarian diplomacy. I claim that the field can be seen as twofold: humanitarian diplomacy and humanitarianism *as* diplomacy, in relation to humanitarian practitioners and state perspectives, respectively. Fifth, I shed light on the process of this PhD research in terms of case study selection, data collection, methodology, and ethical considerations. Sixth, and as the final part of this PhD introduction prior to the research articles, I conclude my main findings and suggest future research avenues and practitioner recommendations.

1.1 Humanitarianism

'Humanitarianism' can be broadly defined as an ideology seeking to reduce human suffering and provide life-saving support at times of conflict, emergency, and crisis. In today's world, humanitarian needs are driven by an increase in internal armed conflict, and unceasing natural and human-made emergencies. 'Humanitarian aid' refers to the distribution of resources such as food, medicine, water, and shelter, among other things, which are provided to 'humanitarian beneficiaries', the vulnerable populations that are the receivers of such aid. 'Humanitarian actors', the aid providers, represent a diverse field of actors from public sector to private sector to voluntary sector representatives, inclusive of traditional and non-traditional actors. Examples of traditional humanitarian actors include religious missionaries, the UN, and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC). Examples of non-traditional actors include private militaries and commercial companies that involve humanitarianism as a part of their activities.

Historically, as a term 'humanitarianism' is around two centuries old.[13] It can be seen synonymous with acts of compassion closely intertwined with religious, philosophical, philanthropical, and spiritual motives.[14] 'Humanitarianism', 'humanitarian' and 'humanity' etymologically derive from the Latin word 'humanus', signifying human, 'of man'. Their societal context has had strong Western roots throughout its history, and humanitarianism can also be seen as stemming from Western imperialism.[15] Humanitarianism at its beginning included secular concerns, such as an interest to mitigate human consequences of war. Yet, early humanitarianism was intertwined and supplemented by religious forces, particularly with Christian theology and affiliations to serve the human race – again, an ideology closely related to philanthropy.[16] This Western tradition with intersections to Christianity is not, however, unique in its relation to faith, as Muslim/Islamic humanitarianism, for example, showcases.[17]

Humanitarianism in its current standing represents a larger social movement and enterprise than at any other time in human history.[18] In particular, the past 60 years have marked a dramatic expansion of global humanitarianism.[19] Humanitarianism has taken a variety of shapes over the years, and what is understood as 'humanitarian' can be broadly defined, at times with contradictions. For example, so-called 'new' forms of humanitarianism can be seen instrumental towards desired outcomes, such as introducing democracy and overthrowing oppressive groups.[20] Thus, the 'new

[13] M. Barnett. *Empire of Humanity: A History of Humanitarianism* (Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press, 2011).
[14] Ibid; P. Stamatov. *The Origins of Global Humanitarianism: Religion, Empires, and Advocacy* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013).
[15] Barnett, *Empire of Humanity*.
[16] J. Paulmann. 'Conjunctures in the History of International Humanitarian Aid During the Twentieth Century'. *Humanity: An International Journal of Human Rights, Humanitarianism, and Development* 4 (2) (2013), 215–238.
[17] Yet, different religious connotations and associations seem to have differing tendencies, as Elizabeth Ferris argues, 'in effect, the differences between faith-based [humanitarian] organizations can be much greater than between faith-based and secular organizations', Ferris, E. 'Faith and Humanitarianism: It's Complicated'. *Journal of Refugee Studies* 24 (3) (2011), 621.
[18] Word choice of humanitarian *enterprise* is borrowed from Larry Minear (2002)
[19] Barnett, *Empire of Humanity*; H. Slim. *Humanitarian Ethics: A Guide to the Morality of Aid in War and Disaster*. London: C. Hurst & Co. Ltd., 2015).
[20] M. Mascarenhas. *New Humanitarianism and the Crisis of Charity: Good Intentions on the Road to Help*. Bloomington IN: Indiana University Press, 2017).

humanitarians' reject the "political naivety" of the past as "morally questionable".[21] Humanitarianism has also, for a long time, taken local forms, such as grassroots humanitarianism in which civil and citizens' aid to one another stand in contrast to institutionalized forms of humanitarianism.[22]

However, perhaps the most discussed and recognized form of humanitarianism is 'international humanitarianism', meaning the kind of humanitarian action that crosses borders and nationalities both in terms of humanitarian actors and beneficiaries, and chains of logistics, politics, and economics. International humanitarianism (hereafter 'humanitarianism' in this dissertation) is often characterized by global imbalances of power and misfortune, geographical distances between the origins of aid providers and aid receivers, and, importantly, interventionism upon others' distant suffering. This type of humanitarianism falls under an umbrella of international interventionism in which humanitarian intervention can be defined as "action by governments (or, more rarely, by organizations) to prevent or stop governments, organizations, or factions in a foreign state from violently oppressing, persecuting, or otherwise abusing the human rights of people of that state".[23]

Through an interventionist approach, politics have been a part of humanitarianism since its beginning, although humanitarianism has been traditionally presented as an ontologically recognized 'other' to politics. In other words, humanitarian intervention is an interference into domestic affairs of a sovereign state or states in forms of political, economic, and possible military interventions.[24] In comparison with other international interventions, humanitarian intervention is unique in its claim to intervene on humanitarian and human rights grounds. It is also often, but

[21] F. Fox. 'New Humanitarianism: Does it Provide a Moral Banner for the 21st Century?' *Disasters* 25 (4) (2001), 275.
[22] 'Grassroots huimanitarianism' sometimes called also as 'everyday humanitarianism', see, for example, L. A. Richey. 'Conceptualizing "Everyday Humanitarianism": Ethics, Affects, and Practices of Contemporary Global Helping'. *New Political Science* 40 (4) (2018), 625–639; A.-M. Fechter and A. Schwittay. 'Citizen Aid: Grassroots Interventions in Development and Humanitarianism'. *Third World Quarterly* 40 (10) (2019), 1769–1780.
[23] B. Simms and D. J. Trim. *Humanitarian Intervention: A History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011) 1.
[24] R. Belloni. 'The Trouble with Humanitarianism'. *Review of International Studies* 33 (3) (2007), 451–474.

not always, grounded in international law, namely the international humanitarian law (IHL), which serves as an important legitimizing tool.[25]

Humanitarianism signals global inequalities in multiple ways, such as who is positioned to be able act upon others' distant suffering. "Politics of vulnerability" prevail in humanitarian settings, in which being able to decide who is deemed as vulnerable and in humanitarian need is an act of power, hierarchy, and status.[26] Whereas humanitarianism seeks to provide aid to the most vulnerable, questions arise on how vulnerability is constructed, and what kind of social, historical, economic, and intersectional understandings influence these constructs.[27] Some other hazards of humanitarianism continue to exist in its Western hegemonic discourse and Western domination in funding, staffing, and political profile, which risks long-term adversity in the larger, non-Western parts of the world.[28]

In this political context and humanitarian political history, traditional humanitarian actors, such as the UN, the IFRC, and Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF), are often found to be defending the ethical terms and neutrality of their practice.[29] This 'classic Dunantist paradigm'[30] rooted in exceptionalism protects the apolitical impression of humanitarianism, arguing that the humanitarian is out of reach of the Westphalian state system, including its power and border politics. Indeed, in the

[25] Heinze, E. *Waging Humanitarian War: The Ethics, Law, and Politics of Humanitarian Intervention* (Albany NY: State University of New York Press, 2009).
[26] For 'poltics of vulnerability', see S. Turunen. 'Conceptualizing 'Leave No One Behind''. *CMI Working Paper* WP (2021:04) (2021), 1–10. Retrieved from Bergen, Norway https://www.cmi.no/publications/7881-conceptualizing-leave-no-one-behind.
[27] L. Chouliaraki. Mediating Vulnerability: Cosmopolitanism and the Public Sphere. *Media, Culture & Society* 35 (1) (2013), 105–112; Turunen, *Conceptualizing 'Leave No One Behind'*.
[28] M. Barnett and T. Weiss. *Humanitarianism Contested: Where Angels Fear to Tread* (vol. 51) (Abingdon: Routledge, 2011); J. O'Hagan and M. Hirono. 'Fragmentation of the International Humanitarian Order? Understanding "Cultures of Humanitarianism" in East Asia'. *Ethics & International Affairs* 28 (4) (2014), 409–424.
[29] See, for example, D. R. DeChaine. 'Humanitarian Space and the Social Imaginary: Médecins Sans Frontières/Doctors Without Borders and the Rhetoric of Global Community'. *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 26 (4) (2002), 354–369; B. A. Rieffer-Flanagan. 'Is Neutral Humanitarianism Dead? Red Cross Neutrality: Walking the Tightrope of Neutral Humanitarianism'. *Human Rights Quarterly* 31 (4) (2009), 888–915; H. Slim. 'Humanitarian Diplomacy: The ICRC's Neutral and Impartial Advocacy in Armed Conflicts'. *Ethics & International Affairs* 33 (1) (2019), 67–77.
[30] 'Classic Dunantist paradigm' after Henry Dunant, founder of the Red Cross movement; D. Hilhorst. 'Classical Humanitarianism and resilience Humanitarianism: Making Sense of Two Brands of Humanitarian Action'. *Journal of International Humanitarian Action* 3 (1) (2018), 1–12.

classical conceptualization of humanitarianism, it is guided by humanitarian principles of independence, neutrality, and impartiality while serving humanity.

However, upholding this apolitical impression of humanitarianism is becoming increasingly difficult. There are several reasons for this out of which I list three examples. First, humanitarianism is increasingly criticized for its inability to tackle the root causes of humanitarian suffering, and is seen as an unsustainable solution. Taking this argument further, at times humanitarianism is also accused of reproducing original cleavages responsible for the humanitarian needs, being embedded in the contemporary conflict and assisting in sustaining it, and having alliances in close connections to political powers, for example, through military humanitarianism.[31] Second, as mentioned earlier, there are new forms of humanitarianism which are politically sensitive and can be seen strictly instrumental toward desired outcomes.[32] This new formulation within the humanitarian regime "blurs the boundaries of "who does" and "what constitutes" humanitarian relief".[33] Third, and finally, structural dilemmas make humanitarianism inherently political.[34] These include the less frequently discussed interests of the Global North of selling a way of life through humanitarianism, which includes "a certain dose of idolatry and blind trust in its [humanitarianism's] ostensibly salvific goals", and "hierarchical perceptions of human beings".[35] This contestation of the apolitical impression, and furthermore the relations between humanitarianism and the political, brings me to the next key concept of this dissertation: diplomacy.

[31] Belloni, 'The Trouble with Humanitarianism'; K. Mills. 'Neo-humanitarianism: The Role of International Humanitarian Norms and Organizations in Contemporary Conflict'. *Global Governance* 11 (2005), 161–183; T. B. Seybolt. *Humanitarian Military Intervention: the Conditions for Success and Failure* (Stockholm: SIPRI Publication, 2007).
[32] Fox, 'New Humanitarianism'; Mascarenhas, *New Humanitarianism and the Crisis of Charity*.
[33] Ibid, 6.
[34] A. De Lauri (ed.). *The Politics of Humanitarianism: Power, Ideology and Aid* (London: I. B. Tauris 2016).
[35] De Lauri, A. 'Introduction'. In De Lauri, A. (ed.). *The Politics of Humanitarianism: Power, Ideology and Aid* (London: I. B. Tauris 2016), 1–16, 1 and 8; T. Asad. *On Suicide Bombing* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2007).

1.2 Diplomacy

'Diplomacy' can be traced to the Latin word 'diploma' (noun) and to the Modern Latin word 'diplomaticus' (adjective), both have been used to describe official documents conferring a privilege or state recommendation. Such documents have been used, for example, in travels between provinces and states. The first time that the word 'diplomatic' was knowingly used in the context of managing international relations was in the 18th century. During the 19th century, diplomacy underwent a gradual professionalization along with the emergence of modern state structure with centralized bureaucracy and the creation of foreign services.[36] Current understanding of diplomacy traces back to these original meanings – as the conduct of relationships among international actors, in which "diplomatic work is traditionally about representing a polity vis-à-vis a recognized other".[37] Ultimately, diplomacy represents an arena in which various political interests come into play, expressing both amity and enmity towards other actors' politics.

Originating from a state-practised action, diplomacy has been, historically, restricted to the prerogative states. This traditional conceptualization still has a solid footing in today's diplomatic studies. As an example, Geoff R. Berridge discusses that diplomacy's "chief purpose is to enable *states* to secure the objectives of their foreign policies without resort to force, propaganda, or law".[38] However, conceptualizing diplomacy as limited to only the Westphalian state system and related international activities is unable to capture the plurality of modern diplomacy. Louise Fréchette, first Deputy Secretary-General of the UN and a Canadian diplomat reflected on this: "diplomats no longer have the monopoly of diplomatic transactions, if they ever did".[39]

[36] Hamilton, K. and R. Langhorne. *The Practice of Diplomacy: Its Evolution, Theory, and Administration* (2nd ed.) (London: Routledge, 2011).
[37] Sending et al., 'The Future of Diplomacy' 528. See also A. F. Cooper, J. Heine, R. Thakur, A. F. Cooper, J. Heine and R. Thakur. 'Introduction: The Challenges of 21st-Century Diplomacy'. In *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy*, eds. A. F. Cooper, J. Heine and R. Thakur (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).
[38] G. R. Berridge. *Diplomacy: Theory and Practice* (5th ed.) (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), 1, emphasis added.
[39] L. Fréchette, L. 'Foreword – Diplomacy: Old Trade, New Challenges'. In *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy,* xxx–xxxv.

Diplomacy has travelled to several other fields on a global scale as a means of representation, influence, and advocacy. In today's multifaceted context, diplomacy is best understood, and as is used in this dissertation, as a representation of a polity vis-à-vis another polity/polities, in which a 'polity' can represent various causes, value systems, ideologies, endeavours, and objectives that range widely beyond state interests and actions.[40] In pursuit of identifying these changes in diplomatic practice, a new set of terms has risen in the discussion, including conceptualizations of NGO diplomacy, defence diplomacy, public diplomacy, small states diplomacy, economic diplomacy, cultural diplomacy, military diplomacy, and business diplomacy.[41] As a further illustration, in their comprehensive overview of modern diplomacy, Andrew Cooper, Jorge Heine, and Ramesh Thakur approach the current diplomatic phenomenological standing inclusive of a variety of actors (e.g., states' political actors and diplomatic missions, international organizations, civil society, and media), modes of its practice (e.g., bilateral and multilateral diplomacy, institutionalized summitry, and practices of negotiation and mediation), tools and instruments (e.g., digital technology, international law, and soft power), and various thematic/issue areas (e.g., peace and state-building, arms control, food security, health, and sports).[42]

Given this plurality of diplomacy in the 21st century, diplomacy can be seen as transprofessional.[43] This means that the diplomatic space – realms in which diplomacy is practiced – has expanded significantly. Occupations such as activists, scientists, journalists, and business consultants have an increasingly important role and agency in shaping up international affairs, may they be included in traditional diplomatic practices and services or standing outside of those.[44] The added value of a diplomat can be seen in their "ability to communicate, negotiate and persuade", all skills and practices broadly needed outside of mere state-to-state relations.[45] Relevant to this PhD

[40] Sending et al., 'The Future of Diplomacy'.
[41] J. O'Hagan. 'Australia and the Promise and the Perils of Humanitarian Diplomacy'. *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 70 (6) (2016), 657–669; Sending et al., 'The Future of Diplomacy'.
[42] J. Heine, R. Thakur and A. F. Cooper (eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).
[43] Constantinou, Cornago and McConnell, 'Transprofessional Diplomacy'.
[44] Heine, Thakur and Cooper, *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy.*
[45] Hamilton and Langhorne. *The Practice of Diplomacy*, 258.

dissertation, I expand this transprofessional approach towards diplomats and diplomatic activities to humanitarians by referring to them as 'humanitarian diplomats'.

In other contexts relevant to this dissertation, diplomacy as a mode of negotiation, mediation, and relationship-building holds a particular gravitas in crisis and conflict settings. Geoff R. Berridge writes that "if violence breaks out, diplomacy remains essential if the worst excesses are to be limited and the ground prepared against the inevitable day of exhaustion and revised ambition".[46] Whereas the author refers to a state-centric approach to diplomacy, I expand it to include non-state actors. Humanitarian actors are examples of these non-state actors, as they are heavily interested and invested in such a mission. They are among other actors concerned with the conflict dynamics, stakeholders, and outcomes, among other things, and are thus incentivized to participate and advance their aims in the midst of the questioned and/or changing power dynamics within a conflict. This, then, brings me finally to the diplomatic practice of humanitarian diplomacy, specifically.

1.3 Humanitarian Diplomacy

The main interest of this PhD dissertation is to explore a phenomenon that can be labelled as humanitarian diplomacy, for which I use a longer subsection herein to elaborate on what I mean. I define 'humanitarian diplomacy' as forms of negotiation, persuasion, and strategizing, among other diplomatic practices, that aim to advance access to and aid delivery of resources and protection for vulnerable populations that are worst affected by crises, conflicts, and emergencies. It is practised by humanitarian actors that seek to represent, influence, and advocate for a humanitarian polity in a non-humanitarian world against other non-humanitarian polities – such humanitarian representation can be considered a cornerstone of humanitarian diplomacy. More specifically, humanitarian diplomacy is part of humanitarian action. As such, humanitarians set goals such as maximizing humanitarian outreach in accessing and

[46] Berridge, *Diplomacy*, 268.

helping populations in humanitarian need. In order to do so, humanitarians engage with other stakeholders by diplomatic means, such as through dialogue, compromise, and pragmatism. This humanitarian diplomatic engagement takes place in settings and contexts where humanitarian interests are dealt with, varying from frontline/field level humanitarian interaction to high-level engagement in humanitarian policy and decision-making.[47]

Furthermore, humanitarian diplomacy is a field for *social exchange of ideas* between humanitarian principles and imperative, various stakeholders, and the perceived driving forces behind humanitarian needs.[48] To elaborate this exchange – and humanitarian diplomacy on a phenomenological level – I next give two quotes from this PhD research for illustration. In both cases, two UN staff members give examples of the kind of humanitarian diplomatic engagement that they face in their humanitarian practitioner work.

Quote 1:

Part of what we do is access negotiation. [For example,] in certain areas, internally displaced people are stranded between the warring parties, and we engage in what we call humanitarian negotiations in the frontlines. We have, luckily, been successful in some of these negotiations and have reached the people in need, in a number of cases, with a lot of support in terms of humanitarian assistance. That being said, it is very difficult because there is no trust between the warring parties. One of the successful examples that I had was from Hudaydah [in Yemen], which is one of the areas most affected by the war… We tried to establish a verbal kind of notification system with the Houthis not to target a [humanitarian equipment] convoy at certain times of the day we

[47] P. Régnier. 'The Emerging Concept of Humanitarian Diplomacy: Identification of a Community of Practice and Prospects for International Recognition'. *International Review of the Red Cross* 93 (884) (2011), 1211–1237.
[48] For definition of 'humanitarian imperative', see ICRC, *Code of Conduct for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) in Disaster Relief* (Geneva: ICRC, 1994). Retrieved from https://www.icrc.org/en/doc/resources/documents/publication/p1067.htm.

identified. It took us days – as there is no trust – to have a guy coming to pick up the convoy to guide them through the area heavily determined with mines. It took us a lot of negotiations and discussions with the warring parties, and even using the [Saudi-led] coalition assets to monitor the times to have an idea how to get the convoy to reach the people in need.

– Current OCHA staff member, male

Quote 2:

For example in Nigeria, OCHA is not able to deliver [humanitarian] assistance in areas that are controlled by non-state armed groups. In Nigeria, there are two main factions, Boko Haram and the Islamic State of West Africa. There are at least five government areas in the North-East that are not under the control of the government. As per the humanitarian imperative and humanitarian principles, OCHA is supposed to be impartial, neutral, independent, and deliver assistance to whoever needs it. However, because of the strong government in Nigeria, if we try to go to those areas, we would be accused of working with the non-state armed groups and going against counter-terrorism efforts. At the moment, there are 1.2 million people that we cannot reach that are in the areas that are called 'inaccessible' because they are not under government control. What we then have to think about is that is it worth trying to reach them and loose the access that we have to 7 million other people that we are able to give assistance to.

– Current OCHA staff member, female

These two quotes capture some of the aspects of humanitarian diplomacy in operational contexts.[49] Quote 1 highlights the practices of negotiation, dialogue, and exchanges between various stakeholders, including non-state armed groups who are active owners of the conflict which creates the humanitarian needs. It also exemplifies how humanitarians create leverage, in this case by accessing the Saudi-led coalition assets, as a diplomatic practice. Quote 2 discusses humanitarian diplomatic pragmatism in terms of government relations with the state, and humanitarians' puzzle to transform humanitarian ideals into actions. Both quotes allude to compromise, quote 1 in terms of stakeholders that are being collaborated with, the warring parties and the Saudi-led coalition, and quote 2 in terms of maintaining a greater geographical access compared to trying to enter highly politicized areas that remain currently 'inaccessible'. As showcased in both quotes, humanitarians require support in terms of key stakeholder relations – or at least, non-resistance – in navigating the complexities of their operational environment. This support translates into terms of political will, economic backing, and logistical access, for example, and the relationship-building and maintenance sits at a core of the diplomatic tradition. In other words, the art of convening such partnerships and support is also an inherent part of humanitarian diplomacy.

While these types of characteristics and practices of humanitarian diplomacy can travel across contexts and actors, the concept remains "under-defined".[50] The most widely used definition for humanitarian diplomacy arises from the IFRC. It suggests that humanitarian diplomacy is about "persuading decision makers and opinion leaders to act, at all times, in the interests of vulnerable people, and with full respect for

[49] These two quotes are included for their elaborative potential. However, humanitarian diplomacy occurs in multiple ways in various of contexts, also outside immediate operational ones. Within the UN context, and as an example of a global construct of humanitarian diplomacy including high policy and decision-making levels, one of the enablers of humanitarian action and access in Syrian conflict is the UN Security Council. Access in North-West Syria pends authorization by the Council for cross-border aid delivery into Syria by UN agencies, for example, through Bab al-Hawa border crossing. At the time of the writing, this access can be seen as a result of successful high-level humanitarian diplomacy in influencing the Security Council, and it has been renewed on an annual basis, latest through UN Security Council Resolutions UNSCR 2585 (in 2021) and updated resolution of UNSCR 2533 (in 2020).

[50] D. Fiott. 'Humanitarian Diplomacy'. In G. Martel (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Diplomacy* (Online: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., 2018), 4.

fundamental humanitarian principles".[51] Whereas this definition has potential to migrate outside the Red Cross movement, in the case of IFRC, the organization also uses humanitarian diplomacy, for example, in promoting its organizational activities and strengthening resource mobilization, which may or may not be applicable to other actors.[52]

Against this example, humanitarian diplomacy should be understood in plurality. A common trait in engaging with the term is to tailor humanitarian diplomacy for the actor's strategic premises, context, and operational procedures. However, less is known of these specific engagements among multiple humanitarian diplomatic actors. A notable example of an under-explored actor is the main focus of this dissertation: the UN. The UN has provided no clear definition for humanitarian diplomacy in its terminology. While inconclusive, its contextual understanding can be partially traced though its protagonists. Jan Egeland, former UN Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator, describes humanitarian diplomacy as "to a large extent, the art of facilitating the optimal relief, reaching through the best channels and actors, without delay and waste, to those in greatest need".[53] Kelly Clements, the UN Deputy High Commissioner for Refugees has referred to humanitarian diplomacy in her working context as requiring advocacy and engagement with state and non-state actors in gaining access for protection and assistance of refugees.[54] During his term as the UN Secretary-General, Ban Ki-Moon paid a particular attention to 'preventive diplomacy', which can be seen as having similar elements to humanitarian diplomacy, such as engaging through private avenues of influence and sharing the interest in conflict and disaster prevention.[55] However,

[51] IFRC, 'Humanitarian Diplomacy Policy', 2 (Geneva: IFRC, 2017). Retrieved from https://www.ifrc.org/sites/default/files/Humanitarian-Diplomacy-Policy_EN.pdf.
[52] Ibid.
[53] J. Egeland. 'Humanitarian Diplomacy'. In Cooper, Heine and Thakur (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy*, 355.
[54] Foreign Service Journal, 'Humanitarian diplomacy: An experienced practitioner addresses today's unprecedented challenges. Q&A with Kelly Clements, Deputy High Commissioner for Refugees'. *American Foreign Service Association* (April 2016). Retrieved from https://www.afsa.org/humanitarian-diplomacy.
[55] For 'preventative diplomacy', see R. Gowan. '"Less Bound to the Desk": Ban Ki-moon, the UN, and Preventive Diplomacy'. *Global Governance* 18 (4) (2012), 387–404. For more on 'private humanitarian diplomacy', see the second notion on subsection 4.2 Humanitarian Diplomacy – Art of Humanitarian Organizations and Institutions. For 'conflict and disaster prevention', see Régnier. 'The Emerging Concept of Humanitarian Diplomacy'.

Ban Ki-Moon focused on political missions, particularly the UN Department of Political Affairs (DPA), and his successor, António Guterres, has taken the concept to relate peace and security affairs.[56]

Despite these individual approaches, the organizational meaning of the term remains unchartered. This notion motivates this dissertation as I seek to showcase an actor specific exploration into the UN's organizational context, thus offering a new avenue for discovering how humanitarian diplomacy becomes evident in the world. The undefined meaning of humanitarian diplomacy for the UN stands in contrast to the centrality of the concept since the UN's beginning as a diplomatic platform and humanitarian body. Therefore, a question relevant to this PhD research is, why has the UN not coined 'humanitarian diplomacy' as an organizational term? As an overall trend in the field – and despite its increasing relevance – is that humanitarian engagement by diplomatic means has not, until recently, been labelled such. Some exceptions remain: to my current knowledge, the first time the term was coined in the context of a state was in the United States, and in the context of a humanitarian organization in MSF.[57] Despite it being relatively under-explored as a phenomenon, humanitarian diplomacy has faced an upward trend in practitioner, policy, and research interests since the millennium onwards.[58]

[56] Regarding the UN DPA, see Gowan, 'Less Bound to the Desk'. See, for example, OCHA Services, ReliefWeb (2021), 'From poverty to climate crisis, "connect the dots" among drivers of instability, Secretary-General tells Security Council debate on conflict prevention', retrieved from https://reliefweb.int/report/world/poverty-climate-crisis-connect-dots-among-drivers-instability-secretary-general-tells.

[57] In the context of a state, see O. S. Straus et al. 'Humanitarian Diplomacy of the United States'. *Proceedings of the American Society of International Law at Its Annual Meeting (1907–1917)* 6 (1912), 45–59; in the context of a humanitarian organization, see R. Moreels. 'Humanitarian Diplomacy'. In F. Kalshoven (ed.), *Assisting the Victims of Armed Conflict and Other Disasters* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1989), 43–54.

[58] See, for example, M. Altunısık. 'Turkey's Humanitarian Diplomacy: The AKP Model'. *CMI Brief*, no. 2019:08 (2019) 5. Retrieved from https://www.cmi.no/publications/6973-turkeys-humanitarian-diplomacy-the-akp-model; S. Autesserre. 'United States' "Humanitarian Diplomacy" in South Sudan'. Journal of Humanitarian Assistance (2002). Retrived from https://academiccommons.columbia.edu/doi/10.7916/D81N7Z78; S. Barakat. 'Priorities and challenges of Qatar's Humanitarian Diplomacy'. *CMI Brief* 2019:07 (2019), 1–6 (Bergen, Norway); Clements, *Humanitarian Negotiations with Armed Groups*; A. D. Cook. 'Humanitarian Diplomacy in ASEAN'. *Asian Journal of Comparative Politics* (special issue) (2021), 1–14; A. Davutoğlu. 'Turkey's Humanitarian Diplomacy: Objectives, Challenges and Prospects'. *Nationalities Papers* 41 (6) (2013), 865-870; A. De Lauri. 'Humanitarian Diplomacy: A New Research Agenda'. *CMI* (2018) (Bergen, Norway); J. Dobrowolska-Polak. 'Humanitarian Diplomacy of the European Union'. Open Europe: Cultural Dialogue Across Borders 5: New Diplomacy in Open Europe (2014), 115–126; Egeland.

Explaining this ongoing international and inter-field (practitioner, academic, and policy) momentum, this change in interest can be approached and explained in multiple ways. As researchers tend to be observers of the world around them, the academic focus can be largely demonstrated through sense-making of changes in practice and policy fields. From the practitioners/humanitarian organizations' side, one explanation lies in the institutionalization and professionalization tendencies of the humanitarian field. Modern-day humanitarianism in the 21st century is characterized by the global extent of its outreach. Since the late 1980s, the scope of humanitarianism has increased significantly, following considerable professionalization and institutionalization during the 1990s.[59] These processes have had a central focus on increased capacity and enhanced delivery, which in turn has transformed previous humanitarian volunteers and amateurs into professional staff members with appropriate education and work experiences.[60] Hugo Slim refers to this transformation as a tension, a "Weberian struggle between charisma and bureaucracy", with cultural implications:

> The tension between voluntarism and professionalism not only turns on expertise but on institutional culture. Like other human institutions evolving along the organizational life cycle from front room to boardroom, expanding

'Humanitarian Diplomacy'; Fiott. 'Humanitarian Diplomacy'; D. Gökalp. 'The UAE's Humanitarian Diplomacy: Claiming State Sovereignty, Regional Leverage and International Recognition'. *CMI Working Paper* 2020:1 (2020) (Bergen, Norway), 1–11; M. Harroff-Tavel. 'The Humanitarian Diplomacy of the International Committee of the Red Cross'. *Relations internationales* 121 (1) (2005), 73–89; Kirecci, M. A. 'Humanitarian Diplomacy in Theory and Practice'. *Perceptions* 20 (1) (2015), 1–6; P. Lin. 'China's Evolving Humanitarian Diplomacy: Evidence from China's Disaster-Related Aid to Nepal'. *Asian Journal of Comparative Politics* (2021), 1–17; Moreels, 'Humanitarian Diplomacy'; K.-K. Pease. *Human Rights and Humanitarian Diplomacy: Negotiating for Human Rights Protection and Humanitarian Access* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016); Régnier. 'The Emerging Concept of Humanitarian Diplomacy'; E. Rousseau. and A. S. Pende. 'Humanitarian Diplomacy'. In T. Balzacq, F. Charillon and F. Ramel (eds.), *Global Diplomacy: An Introduction to Theory and Practice* (Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2020) 253–266; G. Sadik and H. Zorba. 'Humanitarian Diplomacy for Syrian Refugees and Turkey-EU Relations'. *Göç Araştırmaları Dergisi* 3 (2) (2017), 10–39; B. Schweizer. '"The Spirit of Geneva": Humanitarian Diplomacy and Advocacy'. *Refugee Survey Quarterly* 26 (4) (2007), 163–165; Slim. 'Humanitarian Diplomacy'; H. Smith and L. Minear (eds.). *Humanitarian Diplomacy: Practitioners and their Craft* (The United Nations University Press, 2007); M. Veuthey. 'Humanitarian Diplomacy: Saving it when it is Most Needed'. Paper presented at the Humanitarian Space, Webster University Geneva 16th Humanitarian Conference. (Geneva: Webster University, 2012).

[59] M. Barnett, 'Humanitarianism Transformed'. *Perspectives on Politics* 3 (4) (2005), 723–740.

[60] Barnett and Weiss, *Humanitarianism Contested*.

> humanitarian agencies are increasingly characterized by managerialism, bureaucracy and institutionalization.[61]

These processes of professionalization and institutionalization of humanitarianism coincide with humanitarian diplomatic engagement. Diplomacy operates in professional and institutional cultures, some of which are applicable and of interest to humanitarian actors. Increasing visibility, engagement, and influence within these diplomatic platforms and cultures, such as political decision-making bodies like that of the UN Security Council (UNSC), require humanitarians for organized, professional engagement.

Another explanation for an upward trend in employing humanitarian diplomacy within humanitarian organizations arises from the need for better sense-making of and manoeuvering within the increased complexity and politics of the humanitarian field. These trends can also be termed 'pluralization' and 'politization' of humanitarianism. With pluralization I refer to the plethora of actions labelled as 'humanitarian' today, ranging from individual level humanitarian movements and acts of humanitarian expression to global machinery of the "humanitarian enterprise".[62] With politization, as discussed earlier, I refer to the convergence of politics and humanitarianism as traditionally deemed apolitical phenomena. These convergences are evident in the governmental, inter-governmental, and non-governmental levels, in which humanitarian interventions are seen as political acts representative of political ideologies among other political stakeholders in a given crisis or disaster setting.[63] Labelling humanitarian engagement as diplomatic offers a shift in related thinking and strategizing for better acknowledgement of the given political dimensions and plurality of actors. Similarly, Hikaru Yamashita refers to this shift as an "emerging logic of translucency" as bypassing the "logic of distinction" by emphasizing fluidity in

[61] Slim, *Humanitarian Ethics*, 12–13.
[62] L. Minear. *The Humanitarian Enterprise: Dilemmas and Discoveries* (Bloomfield CT: Kumarian Press, 2002).
[63] D. Fassin. 'Humanitarianism as a Politics of Life'. *Public Culture* 19 (3) (2007), 499–520.

distinctions between 'self' and 'other', and producing, intentionally, by crossing boundaries.[64]

For policymakers and states, engagement in humanitarianism offers avenues for advancing national interests. Much like humanitarian actors, these interests may be altruistic or instrumental, and states' humanitarian policies are often integrated and exist in parallel to foreign and security policies.[65] Some of these diplomacies converge with humanitarian world views, such as promoting IHL. At times, states' acts of humanitarianism can be seen, for example, as a way of avoiding political and conflictual spillover between states.[66] Further, and for both humanitarian organizations and states, conceptualizing their respective engagement as humanitarian diplomacy opens normative opportunities. As the modern, civilized world after the Second World War has enabled norm creation through diplomacy, humanitarianism – as an international normative agenda – offers a means of influence and advancement possibilities for both humanitarian and non-humanitarian interests.[67]

[64] H. Yamashita. 'New Humanitarianism and Changing Logics of the Political in International Relations'. *Millennium* 43 (2) (2014), 412, 420.
[65] Thus, again, rather than employing humanitarian diplomacy in the same sense as humanitarian organizations and institutions, states operate humanitarianism *as* diplomacy, O'Hagan, 'Australia and the Promise and the Perils of Humanitarian Diplomacy'. For more on this conceptualization and discussion, see section 4. State of the Art – Humanitarian Diplomacy and Humanitarianism *as* Diplomacy.
[66] Belloni, 'The Trouble with Humanitarianism'.
[67] K. Mahbubani. 'Multilateral Diplomacy'. In A. F. Cooper, J. Heine and R. Thakur (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 248–262.

2. Answering the Research Question: Overview of the Research Articles

This PhD dissertation addresses an overarching research question: How do humanitarian practitioners engage in humanitarian diplomacy? Posing this gives rise to another question: Why focus on practitioner-driven humanitarian diplomacy? I conceptualize humanitarian diplomacy as a prerogative of humanitarian organizations and institutions, for which I seek to explore how practitioners within these conduct the art and practice of humanitarian diplomacy.[68] My point of departure is that humanitarian practitioners operate in interlinear processes of crisis, suffering, and intervention, and while doing so, they showcase interdependencies on and interests to influence other actors and stakeholders in terms of achieving humanitarian aims. In navigating these, I argue that humanitarians actively practice humanitarian diplomacy – a mode of contemporary diplomacy characterized by networks and interrelationships of state and non-state actors, further, traditional and non-traditional diplomatic actors.[69]

As discussed in the previous section, whereas humanitarian diplomacy can be seen as an element of humanitarian action since its beginning, relatively little is known about it. This introduction and the three qualitative research articles comprising this dissertation address aspects of the main research question. These aspects are captured in form of three sub-research questions, which are:

Article 1: How can humanitarian diplomacy be conceptualized through its practices, and what kind of characteristics do these practices have?

[68] For more discussion on this premise, see section 4. on State of the Art.
[69] B. Hocking. 'Multistakeholder Diplomacy: Forms, Functions, and Frustrations'. In S. Slavik (ed.), *Multistakeholder Diplomacy: Challenges and Opportunities* (Malta and Geneva: DiploFoundation, 2006), 13–29; Maley, 'Humanitarians and Diplomats'; Régnier, 'The Emerging Concept of Humanitarian Diplomacy'.

Article 2: What kind of practices of humanitarian diplomacy do practitioners of OCHA engage in?

Article 3: What kind of limitations and possibilities does gender create for the UN's humanitarian diplomats?

Each sub-question is answered in a separate research article, included in this dissertation and in the abovementioned order. Read together, the three articles respond to the overarching research question by painting a picture of practitioner-driven humanitarian diplomacy, and in this section I elaborate why. To conclude this chapter, I address my research positionality, as a former UN practitioner myself, as an influential component of this study.

2.1 Article One: 'Humanitarian Diplomatic Practices'

As I am interested in the humanitarian practitioners' stance, practices can be seen as the main activities of practitioners, and thus a central category of analysis. The first article included embarks on conceptualization, presenting an effort to understand an otherwise abstract concept of humanitarian diplomacy on the more concrete level of its practices. I claim that interactions that humanitarian practitioners have with various actors in advancing humanitarian interests boil down to *humanitarian diplomatic practices*, which is the title of the first article. These practices set semantic boundaries for humanitarians' diplomatic engagement. Humanitarian diplomatic practices include, but are not limited to, dialogue, negotiation, compromise, reaching agreements, bargaining, convening, accommodating, information and intelligence gathering, and establishing and maintaining partnerships in the interest of advancing humanitarian aims.

To understand these practices more in detail, I begin my conceptual building with an identification of their characteristics. Using theoretical framework of practice

theory, I base my approach on Emanuel Adler and Vincent Pouliot's interpretation of international practices.[70] According to the authors, international practices follow an elaborate logic that can be summarized five-fold: 1) practices are performances; 2) practices tend to be patterned; 3) practices are competent in socially recognizable and meaningful ways; 4) practices rely on background knowledge; and 5) practices combine discursive and material elements.[71] Resting on these notions, I build a new analytical framework of humanitarian diplomatic practices answering the five following questions: What are these practices? Why do they occur? Who do they include/involve? Where do they take place? And, finally, how are these practices done?

Answering each of these questions correspond to what I label as characteristics of humanitarian diplomatic practices, and they abide to Adler and Pouliot's notions as follows.[72] For the question 'why', I see that humanitarian diplomatic practices are embodied performances of humanitarianism that express preferences or beliefs, stemming from, for example, humanitarian principles, while representing a humanitarian institution or discourse. Answering the question 'what', I discuss that these practices are socially recognized as competent through standards and meaning in relation to humanitarian action, and the practices can be done correctly or incorrectly, such as successfully or unsuccessfully negotiating access and ceasefires in delivery of humanitarian aid. For the question 'who', these humanitarian diplomatic practices are conducted by humanitarian diplomats, who embody, enact, and reify background knowledge – a humanitarian understanding of the world. These practices are intersubjective in nature, including all stakeholders in a given context, such as non-state armed groups. In responding to the question 'where', I claim that these practices are patterned and often similar from one humanitarian context to another, characterized by iteration in socially organized contexts where humanitarian interests are at stake. And finally, in answering 'how', humanitarian diplomatic practices have two simultaneous dimensions of materialism and discursivity, which draw from both

[70] E. Adler. and V. Pouliot. 'International Practices'. *International Theory* 3 (1) (2011), 1–36. For more detailed discussion on the theoretical framework, please see subsection 3.3.
[71] Adler and Pouliot, 'International Practices', 6–7.
[72] Adler and Pouliot, 'International Practices'. For more elaborated conversation, please see article one and its subsections 3.1–3.5.

humanitarianism and diplomacy. Examples of these include humanitarian resources in terms of logos and personnel, and meetings taking place in diplomatic spaces with appropriate customs and behaviour.

Other questions are also relevant for discussing these practices. For example, *when* they usually take place, and *whose* or *which kind of representation* they involve. However, for a meaningful inquiry given the scope of this study, I focus on the initial five questions to build a foundational framework of characteristics for further studies. By limiting the attention to these characteristics my aim is to provide a focused overview of humanitarian diplomatic practices. By being clear and precise on the focus and scope of the conceptual framework, it facilitates the empirical implementation for further scientific research.[73]

I answer the first sub-research question of this dissertation – how can humanitarian diplomacy be conceptualized through its practices, and what kind of characteristics do these practices have? – through a desk study. I undertake, primarily, conceptual building, but by doing so I subsequently engage in theory-building. Considering the latter, this first article is an original intervention in that it includes humanitarian diplomacy in the literature on practice theory. Similar to other scholars in diplomatic studies, I argue that practice theory can provide a useful social theory in explaining, analysing, and framing humanitarian diplomacy. Humanitarian diplomacy, as other non-traditional forms of diplomatic strains, can seem abstract, fuzzy, and intangible to grasp, let alone define. Practice theory, providing an analytic tool with relational, discursive, material dimensions, can thus assist in the creation of a conceptual framework for studying the concrete practices of humanitarian diplomacy.[74]

Through the establishment of the analytical framework, my main findings in this article include the following: On the one hand, I provide an ontological argument for a self-standing international relation's phenomenon that can be understood as humanitarian diplomacy. Through the conceptualization as diplomacy, humanitarian

[73] G. Van der Waldt. 'Constructing Conceptual Frameworks in Social Science Research'. *The Journal for Transdisciplinary Research in Southern Africa* 16 (1) (2020), 1–9.
[74] Adler and Pouliot, 'International Practices'.

diplomacy opens avenues for increased pragmatism and compromise, and for a potential entry to diplomatic negotiation tables to which humanitarians otherwise might lack access to. Michele Acuto and others discuss humanitarian diplomacy as extending humanitarian spaces in a manner in which diplomacy becomes a humanitarian space.[75] Humanitarian and diplomatic spaces can be seen as "dialectic", and the art of advancing humanitarian interests through diplomatic means within these spaces is, precisely, the art of humanitarian diplomacy.[76]

On the other hand, studying the characteristics of humanitarian diplomatic practices offers an understanding of what constitutes humanitarian diplomacy. These characteristics illustrate its phenomenological manifestation in relation to humanitarian ideologies, other actors and stakeholders, areas and arenas, among others. I conclude in the article that humanitarian diplomatic practices are parts of humanitarian action, and their raison d'être stem from humanitarian principles and IHL, in most cases. These practices occur on several levels of power, from frontline humanitarian negotiations to high-level diplomatic fora where humanitarian interests are at stake. Humanitarian diplomatic practices essentially combine both discursive and material elements from semantic fields of humanitarianism and diplomacy, such as humanitarian briefings with diplomats of an affected country. These findings, I argue, add value to both academics and practitioners alike – academics in developing scientific discussion and debate about humanitarian diplomacy, and practitioners in identifying their own humanitarian diplomatic engagement more clearly.

[75] In M. Acuto (ed.). *Negotiating Relief: The Politics of Humanitarian Space* (London: C. Hurst & Co. Ltd., 2014).
[76] M. Acuto. 'On "Opening" Humanitarian Diplomacy: A Dialectic Space'. In M. Acuto (ed.), *Negotiating Relief*, 259.

2.2 *Article Two: 'The Principled Pragmatists: Humanitarian Diplomatic Practices at the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)'*

Having argued in the first article that humanitarian diplomacy exists as a self-standing diplomatic category that can be reified at the level of its practices, a logical next step is to implement the established analytical framework in an empirical case study. Taking on the UN's context, and more specifically, the OCHA,[77] I explore how the UN humanitarian practitioners engage in humanitarian diplomacy. Whereas the research focus in this dissertation is not comprehensive of all types of humanitarian diplomatic manifestations occurring at the UN, it provides an understanding and illustration of the practitioner-engagement in this regard.

The second article answers the sub-research question of what kind of practices of humanitarian diplomacy practitioners of the OCHA engage in. In documenting these practices, I conducted nineteen in-depth interviews with OCHA practitioners.[78] Whereas these interviews are limited in number, they represent one of the largest samples in study of humanitarian diplomacy, and the interviewees' work experience with OCHA spans 30 different countries. This exploratory case study also represents the first its kind in relation to the UN as a humanitarian diplomatic actor.

Applying the analytical framework of humanitarian diplomatic practices to the OCHA case study reveals several issues of OCHA's, and further, the UN's, humanitarian diplomacy. In response to the 'why' question, I find that OCHA's humanitarian diplomatic practices stem from humanitarian principles, particularly that of humanity.[79] Yet, OCHA's practitioners frequently apply pragmatist approaches. Regarding the 'what' question, I suggest based on the conducted interviews that humanitarian diplomacy can be seen as part of an inverted pyramid where humanitarian action is the umbrella category under which humanitarian diplomacy falls. Other more

[77] For further discussion on the case study of the UN and OCHA, please see subsection 5.1 Case Study Selection.
[78] For further discussion on the data collection, please see subsection 5.2.
[79] More for OCHA context and conceptualization of humanitarian principles, see also OCHA. *OCHA On Message: Humanitarian Principles*. United Nations (2017), 1–2. Retrieved from https://www.unocha.org/sites/unocha/files/OOM-humanitarianprinciples_eng_28Feb2017_0.pdf.

specified activities such as humanitarian negotiation and mediation, are subcategories of humanitarian diplomacy.[80] In response to the 'who' question, I find that both official and non-official actors, such as the organization's employees at various levels, government counterparts, and non-state armed groups engage in these practices. With regard to 'where', OCHA interviewees illustrated that their humanitarian diplomatic practices occur both at field level and as policy level activities, at times connected, and at other times disconnected from one another. At the country level this diplomatic engagement is, for example, with the local communities, at the regional level among bodies such as the African Union, and at the headquarter/policy level with governments and the UN General Assembly, inter alia. Finally, in response to the 'how' question, these practices balance between apolitically perceived humanitarianism and politically perceived diplomacy. The balance applies through, for example, public and private forms of humanitarian diplomatic engagement, which may involve media exposure or discussions behind closed doors.

Overall, through this exploratory case study with empirical evidence I find that the UN's humanitarian diplomacy is a means for navigating between humanitarian ideals and operational realities through dialogue, negotiation, compromise, and pragmatism. Particularly, I argue that the UN humanitarian diplomats – practitioners – can be labelled as principled pragmatists, whose practices are a way of balancing feasibility and extensive demand for interventions to meet humanitarian needs. This principled pragmatism approach emerges from limited resources, access, and, essentially, the limits of the humanitarian mission. Humanitarian action is challenged by chronic under-resourcing in the face of overwhelming humanitarian needs, as a result of which practitioners are forced to make compromises.[81] But the limitations do not end there: Alex De Waal notes further that, whereas humanitarians are capable of

[80] For a graphic illustration, please see figure 1 of the second research article included.
[81] As a rough estimate, in 2020, prior to the Covid-19 outbreak, approximately 167.6 million people worldwide were perceived to be in humanitarian need, translating into one in every 45 people. Those who were perceived as receiving humanitarian aid numbered 108.8 million, with an estimated funding need of USD 28.8 billion. With the lack of projected funding, 58.8 million people in estimated humanitarian need were left behind as they were not included in the targeted funding to begin with. See OCHA. *Global Humanitarian Overview 2020.* United Nations (2019), 1–88. Retrieved from https://reliefweb.int/report/world/global-humanitarian-overview-2020-enarfrzh.

reducing much needless suffering through material resources and technical proficiency, their capacity will never extend to fully address victims' and survivors' rights.[82] Similarly, humanitarianism may be seen as a much more limited endeavour than what it originally set out to accomplish.[83] Principled pragmatism can be seen as an effort to reasonably accommodate these types of limitation of humanitarian action.

2.3 Article Three: '"Have You Been Recruited Because You Are a Woman or Because You Are Good?" Gendered Humanitarian Diplomats at the United Nations'

The third article of this dissertation extends the scholarly field of humanitarian diplomacy to include a gender analysis of its practitioner sphere. In line with the practitioner-focus of the overarching research question, the premise is that humanitarian diplomats as central actors of humanitarian diplomacy are a relevant category of analysis. Humanitarian diplomats represent social attributes in their professional lives, and among these – along with race, ethnicity, age, and dis/ableism, among others – is that of gender. The focus in this article on humanitarian aid providers, instead of humanitarian beneficiaries, represents a novel take. A prevalent gender narrative in humanitarianism has been that women as a social group are seen as susceptible to becoming the most marginalized and at risk in humanitarian emergencies.[84] This has translated, for example, into special protection needs and measures of women with an aim to advance gender equality in humanitarian interventions.[85] Instead of continuing this analysis with a focus on aid beneficiaries' side, in this article I turn my research gaze to the aid providers themselves as central to achieving humanitarian aims.

[82] A. De Waal. 'The Humanitarians' Tragedy: Escapable and Inescapable Cruelties'. *Disasters* 34 (2010), S130–S137.
[83] Dunn, E. C. 'The Chaos of Humanitarian Aid: Adhocracy in the Republic of Georgia'. *Humanity* 3 (1) (2012), 1–23.
[84] N. Al Gasseer et al. 'Status of Women and Infants in Complex Humanitarian Emergencies'. *Journal of Midwifery & Women's Health* 49 (4) (2004), 7–13.
[85] E. Olivius. 'Refugee Men as Perpetrators, Allies or Troublemakers? Emerging Discourses on Men and Masculinities in Humanitarian Aid'. *Women's Studies International Forum* 56 (2016), 56–65.

The sub-research question I respond to in this article is what kind of limitations and possibilities gender creates for the UN's humanitarian diplomats. Gender is a mode of discourse and a relation between groups that is defined, for example, in relation to their sexual differences, economic positions, biological constitutions, and/or ethnic and racial collectivities.[86] Humanitarian diplomacy, as any other social practice, has gendered dimensions. In studying the effect of gender in humanitarian diplomacy, I include eighteen of the nineteen interviews conducted at the OCHA.[87] Given my interest in the gendered aspect of humanitarian diplomacy and gender being a sub-inquiry of analysis within the HUMDIPLO research project within which I work, gender was from the outset included as a theme to be discussed during the research interviews.

The findings of this article highlight that humanitarian diplomats – as practitioners – are also representatives of their gender. The gender of the person affects certain operational realities and positions the individual in particular ways in relation to the institutional context. Operating within the sphere of diplomacy categorized a priori as masculine, the practices of humanitarian diplomacy in the context of the UN place men as the norm and women as the exception.[88] Given the status of the UN as a standard-setting institution for gender equality, this gendered institutional dynamic and inability to adhere to its own standards represents a notable normative shortcoming.

Given that the majority of people affected by humanitarian emergencies are women and children, and that humanitarian diplomacy takes place in a gendered world with a plurality of gendered understandings, including interactions of local and global

[86] N. Yuval-Davis. *Gender and Nation* (London: SAGE Publications, 2013).
[87] The exclusion of one interview from the overall interviewing sampling was due to lack of content as the interviewing time run out and we failed to discuss gender explicitly. This interview was the only published and non-anonymous interview with Jan Egeland, https://www.cmi.no/publications/7373-humanitarian-diplomacy-interview-with-jan-egeland.
[88] K. Aggestam and I. Svensson. 'Where are the Women in Peace Mediation?' In K. Aggestam and A. Towns (eds.), *Gendering Diplomacy and International Negotiations* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018), 149–168; Aggestam, K. and A. Towns. 'The Gender Turn in Diplomacy: a New Research Agenda'. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 21 (1) (2019), 9–28; Aggestam and A Towns, *Gendering Diplomacy and International Negotiation*; J. Cassidy (ed.). *Gender and Diplomacy* (London, New York: Routledge, 2017); H. McCarthy and J. Southern. 'Women, Gender, and Diplomacy: a Historical Survey'. In J. Cassidy (ed.), *Gender and Diplomacy* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2017), 15–31; A. Towns. and B. Niklasson. 'Gender, International Status, and Ambassador Appointments'. *Foreign Policy Analysis* 13 (3) (2017), 521–540.

gender customs and roles, women's presence as humanitarian diplomats is a prerequisite for effectively engaging with the majority of humanitarian beneficiaries.[89] Whereas OCHA interviewees highlighted that women, in general, are best positioned in reaching and talking to other women in humanitarian contexts, manhood and masculinity provided numerous advantages compared to womanhood and femininity. For example, given the gendered norms in the field, informal relationship building is more accessible to men. They also receive a gendered dividend in interacting with some key stakeholders of humanitarian diplomacy, such as non-state armed groups. Institutionally, the qualitative interviews highlighted how gender affected practices in recruitment, retention, career progression, professionalization, influence, representation, access, and operational conduct to the benefit of men and disadvantage of women. Against these gendered inequalities, I argue that the UN's humanitarian diplomatic outreach is hampered by its internal struggles for gender equality.

2.4 Positionality: Practitioner-Turned-Researcher Approach

To conclude this section, I turn to the issue of researcher positionality. Whereas notions of positionality can be discussed, for example, in relation to research design, I am raising it relatively early on as my positionality has been a fundamental component of my perspectives and interests. My own practitioner background has been influential in the way that I have laid a research emphasis on practitioners and how I have completed this dissertation. As Donna Haraway argues, research does not emerge from nowhere, and knowledge creation is an inherently situated process which does not allow room for a "god trick".[90] The point of departure where my research begins is an example of a practitioner-turned-researcher approach. Although I have not worked at OCHA, I am

[89] Gasseer et al., 'Status of Women and Infants in Complex Humanitarian Emergencies'; R. W. Connell. 'Change Among the Gatekeepers: Men, Masculinities, and Gender Equality in the Global Arena'. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 30 (3) (2005), 1801–1825.
[90] Haraway, D. 'Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective'. *Feminist Studies* 14 (3) (1988), 581.

a former UN practitioner with work experience at the organization's field, regional, and headquarter levels.

Having a background within the UN, I have encountered similar dynamics and challenges that the study of humanitarian diplomacy reveals. These include, among others, tensions between different levels of the organization, such as disparities between policy-level design and field-level operational realties, and the web of interests to be navigated in the development and humanitarian fields as a UN practitioner, compared to other governmental, non-governmental, or private sector organizations. As elaborated by one of my interviewees, this role is coloured by the unique relationship that the UN has with the governments/member states in the locations where it operates:

> *It is easier to be principled for an NGO than for the UN. The UN is somehow forced to be pragmatic to actually find an end solution to a particular problem.*
>
> – Former OCHA staff member, male

Understanding these types of institutional pressures and operational contexts, I have been able to undergo and navigate the related research differently compared to a researcher who has not worn the institutional shoes.

Given this premise, my positionality has entailed both benefits and pitfalls. Considering the former, my practitioner background has positioned me both as an 'insider' and 'outsider' within my own research.[91] It has been useful to have networks within the UN system, for example, to find interviewees for the study.[92] However, the greatest added value of my background lies in the tacit knowledge of the organizational

[91] N. Manohar, P. Liamputtong, S. Bhole and A. Arora. 'Researcher Positionality in Cross-Cultural and Sensitive Research'. In P. Liamputtong (ed.), *Handbook of Research Methods in Health Social Sciences* (Singapore: Springer, 2019), 1–15.
[92] For more discussion, see subsection 5.2 for Data Collection.

context, and familiarity with issues at a phenomenological level. For example, I speak the organizational language of the interviewees, including the jargon of UN terms and acronyms. My UN expertise in the field of gender equality, both internally within the UN system and externally in programmatic activities, was central to the article on gendered humanitarian diplomats at the UN. This article builds upon my practitioner understanding, as well as academic training in the area of gender studies, which was the main subject of my master's degree.

My hybrid subjectivity has been useful in creating trust, confidence, and dialogue between my interlocutors and myself. I would argue that despite the limited number of interviews conducted for the two empirical articles included in this dissertation, the exchanges with the interviewees are exceptional compared to what would have been possible for someone with solely research experience. My own professional resonance with some of the interviewees' experiences enabled me in seeking further elaboration at the time of the interviews, hence nourishing a high-quality data collection. This type of relationship-building is not a given, especially between academia and the humanitarian practitioner field. As narrated by one of my interviewees, in some cases there can be a certain level of scepticism towards academics and researchers among humanitarian practitioners:

> *If you read any academic or research views about the humanitarian work, it is always connected to and interrelated with politics. Especially when we talk about conflicts. It is very easy to see that in many situations the humanitarian side is politicized, and humanitarian assistance is used as a weapon directly or indirectly.*
>
> – Current OCHA staff member, male

Herein lies a profound distinction that I have had to navigate both as an 'insider' and 'outsider': the UN humanitarian practitioners and humanitarian researchers remain

divided about the politization of humanitarianism. Often, but not always, my interviewees emphasized humanitarianism as a neutral, impartial, and independent practice. At times, they illustrated through empirical examples how upholding these principles have been detrimental to their own goals – 'giving in' to 'political forces' and similar interests on the ground could have resulted in more comprehensive humanitarian outreach, beneficial from a short-term perspective, but deemed detrimental to long-term humanitarian goals. Researchers, then, often construct the contemporary academic field of humanitarian studies through political lenses, in which humanitarians represent political actors, among others. Researchers also remain inherently distant observers to the humanitarian practice, which builds on differing worldviews and interests, potentially influenced by research funding, compared to that of practitioners' everyday reality. Navigating these worldviews has been both a challenge and curiosity from which I have built my own approaches.

My positionality has also entailed downsides, particularly given my desire to create value for both scholarly discussions and practitioners themselves through my research work. As a result of the division in relation to politics, humanitarian scholars reading my research might yearn for further contributions in terms of political analysis. Humanitarian practitioners, alternatively, might find the analysis already too political, and therefore distant from the principled framework in which they seek to operate. Another potential pitfall includes that the similarities between me and my research participants; being close to the subject I study may have caused epistemological blind spots.[93] Scholars, particularly from the most critical wing who question the raison d'être of humanitarianism in general, and its international interventions in particular, might find fruitful ground for critique towards someone's research who has professionally engaged in the practice.

Victoria Reyes discusses concepts of an ethnographic toolkit and strategic positionality of the researcher, and refers to the researcher's ability to draw from the

[93] One of the ways in which I have tried to mitigate this effect has been to intentionally provide space for practitioner quotes in the last two articles of the dissertation to make the collected empirical data central and visible.

multiple intertwined identities that they represent in the conduction of their qualitative research.[94] These are both visible and invisible tools, such as ethnicity and gender as examples of the former, and social capital and researcher status as the latter.[95] Tapping into these tools exposes how conducting research is active and conscious. In the interviewing processes I have exposed my practitioner background to my interlocutors in a similar manner to how I present it in this dissertation. Depending on the circumstances beneficial to the research, I have tapped into both my practitioner and academic understandings, creating an active dialogue between them. For example, in researching humanitarian diplomacy that has not been defined or clearly established in the UN institutional context, I have drawn elements from the existing research on humanitarian diplomacy in other contexts and academic discussions, and have asked the OCHA practitioners' reflections in relation to these. In summary, my ethnographic toolkit has been built on these two identities, and I have strategically positioned myself with them in the interest of completing this study.

I conclude this subsection on positionality with a reflection of my research focus in Western tradition of humanitarianism; alas, international humanitarianism as established in subsection 1.1. In addition to resulting to certain privileges in, for example, research funding, my positionality as a white citizen and resident of two Global North countries (Finland and Norway) has affected my research interest of studying a traditional Western branch of humanitarianism. This is the branch to which I have been the most exposed, personally, professionally, and academically. Claiming this research focus, I do not intend to claim that the Western tradition is, by any means, the only branch in which humanitarian diplomacy takes place – on the contrary. Against the plethora of interpretations that the word 'humanitarianism' can be seen as representative of, the Western branch represents one of many conceptualizations, along with humanitarian diplomacies that may follow. Having said that, examining humanitarian diplomacy within the Western humanitarianism is a moving target. The Western tradition cannot be approached as a stagnant institute, but rather one

[94] V. Reyes. 'Ethnographic Toolkit: Strategic Positionality and Researchers' Visible and Invisible Tools in Field Research'. *Ethnography* 21 (2) (2020), 220–240.
[95] Ibid.

undergoing a metamorphosis. This is clear, for example, in relation to the rise of non-Western donor countries such as Brazil, China, and Saudi-Arabia.[96] Whereas these actors present opportunities for increased resources and access, they also pose potential to normative conflicts, questioning and shaping also Western tradition.[97]

[96] A. Binder and C. Meier. 'Opportunity Knocks: Why Non-Western Donors Enter Humanitarianism and How to Make the Best of it'. *International Review of the Red Cross (2005)* 93 (884) (2011), 1135–1149.
[97] Ibid.

3. Situating the Research

Whereas this PhD dissertation engages with quintessential political science particularly in relation to state perspectives, it is more specifically located as research within IR scholarship. This has been a logical home of the research given both my positionality as a researcher and the topic of research interest. Albeit familiar to the discipline to differing extends with onus on the latter, both humanitarian and diplomatic studies can be situated under the IR umbrella. They also closely relate to other neighbouring disciplines, such as sociology, historical and legal scholarships, and anthropology, as well as sub-disciplines such as peace and conflict studies, and development studies.

One of the contributions of this dissertation is that research on humanitarian diplomacy within IR is limited, despite its disciplinary suitability. One the on hand, humanitarianism builds upon moral sentiments of humanity to contemporary global politics, thus simultaneously feeding into international relations and standing in opposition to them.[98] On the other hand, and as noted by Mathew Davies, international relations theories study motives, strategies, and actions of actors.[99] Humanitarian actors are involved in processes of strategizing, weighing, and trying various tactics in seeking to provide humanitarian relief to those in need.[100] These actions are part of humanitarian diplomacy, simultaneously presenting a central and fitting interest for studies in IR. Overall, this study of humanitarian diplomacy as a conduct in international relations represents both a novel take on the subject and a conservative approach to IR – the former in the sense of under-explored area, and the latter in its appropriateness to the discipline.

[98] D. Fassin. *Humanitarian Reason: a Moral History of the Present* (1st ed.) (Berkerley CA: University of California Press, 2012).
[99] M. J. Davies. 'From Arrow to Path: International Relations Theory and the Humanitarian Space'. In M. Acuto (ed.), *Negotiating Relief: The Politics of Humanitarian Space* (London: C. Hurst & Co. Ltd, 2014), 211–220.
[100] Ibid.

In this chapter I next elaborate on the disciplinary context of this research in more detail. Afterwards, I continue discussing the philosophy of science that guides my basic ontological and epistemological assumptions of this dissertation, which I see as a constructivist interpretative study. Building on this approach, I then shed light on the practice theoretical framework of the research. I conclude this chapter on situating my research with an explicit conversation and rationale on the inclusion of gender in studying humanitarian diplomacy.

3.1 Disciplinary Location: International Relations

While its research themes date further back in history, the IR discipline can be considered to have emerged after the First World War, with a desire to systematically examine causes of war and circumstances for enduring peace.[101] Or, in other words, "international relations broke loose as an independent discipline during a period in the 1920s when idealism was high and the urge to solve practical problems great".[102] Today, IR as a discipline is a balance between reality and utopia as described by Christian Reus-Smit and Duncal Snidal, drawing from an IR classic Edward Haller Carr: "Without idealism, realism is sterile, devoid of purpose; without realism, idealism is naïve, devoid of understanding of the world in which one seeks to act".[103] Carr thus distinguished IR from political science from the realm of what *is* into what *ought to be*.[104]

This balance between reality and utopia is also fitting for humanitarianism in general, and humanitarian diplomacy in particular. Envisioning humanitarian interventions and building its surrounding infrastructure takes imagination, both from

[101] M. Spindler. *International Relations: A Self-Study Guide to Theory* (Opladen: Barbara Budrich Publishers, 2013).
[102] M. A. Kaplan. 'Is International Relations a Discipline?' *The Journal of Politics* 23 (3) (1961), 463.
[103] C. Reus-Smit and D. Snidal. 'Between Utopia and Reality: The Practical Discourses of International Relations'. In C. Reus-Smit and D. Snidal (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 7; E. H. Carr. *The Twenty Years' Crisis 1919–1939 : an Introduction to the Study of International Relations* (2nd ed.) (London: Macmillan, 1946).
[104] Reus-Smit and Snidal. 'Between Utopia and Reality', 7.

humanitarians as the illustrators and other stakeholders as the audience. Given that humanitarian diplomacy operates particularly in the context of conflict, and represents humanitarian ideals, discourse and polity in a non-humanitarian world, it fits in with defining themes of IR. Relations between international actors, analysing, preventing, and intervening in conflict settings, political responses to issues outside of territorial sovereignty, and relationship-building of multiple stakeholders are some of the examples in which the interests of humanitarian diplomacy and IR overlap. Humanitarian diplomacy, in its essence, builds on international affairs and community – in the forms of international humanitarian actors and institutes, government relations, donors and other partnerships, and in its desire to intervene upon the suffering of a distant 'other'.

In the humanitarian context, such 'international community' can paradoxically seem almost a mystical creature with notable powers. For example, Stanley Hoffman cautions about the dangers and risks of humanitarian interventions in which the international community needs to carefully consider where to intervene and how.[105] Mohammed Ayoob notes that the international community might "threaten international order in the long term" by conducting humanitarian interventions in otherwise sovereign states.[106] Furthermore, Roberto Belloni suggests that the international community is composed of sovereign states of the Westphalian system and that humanitarianism stands as a political and normative alternative to it.[107] Thus, the relationship between humanitarianism and international affairs seems inherent, albeit problematic. From an IR perspective, I suggest that humanitarian *diplomacy* is a form of reconciliation to some of these problems. By engaging at times in very traditional forms of diplomacy, humanitarians find ground for compromise, access to governmental negotiations, and means of mitigating political and logistical resistance for humanitarian interventions. At the same time, states find added justification for their national security, foreign, and possible economic interests by engaging in

[105] S. Hoffmann (ed.). *The Ethics and Politics of Humanitarian Intervention* (Notre Dame IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1996).
[106] M. Ayoob. 'Humanitarian Intervention and International Society'. *Global Governance* 7 (3) (2001), 225.
[107] Belloni, 'The Trouble with Humanitarianism'.

humanitarian dialogue. Humanitarian diplomacy locates in between the humanitarian and Westphalian worlds in which it communicates between the two.

With the inclusion of the last research article on gendered humanitarian diplomats, I extend the disciplinary location to include also feminist international relations, a part of the IR field since the 1980s. Investigating IR through feminist approaches represents, to a certain extent, a clash of differing ontologies and epistemologies.[108] For example, if IR scholars present international environments as asocial typologies, feminist inquiry building upon central categories of social relations finds little interest.[109] Or, whereas feminist theory commits to epistemological pluralism, IR as a discipline has held longstanding debates in its lenience towards logical positivism.[110] An illustration of these tensions between IR and feminists scholars is narrated by Linda Zerilli, exemplifying the same phenomenon in relation to political theory:

> Feminist approaches to the canon of political theory are characterized by deep ambivalence. On the one hand, canonical authors have mostly dismissed women as political beings in their own right, casting them instead as mere appendages to citizen man. If the citizen is a gendered category based on women's exclusion, then it would appear that the canon is more or less bankrupt for the development of feminist political theory. On the other hand, the same Western canon is in important ways constitutive of our political vocabulary, a valuable resource for political thinking that we can hardly do without. To recognize this reliance, however, is not to declare a truce. Feminism's relationship to the tradition has been and in all likelihood will remain, if not agonistic, deeply critical.[111]

[108] J. A. Tickner. 'You Just Don't Understand: Troubled Engagements Between Feminists and IR Theorists'. *International Studies Quarterly* 41 (4) (1997), 611–632.
[109] Ibid.
[110] Ibid; H. Bull. 'International Theory: The Case for a Classical Approach'. *World Politics* 18 (3) (1966), 361–377; M. A. Kaplan. 'The New Great Debate: Traditionalism vs. Science in International Relations'. *World Politics* 19 (1) (1966), 1–20.
[111] L. Zerilli. 'Feminist Theory and the Canon of Political Thought'. In J. Dryzek, B. Honig and A. Phillips (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Theory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 106.

Despite these tensions, I see that the added value of feminist analysis is precisely its different premise – feminist IR can inspect and reach analytical dimensions out of reach of non-feminist IR. V. Spike Peterson argues that gender "reconfigures fundamental categories and disciplinary "givens"", also applicable in international relations.[112]

Through inclusion of feminist IR framework, I argue that by examining the conduct of IR that is humanitarian diplomacy through gender lenses we gain an increased understanding of who has access to this practice, and how, as well as what kind of opportunities and limitations gender sets for humanitarian diplomacy. This point resonates with Sandra Whitworth's remarks that both feminist and IR scholars are interested in power and the ways in which it operates.[113] Whereas the former configurate it in terms of gender and individuals, for the IR scholars the individual level – people – rarely enter the scene.[114] This is an example of feminist IR contribution – humanitarian diplomacy is embodied at the level of humanitarian practitioners, and studying this level reveals what the practice of humanitarian diplomacy, de facto, is. Humanitarian diplomats inevitably represent their gender in their professional and operational contexts, which in turn are also gendered. Scrutinizing gender from the humanitarian aid providers' side, gender analysis reveals under what circumstances and terms humanitarian diplomacy becomes evident in the world.[115]

[112] V. S. Peterson (ed.). *Gendered States: Feminist (Re)Visions of International Relations Theory* (Boulder CO: Lynne Rienner, 1992), 17; V. S. Peterson. 'Transgressing Boundaries: Theories of Knowledge, Gender and International Relations'. *Millennium* 21 (2) (1992), 183–206.
[113] S. Whitworth. 'Feminism'. In C. Reus-Smit and D. Snidal (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008) 391–407.
[114] Ibid.
[115] As discussed, this represents an exceptional approach, as gender in humanitarianism is more commonly discussed on the aid receivers' side. For more, see Olivius, 'Refugee Men as Perpetrators, Allies or Troublemakers?'

3.2 Philosophy of Science: A Constructivist Interpretation

Philosophy of science covers the foundations on which science and research build upon – what is considered to be knowledge, and how it is captured and documented. In this subsection I highlight my research as a constructivist interpretation, as its scientific base and philosophical home. To understand what I mean by this approach, I begin by discussing my basic research assumption that builds upon a new, anti-Westphalian conceptualization of international affairs and its actors. In both the scholarly and realpolitik worlds of international relations that have traditionally focused on states as the units of analysis, challenging this assumption through discussion on humanitarian diplomacy is at the core of this study, discussed next.

One of the basic assumptions of my dissertation is that there is something existing phenomenologically in the world that can be labelled as humanitarian diplomacy, and that it can be scrutinized at the level of its actors and practices. This point of view is not a given, neither in humanitarian nor diplomatic studies, and the contestations stem from a traditional, Westphalian approach to the world and its politics. For humanitarian perspectives, particularly stemming from practitioners, there is a sense of discomfort due to diplomacy's connotations with the political and state-related diplomacy. As established, humanitarian principles, after all, emphasize humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence, something that intrinsically goes beyond the Westphalian state system's powerplay. However, despite this discomfort and, at times, contestation, humanitarians are merged also in the traditional, state-related diplomatic practice. Some scholars note that humanitarians are, even reluctantly, pushed to engage in diplomacy in a traditional manner when trying to pursue their aims on the ground.[116] Thus, my point of departure has been to try to understand and interpret humanitarians' diplomatic engagement even in the cases where practitioners might lack personal and institutional labelling, such as in the case of the UN.

[116] See for, example, Clements, *Humanitarian Negotiations with Armed Groups*; and Smith and Minear, *Humanitarian Diplomacy*.

Then, in diplomatic studies some scholars do not ontologically depart from separate, self-standing diplomatic practices outside state diplomacy, such as humanitarian diplomacy. For example, Ole Jacob Sending, Vincent Pouliot and Iver Neumann argue for a mutually constitutive and coexisting forms of old and new diplomacies, and they stand against "explanation by naming", which humanitarian diplomacy as a label would fall onto.[117] The authors criticize such approaches – and new literature on global governance in general – as too actor-centric, lacking a relational understanding of power. The authors' argument for relational ontology is understandable, particularly given the interest of states with traditional state diplomats interfering and engaging in humanitarian issues. However, in my analysis their argument's explanatory power falls short for the same reasons they argue for the opposite. Actor-centric approaches, as employed in this dissertation, unveil actor-specific interests and practices that would otherwise lack sufficient understanding of agency in a mere relationally constructed view. This, in turn, could also result in insufficient capturing of 'new' forms of diplomatic practices. Therefore, as a research field exploring the plurality of diplomacy, a productive soil seems to be combining and cross-fertilizing these types of analyses.

The overlaps between these ends are closer, in my reading, than they seem apart. For example, whereas Ole Jacob Sending does not agree with my ontological interpretation of humanitarian diplomacy, I agree with his notion in which humanitarians continuously need to reproduce and reconstruct what they represent, meaning people in humanitarian need.[118] By rationalizing their own existence as humanitarian practitioners this way, they gain legitimacy for acting and intervening in the name of humanitarianism as deemed necessary.[119] This, then, to me is central in

[117] Sending et al., 'The Future of Diplomacy', 529. A question of philosophical relevance here is that what is considered new – humanitarian diplomacy, such as its functions of negotiation and compromise, can be seen as an element of humanitarianism since its beginning, depending on its conceptualization. This discussion of when humanitarian diplomacy 'commenced' is then further in line with Michael Barnett's and Thomas G. Weiss' notion: "in many respects it makes no more sense to speak of the birth of humanitarianism than, say, the birth of capitalism, nationalism, liberalism, sovereignty, or any other sort of longstanding set of beliefs that have been institutionalized in everyday life", Barnett and Weiss, *Humanitarianism Contested*, 35.
[118] O. J. Sending. 'United by Difference: Diplomacy as a Thin Culture'. *International Journal* 66 (3) (2011), 643–659.
[119] Ibid.

humanitarian diplomacy: By claiming to represent their constituency – people in humanitarian need – humanitarian practitioners, actors, and institutes find ground to attempt to achieve political, economic, and logistical support by the means of persuasion and advocacy, among other diplomatic means.

Having now clarified my basic research assumption, I move on to elaborate what I mean by a constructivist interpretation. In my view, humanitarian diplomacy is constructed by social interactions and relations for which my research approach employs constructivism. Humanitarian diplomacy has foundational elements that build upon social constructions such as (humanitarian) interests, ideologies, and practices, among others. However, using a constructivist approach in actor-centric research may seem to be a philosophical discord: constructivists can be criticized for lacking understanding of agency and focusing instead on collectively held, intersubjective understandings and structures.[120] The ideologies involving individualism would, thus, better fit, for example, with neorealism or neoliberalism.

Yet, social constructivism captures humanitarianism as its own polity and set of ideologies, creating intersubjective understandings. Despite its metamorphosis, I regard humanitarianism as a consensus-driven movement in which humanitarian imperative, principles, and legal frameworks set its semantic boundaries. If these are taken away, humanitarianism either ceases to exist or transforms into something else. Humanitarian action – driven by shared humanitarian ideas – becomes intersubjective and often institutionalized, for which constructivism is fitting. Humanitarianism itself is a social construction in need of continuous semantic reconstruction and reconfiguration, as is its related diplomacy. Agents, such as humanitarian diplomatic actors, thus continuously recreate the structure in which they operate. In this way, the social construction of humanitarian diplomacy is understood as being "a product and, at the same time, producer of socialization".[121]

[120] J. T. Checkel. 'The Constructive Turn in International Relations Theory'. *World Politics* 50 (2) (1998), 324–348.
[121] M. Grundmann. 'Social Constructions Through Socialization: the Perspective of a Constructivist Socialization Research'. In *Social Constructivism as Paradigm?* (Routledge, 2018) 92.

Constructivists are interested in the social meaning attached to practices.[122] In relation to these, I further combine my constructivist research approach with interpretation, particularly with my chosen theoretical framework, practice theory.[123] In the landscape of philosophy of science, practice theory can be situated as a form of interpretative constructivism. Vincent Pouliot notes that "constructivism rests on an epistemology in which interpretation is an intrinsic part of the social sciences".[124] By categorizing my approach as interpretative constructivism, I pose an interpretation of humanitarian diplomacy and see that social sciences, such as IR, cumulatively build upon these types of interpretation in relation to one another.

My epistemological premise is that by examining practitioners and practices we gain information and knowledge on humanitarian diplomacy. Essentially, with this choice I have taken an interpretivist approach in which I qualitatively examine humanitarian diplomacy and its practices based on practitioners' interpretations of their humanitarian diplomatic engagement. The interpretation of these practices relies on concepts, frameworks, and language, both from the side of interlocutors (my interviewees) and myself as a researcher. By employing this constructivist interpretation, I have studied humanitarian diplomacy as an interaction between agencies and structures with subjective meanings.

Lastly, in relation to philosophy of science, whether to label practice theory as interpretative constructivism is open to debate. Such labelling can limit the scope of inquiries that practice-focused approaches have the potential to expand into. This is particularly notable when considering "constructivism's cyclical tendencies", in which narrowed understanding of constructivism has previously limited the scope of inquiries.[125] More broadly speaking, advertising 'practice turn' within constructivism would also risk rationalist, realist and other researchers from conducting research on

[122] I. Hurd. 'Constructivism'. In C. Reus-Smit and D. Snidal (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, (2009), 298–316.
[123] For detailed discussion on practice theory, see next subsection.

[124] Pouliot, *International Security in Practice*, 61.
[125] D. M. McCourt. 'Practice Theory and Relationalism as the New Constructivism'. *International Studies Quarterly* 60 (3) (2016), 483.

practice theory.[126] The interlinkages between different strands of IR, such as studies of humanitarian diplomacy, yearn for further scientific discovery that should not be diminished by strict, and essentially, artificial barriers within academia and beyond.

3.3 Theoretical Framework: Practice Theory

This discussion on theoretical framework is divided into two parts. I begin by presenting what is practice theory, and what part of this umbrella concept is applied in this dissertation. This theoretical discussion is particularly applicable considering the first two research articles included, as the third article represents an extended empirical analysis of the collected data material on gender.[127] In this subsection I seek not only to illustrate what is practice theory, but also to answer why it is a relevant theoretical model to do research on humanitarian diplomacy, which is the second part of the subsection. By doing so, I simultaneously contribute to its related scholarly discussion on theory-building, as humanitarian diplomacy has not been previously examined through practice theory.

Practice theory is not to be understood as a ubiquitous theory, rather, a variety of theories focused on practices.[128] When perusing varying approaches to practices, Christian Bueger and Frank Gardinger make a useful analytical suggestion that practice theory could be approached as an intellectual "trading zone" in which scholars can discuss and trade ideas on practices, how to study them, and possibly cooperate on further developments.[129] Bueger and Gardinger also provide a typology of seven commonly used approaches in practice theory.[130] They begin with Pierre Bourdieu, whose praxeology was influential enough to practice theory at its beginning, in that it

[126] See next subsection for further discussion on practice turn.
[127] Whereas the third article continues the practitioner and practice focus of this dissertation, it is rather inspired by the practice theoretical model developed in the first research article and applied in the second research article, rather than a direct descendant of practice theory.
[128] Adler and Pouliot, 'International Practices'; Bueger and Gadinger, *International Practice Theory*; McCourt, 'Practice Theory and Relationalism as the New Constructivism'; Thaddeus Jackson et al. *The Practice Turn in International Relations* (2017).
[129] Bueger and Gadinger, *International Practice Theory*, 6.
[130] Bueger and Gadinger, *International Practice Theory*.

equated with the work of Bourdieu. Second, the authors discuss Michel Foucault as a practice theoretical thinker with emphasis of practice theory's intertwining nature with textualism and discourse analysis. Third, they map how the concept of community of practice has been expanded from organizational sociology and management studies into IR, and further to practice theory. The authors continue with Theodore Schatzki's philosophical approach on practices. Schatzki's ontology is predominantly social in that individual's thoughts, actions, and social contexts are inseparable. Then, they discuss narrative approaches on practices, in which narratives are understood as intermediate in nature, linking practices with time, space, and context through social storytelling. Sixth, author-network approach is included, which, compared to the former approaches, places greater emphasis on performativity, materialism, and contingency. Finally, Bueger and Gardinger conclude with exploring the possibility to integrate pragmatic sociology better into practice theory. This is done through the work of Luc Boltanski who studies controversies and justifications that actors themselves provide.

Whereas the above-mentioned strands of practice theory provide many interesting avenues for exploring practices in the context of humanitarian diplomacy, my research engagement with practice theory originates from Emanuel Adler's and Vincent Pouliot's interpretation of international practices, which builds on a variety of practice theoretical approaches.[131] I have chosen their focus due to its applicability in the international affairs' sphere where humanitarian action and its diplomacy is located. Adler and Pouliot, both prominent proponents of practice theory, suggest that practices are socially competent performances that give meaning to international action – "the quotidian unfolding of international life".[132] I argue that humanitarian diplomacy is a form of IR, and thus of international life, and composed of practices that can be analysed. In the context of this research within the IR discipline, practices can be seen as "the smallest unit of analysis" against "a polar opposite from international relations'

[131] Adler and Pouliot, 'International Practices'.
[132] Ibid, 1.

neo-realist focus on the system level".[133] Therefore, the focus on practices is suitable for the anti-Westphalian focus of this dissertation, which does not place state as a central unit of analysis.

Building on Emanuel Adler's and Vincent Pouliot's intervention to practice theory, in this dissertation I argue that a) humanitarian diplomacy constitutes of practices that can be understood through specific characteristics (article one), and b) the UN humanitarian diplomats practice humanitarian diplomacy specific to the UN, thus constituting what it is and what it means (article two).[134] Both of these arguments focus on practices as something international actors *do* – in other words, as "socially meaningful patterns of action".[135] Further, both also claim practices' ontology as inherently relational. I analytically frame these relations, processes of repetition and deeds as humanitarian diplomatic practices and identify their basic characteristics in the first article, and empirically examine them in the second article.

From a practice theory perspective, practices are seen as a central constitutive element of a given actor (humanitarian practitioner, in this case). The significance of a deed – practice – for a practitioner can be understood in various gravities. As an extreme interpretation, and as discussed in the first article, practices can be seen in a Butlerian sense, although Judith Butler herself does not emphasize the term.[136] For Butler, both the deed and the doing construct the doer.[137] Then, as signifying the doer, who is created by deeds/practices, an embodiment develops through a regulated process of repetition.[138] The relation between a deed and a doer can also be seen as

[133] For 'the smallest unit of analysis', see C. Bueger. 'Pathways to Practice: Praxiography and International Politics'. *European Political Science Review* 6 (3) (2014), 383; for 'a polar opposite from international relations', see Wiseman, 'Diplomatic Practices at the United Nations', 384.
[134] Adler and Pouliot, 'International Practices'.
[135] C. M. Constantinou et al. 'Thinking with Diplomacy: Within and Beyond Practice Theory'. *International Political Sociology* 15 (4) (2021), 560.
[136] J. Rouse. 'Practice Theory'. In S. Turner and M. W. Risjord (eds.), *Philosophy of Anthropology and Sociology* (Amsterdam and Oxford: Elsevier, 2007), 639–681.
[137] J. Butler. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York and London: Routledge, 1990).
[138] Ibid, 198.

more moderately mutually constituting, where "structures are located also within ourselves".[139]

In the empirical example of the second article I examine the co-constitution of practitioners and practices: I give an illustration of how practitioners constitute what is UN humanitarian diplomacy in the same way as these practices constitute the UN humanitarian diplomats themselves. The surrounding structure of these practices and practitioners is signified by their institutional context, the UN. Whereas the UN humanitarian practitioners' entity-specific mandates vary, the structure in which they operate – the UN – sets them pragmatically, operationally, and semantically apart from other, non-UN forms of humanitarian diplomacy. One is unable to practise 'UN humanitarian diplomacy' without the institutional context as UN humanitarian diplomats, as legitimacy derives from institutional belonging and representation as "card-carrying humanitarian officials".[140] Therefore, practices are relational to their social contexts, or social structures, using a term familiar to practice theory.

This brings me to three notions that are relevant for both articles, partially further relying on Emanuel Adler's and Vincent Pouliot's views on international practices, which include the first notion of stability and change, and the second notion of agency and structure.[141] Outside the authors' discussion I also include methodological considerations in applying practice theoretical framework as a third notion. To begin with the first notion, practices entail continuous processes of stability and change.[142] Stability of practices stems from institutional affiliation, values, frameworks, and further, the semantic fields such as humanitarianism. Stability also means that humanitarian diplomatic practices tend to travel across various spaces and, in some cases, time. Some practices, such as access negotiations to people in humanitarian need, can be seen as a prevalent, stabile form of humanitarian diplomacy

[139] V. Pouliot. *International Pecking Orders: The Politics and Practice of Multilateral Diplomacy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 71. See also Neumann, 'Returning Practice to the Linguistic Turn'; V. Pouliot. *International Security in Practice: The Politics of NATO-Russia Diplomacy* (vol. 113) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010); Grundmann, 'Social Constructions Through Socialization'.
[140] Smith and Minear, *Humanitarian Diplomacy*, 8.
[141] Adler and Pouliot, 'International Practices'.
[142] Ibid. See also, T. Hopf. 'Change in International Practices'. *European Journal of International Relations* 24 (3) (2018), 687–711.

since the beginning of humanitarian interventions. Notably, stability also operates in preventive and restrictive ways. As an example, and as discussed in the articles, institutional owning of humanitarian diplomacy is still lacking at the UN, potentially signalling an institutional resistance to change. However, practices are also non-stagnant in the sense that they are subject to change and adopt new forms should their institutional context transform or evolve. New practices, such as celebrity humanitarianism as a form of diplomatic engagement and advocacy, can be seen as an example of these. Mark D. Alleyne discusses how the practice to deploy celebrities in the UN diplomacy marked a transformation in the institution context towards a desire to improve public relations and to find new ways for influencing and public information sharing without offending member state governments.[143]

Second, and as already discussed in this subsection, humanitarian practitioners are agents operating within their structures. Practitioners exhibit agency, for example, through individual emotions and strategies.[144] A key shift in agency within practice theory is, however, by now famously narrated by Pouliot, in that social actors think *from* somewhere instead of *about* something.[145] Similarly, practice theory draws attention to analyse the physical environment and surroundings of practices in which agency is created through social topographies distributing knowledge, power and recognition.[146] This type of analysis is provided both in second and third articles of this dissertation with OCHA and the UN as the analytical environments. In practice theory, international actors are often seen to be driven by context-dependent, practical imperatives, such as everyday logics, habits, and embodied dispositions, rather than abstract forces such as national interests, preferences, and identities.[147] However,

[143] M. D. Alleyne. 'The United Nations' Celebrity Diplomacy'. *The SAIS Review of International Affairs* 25 (1) (2005), 175–185.
[144] J. Cornut. 'The Practice Turn in International Relations Theory'. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of International Studies* (2015), 1–26.
[145] V. Pouliot. *International Security in Practice: The Politics of NATO-Russia Diplomacy* (vol. 113) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 11.
[146] Adler and Pouliot, 'International Practices'; McCourt, 'Practice Theory and Relationalism as the New Constructivism'.
[147] Constantinou, C. M. 'Everyday Diplomacy: Mission, Spectacle and the Remaking of Diplomatic Culture'. In J. Dittmer and F. McConnell (eds.), *Diplomatic Cultures and International Politics: Translations, Spaces and Alternatives* (Routledge, 2016), 23–40; McCourt, 'Practice Theory and Relationalism as the New Constructivism'.

identifying, conceptualizing, and locating individuals and their agencies in relation to practices vary according to different approaches used. It is also source of its criticism, some including that focusing on practices can be considered already "too agential".[148] Or alternatively, that practices reduce social meaning into its most functional forms.[149] The problematization of agency in the realm of constructivism is nothing new, however.[150]

As for the third notion, applying practice theory raises methodological and epistemological issues. In the context of this dissertation, in articles two and three, using in-depth interviews as data collection method with practitioners to identify their practices can be seen as a novel approach.[151] Can the practitioners self-identify their own practices? Anthony Giddens has raised a concept of "practical consciousness", in which humans as agents are highly knowledgeable and aware of the "knowledge which they possess, and apply, in the production and reproduction of day-to-day social encounters" and that "the vast bulk of such knowledge is practical rather than theoretical in character".[152] Ted Hopf raises this same concept of 'practical consciousness' along with its commonality in practice theory, relying on Theodore Schatzki's notion of "what people often do often reflects formulations of which they are aware".[153] Furthermore, Schatzki explains that "people can explain almost all their actions in great detail (which is not to say that their explanations are never wrong)".[154]

Gathering from these scholarly stances, I too take a practice theory premise that practitioners can identify and are well-positioned to explain and understand their own practices – inclusive both of their actions and reflections on the rationale behind these. Their responses might, indeed, be more practical than theoretical in nature, such as

[148] Hopf, 'Change in International Practices', 544.
[149] M. Barnett. 'Human Rights, Humanitarianism, and the Practices of Humanity'. *International Theory* 10 (3) (2018), 314–349.
[150] See previous subsection and also Checkel, 'The Constructive Turn in International Relations Theory'.
[151] For more discussion on methodology, please see section 5.2 on Data Collection.
[152] A. Giddens. 'The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration – Elements of the Theory Structuration'. In G. Spiegel (ed.), *Practicing History: New Directions in Historical Writing after the Linguistic Turn* (New York and London: Routledge, 2005 [1984]), 131.
[153] Hopf, 'Change in International Practices', 687, 691. Original text, T. R. Schatzki. 'Practice Mind-ed Orders'. In T. R. Schatzki, K. K. Cetina and E. V. Savigny (eds.), *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory* (London: Routledge, 2001), 59.
[154] Schatzki. 'Practice Mind-ed Orders', 59.

drawing from and exemplifying through their empirical experiences. However, this does not equate to practitioners not understanding their own practices and having the ability to critically reflect on these. I see the theoretical level discussion, rather, as a scholarly contribution from a research stance. In response to Schatzki's important notion that these practitioner explanations do not entail an assumption of never being wrong, there lies a research responsibility for a practice theoretician to identify patterns in interlocutors' responses (note, plural), without emphasizing an individual experience, rather seeking a patterned action for triangulating a given practice.

Moving onto the second part of this subsection on theoretical framework, I now more clearly reflect the following question: Why, then, study humanitarian diplomacy specifically through practice theoretical lenses? Arguably, several other options in terms of theoretical and analytical frameworks could be chosen across several social sciences. As examples, and in a previously raised relational view of diplomacy,[155] game theory represents an interesting option in assessing relations, patterns, intersubjectivity, and strategic interdependence between humanitarian actors and others involved in the making of humanitarian diplomacy. Then, process tracing that mechanically explores causality over time as trajectories for outcomes of social phenomena presents another choice.[156] This type of analysis could add value particularly in understanding the emergence and current momentum of humanitarian diplomacy, including its etymological roots. Similarly, the history of humanitarianism has been a rising trend among history scholars, which could serve as an impetus to include specified historical research on humanitarian diplomacy.[157]

Another option would be discourse analysis, particularly given the centrality of linguistic construction of both humanitarianism and diplomacy. Language represents "the very essence of diplomatic vocation", and humanitarian language discursively

[155] Drawing also from Sending, Pouliot and Neumann (2011).
[156] A. Bennett, and J. T. Checkel. *Process Tracing: From Metaphor to Analytic Tool* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014); L. Norman. 'Interpretive Process Tracing and Causal Explanations'. *Qualitative & Multi-Method Research* 13 (2015), 4–9.
[157] See, for example, mM. Hilton et al. 'History and Humanitarianism: a Conversation'. *Past & Present* 241 (1) (2018), e1–e38; J. Reinisch. 'Introduction: Relief in the Aftermath of War'. *Journal of Contemporary History* 43 (3) (2008), 371–404; T. Zahra. '"The Psychological Marshall Plan": Displacement, Gender, and Human Rights after World War II'. *Central European History* 44 (1) (2011), 37–62.

constructs, inter alia, humanitarian aid receivers' identities and vulnerabilities.[158] Further, institutional/organizational perspectives along with their comparative case studies could further unravel actor-specific humanitarian diplomatic behavior. These include, among others, studying institutional logics, organizational sense-making, particularly in relation to (humanitarian) crises, and organizational identity research in understanding, inter alia, what humanitarianism means to organizations conducting humanitarian diplomacy.[159]

As there are many interesting research avenues to examine humanitarian diplomacy, out of which only a portion is listed above, I highlight humanitarian diplomacy as an under-explored research field. Given what I see as the tentative stages of the scholarly interest, my contribution has begun with what I consider to be the foundational intellectual building blocks. These include a more systematic understanding and account of what humanitarian diplomacy is *in practice*, bringing me to practice theory. The reasons why I have prioritized a practice theory approach over other options are threefold: First, its suitability to studies of traditional, but particularly non-traditional forms of diplomacy; second, the contemporary disciplinary interest given 'practice turn' in IR scholarship, and third, the practitioner focus of my research interest.[160] Next, I elaborate more on these three reasons behind my theoretical choice.

[158] For 'the very essence of diplomatic vocation', see S. Nick. *Use of Language in Diplomacy* (2001), 17. Paper presented at the the Second International Conference on Knowledge and Diplomacy (February 2000), and the International Conference on Language and Diplomacy (January 2001), Malta. L. Chouliaraki. *The Ironic Spectator: Solidarity in the Age of Post-humanitarianism* (Cambridge: Polity, 2013); B. Ngo and S. Hansen. 'Constructing Identities in UN Refugee Camps: the Politics of Language, Culture and Humanitarian Assistance'. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies* 10 (2) (2013), 97–120.

[159] For institutional logics, see, for example, C. B. Johansen and S. B. Waldorff. 'What are Institutional Logics – and where is the perspective taking us?' In Krücken, G. et al. (eds.), *New Themes in Institutional Analysis* (Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2017), 51–76; S. B. Waldorff, T. Reay, E. Goodrick. 'A Tale of two Countries: How Different Constellations of Logics Impact Action'. In Lounsbury, M. and E. Boxenbaum, (eds.), *Institutional Logics in Action, Part A (Research in the Sociology of Organizations, Vol. 39 Part A)* (Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 2013), 99–129. For 'organizational sense-making', see S. Maitlis and S. Sonenshein. 'Sensemaking in Crisis and Change: Inspiration and Insights from Weick (1988)'. *Journal of Management Studies* 47 (3) (2010), 551–580. For 'organizational identity research', see D. A. Gioia and A. L. Hamilton. 'Great Debates in Organizational Identity Study'. *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Identity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 21–38; M. Schultz and T. Hernes. 'Temporal Interplay Between Strategy and Identity: Punctuated, Subsumed, and Sustained Modes'. *Strategic Organization* 18 (1) (2020), 106–135.

[160] For the first two reasons, see also Constantinou et al., 'Thinking with Diplomacy'; and for the second reason also Jackson et al., *The Practice Turn in International Relations*.

In relation to the first listed reason, numerous scholars studying diplomacy have found a relatively recent interest in practices of diplomacy and, further, practice theory, signalling suitability and contemporality of the research approach. As examples, Christian Lequesne studied the European Union's diplomatic service and combined foreign and defence ministry, the European External Action Service, through the creation of practices as a constitutive foundation of a new diplomatic body.[161] In his historic research, David E. Banks examined the collision of domestic and international practices in Sinocentric diplomacy, illustrating both the symbolic and eroding power of diplomatic practices.[162] In seeking to understand institutional diplomatic change, Geoffrey Wiseman argues that informal practices are more transformative compared to formal reform processes in the context of the UN.[163] In something of a contrast, Andrew Cooper and Jérémie Cornut criticize practice theory for focusing on stability rather than change, but identify its utility in studying diplomacy in three ways:

> it provides empirical depth to analyses that are often disconnected from on-the-ground practical realities; it gives a central place to agency and individual performances in a discipline that tends to over-emphasise structure; and it privileges complexity-sensitive and problem-driven investigations rather than parsimonious and theoretically driven ones, creating a space where interparadigm cross-fertilisation become possible.[164]

The above-mentioned examples of discoveries and studies are among traditional state and multilateral diplomatic actors and environments. However, practice theory and practice focus has found fruitful ground also in conducting research on 'new' and

[161] Lequesne, 'EU foreign policy through the lens of practice theory'.
[162] Banks, 'Fields of Practice'.
[163] Wiseman, 'Diplomatic Practices at the United Nations'.
[164] A. F. Cooper and J. Cornut. 'The Changing Practices of Frontline Diplomacy: New Directions for Inquiry'. *Review of International Studies* 45 (2) (2019), 303. See also, Adler and Pouliot, 'International Practices'; V. Pouliot and J. Cornut. 'Practice Theory and the Study of Diplomacy: A Research Agenda'. *Cooperation and Conflict* 50 (3) (2015), 297–315.

non-traditional forms of diplomacy, a categorization under which humanitarian diplomacy falls. As examples here, Stuart Murray argues that sports diplomacy presents an avenue for diplomatic practices between people, states, and organizations that conventional diplomacy among states would otherwise not have access to.[165] Jonathan P. Doh, N. M. Dahan and M. Casario apply practice theory to assess global non-market strategies of multinational enterprises to illustrate international business diplomacy.[166] Then, whereas his focus remains on mainly on state actors, Erik Pajtinka discusses cultural diplomacy as a practice of fostering value, linguistic, and expatriate exchanges and relations among states and their residents.[167] Taking the concept to non-state actors, Lucian Jora reflects non-traditional actors in cultural diplomacy as assuming and practicing previously state-owned roles.[168] Therefore, given that practice theory has showcased its utility in diplomatic studies among both traditional and non-traditional actors, it also presents a viable candidate in undertaking a study of humanitarian diplomacy with humanitarian practitioners representing non-traditional diplomatic actors.

As for the second reason behind this theoretical choice – While situating this dissertation in the IR discipline, I further locate it within this IR's 'practice turn'. It can be viewed as a contemporary approach to middle-range theorizing with a disciplinary focus on how "social realities – and international politics – are constituted by human beings acting in and on the world".[169] By scaling down the commonly found macro level analysis of international politics in IR, researchers interested in practices seek to study overarching phenomena through them.[170] The focus on studies within practice turn is, indeed, often on the actors in terms of human individuals, which presents a change in IR that is commonly focused on states.[171] However, some scholars argue also

[165] S. Murray. *Sports Diplomacy: Origins, Theory and Practice* (London: Routledge, 2018).
[166] J. P. Doh, N. M. Dahan and M. Casario. 'MNEs and the Practice of International Business Diplomacy'. *International Business Review* 31 (1) (2022), 101926.
[167] E. Pajtinka. 'Cultural Diplomacy in Theory and Practice of Contemporary International Relations'. *Politické vedy* 17 (4) (2014), 95–108.
[168] L. Jora. 'New Practices and Trends in Cultural Diplomacy'. *Romanian Review of Political Sciences and International Relations* 10 (1) (2013), 43–52.
[169] Cornut, 'The Practice Turn in International Relations Theory', 1.
[170] Cornut, 'The Practice Turn in International Relations Theory'.
[171] See also discussion on the anti-Westphalian approach in subsection 3.3. Philosophy of Science.

for the need to go beyond anthropocentrism, and expanding the focus to include, for example, material context and spaces, such as digital platforms .[172]

'Practice turn' was first labelled in IR and diplomatic studies by Iver B. Neumann who discussed it in relation to 'linguistic turn'.[173] Primarily, the claim of the parallel is that both discursivity and practices are inherently intertwined and must be understood in relation to one another, a remark that I apply in my analytical model on practices.[174] For Neumann, practices are discursive and thus cannot be treated outside of discourse, and analysing practices has been an integral part of discourse analysis from the beginning. Simultaneously, "lived practices" of global politics is something that mere text-based data analyses of 'linguistic turn' cannot capture.[175] Therefore, Neumann argues for including the concept of culture to illustrate the interplay of practice and discourse – something I see as the institutional culture in the context of my study.

Finally, in relation to the third reason of my chosen theoretical framework – my research interest in practitioners – I will raise Vincent Pouliot and Jérémie Cornut's identification of cross-fertilization between practice theory and study of diplomacy.[176] According to the authors, diplomatic studies have entered a theorization phase as a scholarly field during which practice theoreticians seek empirical and analytical implementation.[177] The two scholars identify five particular synergies regarding why practice theory and studies of diplomacy are an exceptionally relevant fit:

> [the two bodies of literature, practice theory and studies in diplomacy, have] 1) a focus on concrete enactments of human performance; 2) a relational or

[172] See Jason Dittmer in C. M. Constantinou et al. 'Thinking with Diplomacy: Within and Beyond Practice Theory'. *International Political Sociology* 15 (4) (2021).
[173] Neumann, 'Returning Practice to the Linguistic Turn'.
[174] See article one, subsection 3.5. This notion also highlights the connection for my methodological approach to identify humanitarian diplomatic practices through direct practitioner-engagement and interviews in the second article.
[175] Neumann, 'Returning Practice to the Linguistic Turn', 628.
[176] Pouliot and Cornut, 'Practice Theory and the Study of Diplomacy'.
[177] Ibid.

> interactionist perspective on international politics; 3) a commitment to interdisciplinarity, in particular political science, history, anthropology, geography and sociology; 4) an ecumenical approach to paradigms; and 5) a desire to build bridges between scholarship and actual practice.[178]

In choosing this theoretical framework, these remarks echo my research interests with a potential to respond to my overarching research question of how humanitarian practitioners engage in humanitarian diplomacy. In relation to Pouliot's and Cornut's first remark, my research focus is on the practitioners, the human performance of humanitarian diplomacy.[179] In relation to their second remark, the interactionist and relational approach is captured by humanitarian practitioners' interdependence in humanitarian diplomacy, namely to other diplomatic stakeholders, influencers, and arenas through which humanitarian aims are sought to be advanced. The third remark on the interdisciplinarity of practice theory and diplomatic studies is fitting given this study's crosscutting research interests that locate in IR, humanitarian studies, peace and conflict studies, political science, and gender studies. Fourth, an ecumenical approach that studying humanitarian diplomacy provides is challenging and questioning Westphalian state-centred diplomacy. This, as established, is a foundational premise for my scholarly and phenomenological thinking, and representative of broader scholarly discussions of non-traditional diplomatic actors. And, finally, in relation to the fifth remark, a practice theory framework showcases the suitability that my positionality has as practitioner-turned-researcher, as well as an academic with an interest in catering for practitioner audiences in addition to scholarly ones.

To conclude this subsection, I wish to underline that by choosing the theoretical framework of practice theory I do not state it to be an all-inclusive and all-exhaustive research approach. Some of the shortcomings include the following: Applying practice

[178] Ibid, 298.
[179] Pouliot and Cornut, 'Practice Theory and the Study of Diplomacy'.

theory empirically faces challenges of relational ontology that it inherently represents, where, inter alia, the researcher – also with my own former practitioner-positionality – stands as an observer in relation to practitioners themselves. Also, identification of practices in empirical world represents certain challenges, such as in clearly defining of what falls under the category of a 'practice', albeit that it is often "generally possible to identify what counts as the competent performance of X-ing".[180] Then, researchers have little access to the arenas of diplomatic practices in order to identify these by using alternative methodologies such as participant observation, although some exceptions apply.[181] This is a notable challenge, particularly in humanitarian diplomacy (similar to 'sibling' diplomacies of military diplomacy and peace diplomacy, among others), where humanitarian negotiations, with lives at stake, can be endangered by the inclusion of 'outsiders' such as researchers. As a final example, humanitarianism itself is also peculiar compared to other forms of diplomacies, as many of its forms pursue to follow idealistic logics of neutrality, impartiality, and independency in the name of shared humanity – features that apply neither to most traditional state diplomacies nor to new diplomacies. Therefore, pursuant to applying practice theory distinctively in the realm of humanitarianism, particular consideration to this ideological framework behind the practices must be taken to understand them in their social contexts.[182]

3.4 Inclusion of Gender

As stated at the beginning of the previous subsection, the third article of this dissertation takes a different path compared to the first two articles. In the last article I discuss gendered aspects of humanitarian diplomacy, and in this subsection I clarify the reasons for this approach. Gender cuts across humanitarian diplomacy, therefore underlining the importance of it being included in related studies. Gender becomes evident in considering both the humanitarian aid givers and the receivers' ends, as well

[180] Emanuel Adler and Vincent Pouliot in Jackson et al., *The Practice Turn in International Relations*, 3.
[181] See, for example, M. Halme-Tuomisaari. 'Methodologically Blonde at the UN in a Tactical Quest for Inclusion'. *Social Anthropology* 26 (4) (2018), 456–470.
[182] For more discussion, see beginning of section 3 in article one.

as the contexts and cultures in which humanitarian diplomacy takes place. Within these parameters, the third article specifically addresses the issue of gendered humanitarian diplomats and their operational environments – the aid givers' side. This aspect is rarely discussed in related literature that has had an emphasis on the aid receivers' side, and gendered aid programming and policymaking.[183] I argue that the aim of gender equal humanitarian action is hampered by gender inequality among the humanitarians themselves.

This subsection has two parts: In reverse order, the latter half entails a discussion why gender matters as an ontological and analytical framework in studies of humanitarian diplomacy. Prior to discussing gender in humanitarian diplomacy, however, I explain how I conceptualize gender in this dissertation and what the concept means in my analytical context, the UN, as the first half.

In studying a social phenomenon such as humanitarian diplomacy, gender should be understood as a concept that embodies and captures difference. Categorized as post-structuralism and post-constructionism, I draw my approach to gender from a feminist philosopher Judith Butler's ideas of gender performativity.[184] The term refers to series of acts and practices – performances – an individual carries out which signify gender of the person.[185] This performativity is done in social contexts, such as time, culture, space, and norms, which vary in relation to genders that they mark. Thus, gender is also relational, representing a social signifier of a person, along with related power structures and struggles between social groups, such as discrimination based on gender. In the context of humanitarian diplomacy, humanitarian practitioners also perform and embody their genders in professional contexts. This gendered way of being, as capturing difference, affects the ways in which they are perceived and exist

[183] A. Zurkuhlen. 'Book review: Chasing misery: An anthology of essays by women in humanitarian responses by Kelsey Hoppe'. *Medicine, Conflict and Survival* 31 (3-4) (2015), 171–172.
[184] For 'post-structuralism', see P. Clough. 'Judith Butler'. In G. Ritzer (ed.), *The Blackwell Companion to Major Contemporary Social Theorists* (Malden MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2003), 333–352; for 'post-constructionism ', see N. Lykke. 'The Timeliness of Post-Constructionism'. *Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research* 18 (2) (2010), 131–136; for 'gender performativity', see Butler, *Gender Trouble*.
[185] Butler's approach to gender is also influential in my conceptualization of practices, as I use a related concept of embodiment in a Butlerian sense – see section 3.3 on theoretical framework and article one.

in these professional spheres – which themselves are gendered constructs – and how they are able to carry out relevant humanitarian diplomatic practices.

An important gender concept that I use in this dissertation is masculinity, and in tandem with it, femininity. Masculinity refers to a plurality of qualities, characteristics, attributers, and norms that signify 'male' and 'manhood'. Whereas the term is most commonly used in relation to men, it is not restricted to men as its only social category.[186] Further, masculinity is frequently discussed in relation to power, such as having the ability to create legitimacy, produce social privilege, and generate uneven distributions of wealth and well-being.[187] This association between masculinity and privilege is also etymologically important, as noted in the work of Amanda Bailey:

> The word 'masculinity', which did not enter the English language until the middle of the eighteenth century, referred to the privilege awarded to men in matters of inheritance. Manhood and 'manliness' were the terms used in the sixteenth century to connote those qualities essential to civility, which was identified teleologically as the definitive characteristic of the adult man.[188]

Femininity, then, is used similarly as a concept for the plurality of qualities, attributes, norms, and characteristics signifying 'female' and 'womanhood'. Like masculinities, femininities also manifest outside the social group categorized as 'women'.[189] Femininity can be understood as a performance of womanhood, and in

[186] Jack Halberstam. *Female Masculinity* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1998); Judith Halberstam. 'Global Female Masculinities'. *Sexualities* 15 (3–4) (2012), 336–354.
[187] Halberstam, *Female Masculinity*.
[188] A. Bailey. *Flaunting: Style and the Subversive Male Body in Renaissance England* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007), 48. Quoted in C. T. Haywood et al. *The Conundrum of Masculinity: Hegemony, Homosociality, Homophobia and Heteronormativity* (Oxfordshire: Routledge, 2017), 2.
[189] M. Atkinson. 'Exploring Male Femininity in the "Crisis": Men and Cosmetic Surgery'. *Body & Society* 14 (1) (2008), 67–87; D. B. Hill. '"Feminine" Heterosexual Men: Subverting Heteropatriarchal Sexual Scripts?' *The Journal of Men's Studies* 14 (2) (2007), 145–159.

many ways in which it means to be a woman on a global scale.[190] Importantly in this dissertation, the relationship between masculinity and femininity in terms of interdependence is central. As I note in the third included research article, Cynthia Enloe argues that the construction of masculine behavior "in any culture cannot be accomplished without constructing ideals of femininity that are supportive and complementary".[191] Therefore, feminine expressions, ideals, and expectations exist in relation to masculine sets of such, and vice versa. This creates a linkage in which, for example, and in relevance to the claims of this study, masculine domination cannot exist without its dependence on feminine subordination.

Whereas I limit my discussion in this dissertation on gender in humanitarian diplomacy, I also stress the importance of integrating analyses of other social categories and their overlap in further studies. In my line of argument, these I see as framing opportunities and limitations to humanitarian diplomatic engagement similarly to gender. Other closely related concepts in embodying difference can be understood from an intersectional framework, wherein social categories such as gender, race, age, ability, and class intersect, overlap, and interdependently define social positioning. The author of the term, Kimberlé Crenshaw, wrote that "[i]ntersectionality was a lived reality before it became a term" three decades ago in 1989.[192] In the context of my research framework, this is showcased, for example, in relation to national and international staff categories of the UN, and the gendered interplay within these categorizations that further define opportunities, limitations, and trends. Intersectionality is an analytical tool that has the potential to expand collective identities and understandings, which simultaneously enable political analysis and

[190] For 'performance of womanhood', see V. Walkerdine. 'Femininity as Performance'. *Oxford Review of Education* 15 (3) (1989), 267–279. For 'what it means to be a woman on a global scale', see B. Ehrenreich and A. R. Hochschild. *Global Woman: Nannies, Maids, and Sex Workers in the New Economy* (London: Granta Books, 2003); C. Mohanty. 'Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses'. *Feminist Review* 30 (1) (1988), 61–88.

[191] Enloe, C. 'All the Men Are in the Militias, All the Women Are Victims: The Politics of Masculinity and Femininity in Nationalist Wars'. In *The Curious Feminist: Searching for Women in a New Age of Empire*, 1st ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004), 99–118, 107.

[192] K. Crenshaw. 'Why Intersectionality Can't Wait'. *Washington Post* (September 24, 2015). Retrived from https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/in-theory/wp/2015/09/24/why-intersectionality-cant-wait/; B. Cooper. 'Intersectionality'. In L. Disch and M. Hawkesworth (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Feminist Theory* (vol. 1) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 385–406.

action.[193] This type of analysis and action is particularly relevant in a normative and standard-setting institution concerned with equal opportunities and representation, such as the UN.

To identify a closer institutional context of understanding gender, I refer to the definition given by UN Women, the gender equality and women's empowerment entity of the UN. This definition of gender in the institutional context of the UN captures a binary approach that refer to categorizations on such axes as men-women and boys-girls:[194]

> Gender refers to the roles, behaviors, activities, and attributes that a given society at a given time considers appropriate for men and women. In addition to the social attributes and opportunities associated with being male and female and the relationships between women and men and girls and boys, gender also refers to the relations between women and those between men. These attributes, opportunities and relationships are socially constructed and are learned through socialization processes. They are context/time-specific and changeable. Gender determines what is expected, allowed and valued in a woman or a man in a given context. In most societies there are differences and inequalities between women and men in responsibilities assigned, activities undertaken, access to and control over resources, as well as decision-making opportunities. Gender is part of the broader socio-cultural context, as are other important criteria for socio-cultural analysis including class, race, poverty level, ethnic group, sexual orientation, age, etc.[195]

[193] P. H. Collins and S. Bilge. *Intersectionality* (2nd ed.) (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2020).
[194] Whereas gender manifests between and beyond these categorizations, I have conducted my gender analysis in this dissertation along these binary lines as a reflection of the institutional narrative.
[195] UN Women, UN Women Training Centre eLearning Campus, Gender Equality Glossary, OSAGI Gender Mainstreaming – Concepts and Definitions, retrieved from https://trainingcentre.unwomen.org/mod/glossary/view.php?id=36&mode=letter&hook=G&sortkey=&sortorder=, accessed December 13, 2021. Note a very similar definition used by the European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE), an autonomous body of the European Union, retrieved from https://eige.europa.eu/gender-mainstreaming/concepts-and-definitions, accessed December 13, 2021.

In the research context of the UN, gender does not, in most cases, mean a spectrum of social categories and ways of differentiation. Rather, gender often translates to mean 'women', simultaneously indicating an essentialized view of womanhood represented with a single voice.[196] This simultaneously exposes a masculinity premise for the UN as otherness, specialty, as a signification mark of the female gender, as well as neutrality, generality, and a non-specific mark of the male gender. Gender that translates to 'women' entails, in practice, the notion of men and masculinity as the social norm, almost anything, as in "not an identity, not a particularizing quality, because it is everything. Therefore, men/masculinity is no gender because it is all genders".[197]

Similar to other scholars, in the third article I discuss the UN as a gendered institution with a masculine premise and preference. This particularity of women and the masculinity premise in the UN system is highlighted by several studies. Among these, Kristen Haack argues that the UN replicates gendered patterns from national politics in senior appointments, such as that crises enable women to gain access to executive offices, gender quotas support the appointments, women are assigned with 'soft'/feminine portfolios (including compassion issues such as children, education, and healthcare), and backgrounds in influential political families facilitate access to leadership roles.[198] In another article by Haack, the author continues that this gendered pattern of leadership access and lack of opportunities for women is "intimately connected" with the representation of women and women's issues at the UN.[199] Using a feminist institutionalist perspective and a narrative approach, Ingvild Bode identifies, inter alia, that gendered practices at the UN sustain positional divisions in which the

[196] F. D'Amico. 'Women Workers in the United Nations: From Margin to Mainstream?' In M. Meyer and E. Prügl (eds.), *Gender Politics in Global Governance* (Lanham MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999), 19–40.
[197] C. Haywood and M. Mac an Ghaill. *Men and Masculinities: Theory, Research and Social Practice* (Buckingham: Open University Press, 2003).
[198] K. Haack. 'Gaining Access to the "World's Largest Men's Club": Women Leading UN Agencies'. *Global Society: Journal of Interdisciplinary International Relations* 28 (2) (2014), 217–240.
[199] K. Haack. 'Breaking Barriers: Women's Representation and Leadership at the United Nations'. *Global Governance* 20 (2014), 38.

UN is "a men's world" that women need to enter.[200] Women and the 'inclusion of women' narrative represent legitimizing functions at the UN, while simultaneously women are not equally represented as diplomats in practices such as mediation and peacebuilding.[201] Also, Sheri Lynn Gibbings has showcased how the UN-based cultural norms necessitate positive framing on issues, and that gender in particular represents politics of language in terms of inclusion and exclusion.[202]

Whereas my empirical analysis of the gendered UN humanitarian diplomats feeds into these studies and can be read in full in the third article, in what remains of this subsection I discuss gender more broadly in terms of humanitarian diplomacy. I do this with the intention of highlighting why gender matters as an ontological and analytical framework in studies of humanitarian diplomacy. My arguments include two central, gendered contexts. First I discuss, reversedly, what I label as a secondary context, gender in humanitarian action. Herein I argue that whereas the means and manifestations of conflict-related humanitarian emergencies, representing most humanitarian crises, are driven mainly by men and the construction of masculinities, the majority of those who experience civilian suffering are women, constituting a significant group of humanitarian beneficiaries.[203] Humanitarian diplomats, therefore, operate in an inherently gendered landscape, in which these trends are not all-inclusive in terms of gender, but broadly transferrable from one humanitarian setting to another. The second part, a primary context, is the humanitarian diplomats themselves who operate in both semantic fields of humanitarianism and diplomacy. For the former, humanitarian practitioners face and stipulate several prevalent gendered norms and assumptions that impact and, at times, hamper their work, particularly in the 'field'

[200] I. Bode. 'Women or Leaders? Practices of Narrating the United Nations as a Gendered Institution'. *International Studies Review* 22 (3) (2020), 354.
[201] See also UN Security Council, Report of the Secretary-General on Women and Peace and Security, S/2021/827, aRetrived from https://undocs.org/S/2021/827. L. J. Shepherd. *Gender, UN Peacebuilding, and the Politics of Space: Locating Legitimacy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017); C. Standfield. 'Caught Between Art and Science: the Women, Peace and Security Agenda in United Nations Mediation Narratives'. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 22 (5) (2020), 629–651.
[202] S. L. Gibbings. 'No Angry Women at the United Nations: Political Dreams and the Cultural Politics of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325'. *International Feminist Journal of Politics 13* (4) (2011), 522–538.
[203] According to the World Bank, 80 per cent of humanitarian needs are due to conflicts: *World Bank, Fragility, Conflict and Violence: Overview (2020)*. Retrieved from https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/fragilityconflictviolence/overview.

(site of humanitarian aid delivery). For the latter, humanitarian diplomacy takes place in the diplomatic realm, which is a gendered construction backed up by the historical dominance as a masculine field. Next, I discuss both contexts more in detail.

In analysing the secondary context of humanitarian action, gender and war/conflict literature is of particular relevance given the relationship between conflict and humanitarian needs, as well as diplomacy being seen as a means to prevent and manage escalated and hostile situations. This field of scholarly literature points towards the tendency in which the machinery of state and non-state violence (e.g., weapons, military and guerilla forces) are in the hands of men, situating war in a male-dominated cultural materialist framework.[204] For example, almost 20 years ago Joshua Goldstein stated that "of about 23 million soldiers in today's uniformed standing armies, about 97% are male (somewhat over 500,000 are women)", a total figure that has increased slightly over the years.[205] As another example, Tazreena Sajjad finds that whereas guerilla movements enlist and depend on women, they are expected, alongside being a combatant, to fulfil conventional gender roles, such as that of a nurturer.[206] The author also discusses that the dynamics of the conflict, such as nationalist ideals behind freedom movements, still perpetuate male domination and gender inequality.[207]

Although making remarks to social and inter-related categories of men and women, related studies often discuss categorizations of 'masculinity' and 'femininity' as more applicable in the context of conflict and warfare. Drawing from the work of Raewyn Connell, both Kimberly Hutchings and Frank Barrett use the concept of hegemonic masculinity as a dominant mode in war and conflict, defined as "a particular idealized image of masculinity in relation to which images of femininity and other

[204] R. B. Ferguson. 'Masculinity and War'. *Current Anthropology* 62 (S23) (2021), S108–S120.
[205] According to World Bank data from 2018, the total number of armed personnel was 27,642,295, https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/MS.MIL.TOTL.P1. J. Goldstein. 'War and Gender: How Gender Shapes the War System and Vice Versa'. In C. Ember and M. Ember (eds.), *Men and Women in the World's Cultures* (vol. 1) (New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, 2003), 107.
[206] T. Sajjad. 'Women Guerillas: Marching Toward True Freedom? An Analysis of Women's Experiences in the Frontlines of Guerilla Warfare and in the Post-war Period'. *Agenda* 18 (59) (2004), 4–16.
[207] Ibid.

masculinities are marginalized and subordinated".[208] In this framework, Hutchings points out the inter-relatedness of masculinity and war as difficult to discuss one without the other, and finds that "the crucial characteristic that is shared by all masculinity discourses is that they are not feminine".[209] Among others, Maya Eichler takes the concept further, identifying how military service, combat in particular, configurates military masculinity that is acquired and proven, and formulates a pattern that perpetuates violence at the level of international relations.[210]

In the context of conflict-related humanitarianism – which is the dominant modality – the interplay of masculinity and femininity is evident. Whereas masculinity drives conflict, femininity is at the receiving end of the crisis. Men are, indeed, the majority of the combatants and, thus, the casualties of combats.[211] However, the spillover effect outside the immediate battle has dire consequences for 'non-male' and 'non-masculine' groups, out of which I touch upon four ramifications. First, women, along with children, represent the bulk of conflict-related civilian casualties, including post-conflict settings.[212] Second, gender-based violence,[213] maternal deaths,[214] and female refugees and displaced people all interconnect with conflict with an increasing trend.[215] Third, globally women bear a disproportionate care responsibility at family and community levels, which gets acutely affected by wars, disasters, and emergencies with a worsening effect.[216] Fourth and finally, existing vulnerabilities in the realm of

[208] R. Connell. *Masculinities* (2nd ed.) (London: Routledge, 2020 [1995]); K. Hutchings. 'Making Sense of Masculinity and War'. *Men and Masculinities* 10 (4) (2008), 389–404; F. J. Barrett. 'The Organizational Construction of Hegemonic Masculinity: The Case of the US Navy'. *Gender, Work, and Organization* 3 (3) (1996), 79.
[209] Hutchings. 'Making Sense of Masculinity and War', 401.
[210] M. Eichler. 'Militarized Masculinities in International Relations'. *Brown Journal of World Affairs* 21 (2014), 81.
[211] M. Buvinic et al. 'Violent Conflict and Gender Inequality: an Overview'. *The World Bank Research Observer* 28 (1) (2013), 110–138; Goldstein, 'War and Gender'.
[212] C. Ormhaug et al. 'Armed Conflict Deaths Disaggregated by Gender'. *PRIO Paper* 23 (2009).
[213] In the context of OCHA, see also OCHA. *OCHA On Message: Gender-Based Violence*. United Nations (2019), 1–3. Retrieved from https://www.unocha.org/sites/unocha/files/OOM_GBV_in_emergencies.pdf.
[214] According to UN Security Council report of S/2021/827, an estimate of 60 per cent of preventable maternal deaths take place in humanitarian crises or fragile settings such as conflict and war. Retrieved from https://undocs.org/S/2021/827.
[215] Gasseer et al., 'Status of Women and Infants in Complex Humanitarian Emergencies'; Buvinic et al., 'Violent Conflict and Gender Inequality'; M. Ticktin. 'The Gendered Human of Humanitarianism: Medicalising and Politicising Sexual Violence'. *Gender & History* 23 (2011), 250–265.
[216] F. N. Aolain. 'Women, Vulnerability, and Humanitarian Emergencies'. *Michigan Journal of Gender & Law* 18 (2011), 1.

gender inequality can be exacerbated and new ones created in the context of humanitarian crises.[217] Against these "first and second-round impacts" of violent conflicts, women and children – the 'non-male' – can be argued to bear a significant, if not the greatest, burden of conflict, inclusive of long-term consequences.[218] Gender, therefore, matters when considering humanitarian intervention measures, also conclusive of humanitarian diplomacy.

Moving onto my second, primary context of why gender matters in humanitarian diplomacy, I turn to the humanitarian diplomats themselves. Against these gendered realities occurring at a humanitarian crisis, I argue that the humanitarian system is currently ill-equipped to respond in a gender-sensitive manner, including at the UN. Julie Lafrenière, Caroline Sweetman and Theresia Thylin discuss that "[t]he specific needs of women and girls continue to be inadequately addressed by humanitarian responders" and that "[a]n intersectional feminist approach is badly needed".[219] As for the causes, the authors raise policymakers' and practitioners' lack of understanding of gendered humanitarian needs and their underlying gender inequality dynamics in a given society or context, which further occurs in tandem with inconsistent gender mainstreaming and gender-sensitive programming of humanitarian responses.[220] I would like to push these notions further – I claim that the secondary context of gender-inequal humanitarian action is directly affected by the primary context of gender inequality among humanitarians themselves. Humanitarian practitioners represent and operate as a male-dominated structure for which they are a priori ill-equipped for gender-balanced humanitarian action. This structure is affected by the above-mentioned masculinity of conflict, violence, and war as the immediate

[217] In the context of OCHA, see also OCHA. *OCHA On Message: Gender in Humanitarian Action*. United Nations (2019), 1–2. Retrieved from https://www.unocha.org/sites/unocha/files/OOM%20Template%20gender%20-%2005Aug2019%20%28002%29.pdf. E. Zhukova. 'Vulnerability'. In A. De Lauri (ed.), *Humanitarianism: Keywords* (Leiden: Brill, 2020), 230–232.
[218] Buvinic et al., 'Violent Conflict and Gender Inequality', 110; Gasseer et al., 'Status of Women and Infants in Complex Humanitarian Emergencies'.
[219] J. Lafrenière et al. 'Introduction: Gender, Humanitarian Action and Crisis Response'. *Gender & Development* 27 (2) (2019), 188.
[220] Lafrenière et al., 'Gender, Humanitarian Action and Crisis Response'.

settings of most of humanitarian action, but also by humanitarianism and diplomacy as the respective, masculine sub-fields of humanitarian diplomacy, both discussed next.

When looking into the humanitarian practitioners' side – aid providers – certain gendered norms and stereotypes come into place. Whereas humanitarians can be conceptualized and constructed through feminine roles, such as those of a nurturer, caregiver, and potential mother, masculinity is deeply embedded in the overarching structure.[221] Masculine narratives of 'risk' and 'security' dominate in humanitarian settings, further suppressing the realm of 'personal' or 'private', often seen as feminine spheres of life.[222] Gemma Houldey discusses the masculinization of humanitarian aid in the field work context, in which humanitarian practitioners need to appear unaffected by crises, insecurities, and dangers related to work.[223] Humanitarians must also showcase their availability for a 24-hour, seven-days-a-week working culture, which includes few and remote family ties, and an apparent lack of primary caretaker responsibilities.[224] Similarly, and specifically in the context of the UN, Ingvild Bode finds that field experiences represent an important promotion criteria, posing a challenge for female professionals: "A particular version of hegemonic masculinity can be seen to emerge here, casting the ideal UN professional as strong, independent, courageous, and highly mobile".[225] Not only are these types of masculine assumptions invisible, but also visible. Helen Seeger discusses this among humanitarian workers:

> the prestige, admiration and recognition of a specific individual is directly proportional to how authentically grubby, sweaty, sunburnt and sleep-deprived

[221] F. Du Pasquier. 'Gender Diversity Dynamics in Humanitarian Negotiations: The International Committee of the Red Cross as a Case Study on the Frontlines of Armed Conflicts'. *Harvard Humanitarian Initiative, Advanced Training Program on Humanitarian Action* (Humanitarian Negotiation Working Paper Series, Paper #1) (2016), 1–22. Retrieved from https://www.alnap.org/system/files/content/resource/files/main/atha-gender-diversity-dynamics-in-humanitarian-negotiations.pdf.
[222] N. Fraser. *Fortunes of Feminism: From State-Managed Capitalism to Neoliberal Crisis* (Verso Books, 2013); G. Houldey. 'Humanitarian Response and Stress in Kenya: Gendered Problems and their Implications'. *Gender & Development* 27 (2) (2019), 337–353; Yuval-Davis, *Gender and Nation.*
[223] Houldey, 'Humanitarian Response and Stress in Kenya'.
[224] Houldey, 'Humanitarian Response and Stress in Kenya', referencing P. Redfield. *Life in Crisis: The Ethical Journey of Doctors Without Borders* (Berkley CA: University of California Press, 2013).
[225] Bode. 'Women or Leaders?', 364.

> he or she is. If the layer of dirt and sweat has been accrued in more than one country, so much the better.[226]

In this type of working culture, professional humanitarian women, inter alia, face stereotypes of an aid worker representing commonly men, and grapple responding to the challenges of a work-family life balance in their own private caretaker roles.[227]

Humanitarian Women's Network (HWN), a collective of more than 11,000 women in 75 countries, conducted a survey in 2016 with the aim of better understanding women's experiences working in the humanitarian field. From a total of 1,005 respondents from more than 70 organizations, the survey details patterns of discrimination, harassment, and sexual aggression and assault based on gender.[228] For example, 36 per cent of the respondents have experienced gender-based discrimination in getting a humanitarian portfolio or promotion in the field. The majority, 69 per cent, have had their physical appearance or clothing commented on by their male colleagues. Almost half, 48 per cent of the respondent humanitarian female workers have also been touched in an unwanted way by a male colleague. All these examples represent behaviour among humanitarian practitioners – the primary context – thus not extending the gendered and gendering experiences to external stakeholders and activities – the secondary context – such as the humanitarian aid delivery itself. These experiences embody the masculinity premise of the humanitarian field, at its worst translating into hostility and aggression towards women and femininity. Men enjoy privileges and seemingly, unconsciously or consciously, many seek to showcase male dominance and

[226] H. Seeger. 'The Field: The Ever Receding Vanishing Point. In K. Hoppe (ed.), *In Chasing Misery: An Anthology of Essays by Women in Humanitarian Responses, edited by Kelsey Hoppe* (North Charleston SC: CreateSpace Independent Publishing, 2014), 31.
[227] Melissa Philips and others in K. Hoppe. (ed.). *Chasing Misery: an Anthology of Essays by Women in Humanitarian Responses* (North Charleston: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2014); G. Bahng. 'Professionalizing Humanitarian Work for the Woman Worker'. (2013).
[228] HWN. *Humanitarian Women's Network: Full Survey Results* (HWN, 2016). Retrieved from https://www.humanitarianwomensnetwork.org/about.

patriarchical behaviour to subordinate women and femininity – a relation without which masculine domination would seize to exist.[229]

Then, humanitarian diplomacy has another semantic field, diplomacy, which represents a masculine field that has been historically built on the inclusion of men and exclusion of women.[230] Whereas women have been diplomats and diplomatic figures throughout human history, and their numbers as ambassadors has increased in the last two-and-a-half decades, still the global majority representation, at 85 per cent, are male ambassadors.[231] When expanding the concept of a 'diplomatic space' to also include other nearby, outside-state spheres, such as peace-mediations and international negotiation, the majority of the representatives continue to be men.[232] For example, according to UN Women, women represented, on average, 13 per cent of negotiators, 6 per cent of mediators, and 6 per cent of signatories in major peace processes worldwide between 1992 and 2019.[233] Relevant to the context of this dissertation, in the UN-led or co-led peace processes only 23 per cent of the delegates were women.[234] Diplomacy, therefore, in its state-related and non-state-related conceptualizations, represents first and foremost men and a masculine occupation.

Not only do diplomats embody, most commonly and acceptedly, a male body, but diplomatic practices also have gendered patterns.[235] Catriona Standfield explains how diplomacy gets reproduced as a masculine field through gendered diplomatic practices.[236] These include practices of "incorporation" and "intimacy": Incorporation refers to a historical pattern of husband-and-wife diplomatic teams, in which the male ambassador is accompanied by the wife and her centrality in "representational

[229] Enloe, 'All the Men Are in the Militias, All the Women Are Victims'.
[230] Aggestam and Towns. 'The Gender Turn in Diplomacy'.
[231] H. McCarthy. *Women of the World: The Rise of the Female Diplomat* (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2014); McCarthy and Southern. 'Women, Gender, and Diplomacy; Towns and Niklasson. 'Gender, International Status, and Ambassador Appointments'.
[232] Aggestam and Svensson. 'Where are the Women in Peace Mediation?'
[233] UN Women, Facts and Figures: Women, Peace, and Security, retrieved from https://www.unwomen.org/en/what-we-do/peace-and-security/facts-and-figures#notes.
[234] UN Security Council, Report of the Secretary-General on Women and Peace and Security, S/2021/827. Retrieved from https://undocs.org/S/2021/827.
[235] See also I. B. Neumann. 'The Body of the Diplomat'. *European Journal of International Relations* 14 (4) (2008), 671–695.
[236] C. Standfield. 'Gendering the Practice Turn in Diplomacy'. *European Journal of International Relations* 26 (1_suppl) (2020), 140–165.

functions, specifically through reproduction and homemaking".[237] Intimacy refers to "warm informality", such as diplomats' private homes becoming places for meetings and informal interaction.[238] Particularly through diplomatic intimacy, the author sees that diplomacy carries strong homosocial elements in which the company of one's own gender is preferred, and which builds "upon a dichotomous construction of gender, in which people clearly embody masculine or feminine habitus".[239]

Therefore, I argue that humanitarian diplomacy must be understood as a gendered, mainly masculine field through its foundations in masculine structures of humanitarianism and diplomacy. Its primary context, humanitarian diplomats, engage in processes of negotiation, persuasion, and strategizing, among other diplomatic practices, which have been historically spaces of public domain that men and masculinities have occupied. Simultaneously, in their secondary context of humanitarian action, these practices aim to advance access to and aid delivery of resources and protection for vulnerable populations worst impacted by crises, conflicts, and emergencies – gendered constructs themselves as discussed above, heavily impacting the 'non-male', such as civilian women. Thus, gender is a fundamental category of analysis in humanitarian diplomacy, also ontologically. The areas and spaces in which humanitarian diplomacy takes place, along with the humanitarian diplomats themselves as gendered actors, need to be analysed through gender lenses to be appropriately examined. Whereas gender as a defining characteristic of limitations and opportunities in humanitarian diplomacy is elaborated in detail in the third article, I next turn to a literature review and state-of-the-art discussion of humanitarian diplomacy to illustrate the phenomenon more broadly.[240]

[237] Ibid, 154.
[238] Ibid, 155.
[239] Ibid, 156.
[240] It, however, lacks gender analyses in its current conjuncture, as my third included article represents a first intervention in the area.

4. State of the Art – Humanitarian Diplomacy and Humanitarianism as Diplomacy

In its undefined nature, humanitarian diplomacy remains vacant for actor-specific interpretation and usage. In this section I explore this conceptual vacancy and argue that the current state of the art in humanitarian diplomacy can be seen as a representation of two main modi operandi: humanitarian diplomacy and humanitarianism *as* diplomacy, both discussions constituting their own subsections herein. I borrow this distinction from Jacinta O'Hagan, who discusses the separation between humanitarian diplomacy – humanitarian practitioners/institutes domain – and humanitarianism *as* diplomacy – states' domain.[241] The author argues that when humanitarian diplomacy is at odds with national interests of the state, an option (even a likely one) for a state is to drop out from the related diplomacy. Distinctively, such choice is not available for humanitarians advancing humanitarian interests, creating an impetus for diplomatic engagement of their own.

To continue, O'Hagan states that "humanitarian diplomacy is ultimately defined by treating the interests of those in need as primary, whereas when humanitarianism becomes a vehicle for broader diplomatic objectives, it is the national interests that gain precedence".[242] I concur that within the international community state and non-state actors position inherently in different ways with different powers, outreach, and focus. Next, I discuss humanitarian diplomacy from this view, simultaneously providing a literature overview according to the two categorizations.[243]

[241] O'Hagan, 'Australia and the Promise and the Perils of Humanitarian Diplomacy'.
[242] Ibid, 667.
[243] See also the discussion on 'international community' in subsection 3.1 Disciplinary Location: International Relations.

4.1 Humanitarianism as Diplomacy – State Perspectives

The mix of humanitarian diplomacy, state diplomacy, humanitarian operational activities, and wider questions of war and peace presents a complex puzzle.[244] States represent their multifarious national interests when engaging in humanitarian issues, and these state approaches to humanitarianism as diplomacy can closely relate to foreign and security policies. Furthermore, states formulate an operational scene for humanitarian issues that differs manifestly from humanitarian actors and institutions, as elaborated by Kelly-Kate Pease: "The state remains the greatest protector of, and the greatest threat to, internationally recognized human rights [and humanitarian principles]".[245]

Despite being more applicable to the idea of humanitarianism *as* diplomacy, states themselves often refer to the wording 'humanitarian diplomacy' in relation to their own activities, which I shall next demonstrate to vary on a large scale.[246] The first time the term 'humanitarian diplomacy' was notably referenced and published in the English language dates back to 1912 in relation to the United States, as discovered by Michael Clark in his doctoral thesis.[247] However, perhaps the most prominent state actor that has integrated humanitarian diplomacy into its policy framework is Turkey. The state links humanitarian diplomacy as a defining approach to its foreign policy, in which Turkey's first priority is consideration towards Turkish citizens, and its secondary priorities are towards global solidarity.[248] Turkey hosts the largest number of refugees worldwide and its close proximity to crises in the Middle East, such as its neighbour Syria, makes the country a unique case. More than 3.6 million Syrians are refugees in Turkey, and given Turkey's proximity to Europe and refugees' willingness

[244] C. M.Constantinou. 'In Pursuit of Crisis Diplomacy'. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy* 10 (1) (2015), 29–34.
[245] Pease, *Human Rights and Humanitarian Diplomacy*, 18.
[246] While this section gathers an overview of examples that illustrate state-specific approaches, they simultaneously open up many under-explored research avenues for comparative studies. Whereas these inquiries fall outside of the research focus and scope of this dissertation, the cases of Turkey, the UAE, and Qatar have been included the HUMDIPLO research project framework, which this PhD dissertation also belongs to. For more resources, see the HUMDIPLO project site, available at https://www.cmi.no/projects/2178-humanitarian-diplomacy.
[247] M. Clark. *Humanitarian Multi-Track Diplomacy: Conceptualizing the Definitive, Particular, and Critical Role of Diplomatic Function in Humanitarian Action* (PhD, University of Groningen, 2018).
[248] Davutoğlu, 'Turkey's Humanitarian Diplomacy'.

to access various countries on the continent, Turkey also engages in humanitarian diplomacy with the European Union (EU) relations in mind.[249]

On the EU side, humanitarian diplomacy has not been consolidated as a central concept. The European Commission's main arm for humanitarian action, the Department for Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations, publishes an annual 'General Guidelines for Operational Priorities on Humanitarian Aid', and the last time these referred directly to humanitarian diplomacy was in 2018 in liaison to "Syria Regional Crisis".[250] In particular, the strategy placed humanitarian diplomacy in parallel with advocacy for 'classic' humanitarian themes, such as protection of civilians.[251] Despite not frequently integrating the concept into its strategies, Daniel Fiott observes that the EU conducts humanitarian diplomacy:

> for the dual purpose of awareness-raising for a particular humanitarian issue and for increasing "awareness, understanding and support on the part of Union citizens for humanitarian aid issues and the role which the European Union plays in the field."[252]

Several EU and European Economic Area (EEA) countries integrate humanitarian diplomacy as a concept into their policies on humanitarian action. For example, Spain is set to develop a National Humanitarian Diplomacy Strategy,

[249] M. Altunısık. 'Turkey's Humanitarian Diplomacy: The AKP Model'. *CMI Brief* 2019:08 (2019) (Bergen, Norway) 1–5. Retrieved from https://www.cmi.no/publications/6973-turkeys-humanitarian-diplomacy-the-akp-model; Sadik and Zorba, 'Humanitarian Diplomacy for Syrian Refugees and Turkey-EU Relations'.
[250] Annual priorities available from 2011 to 2021, retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/echo/who/accountability/strategy_en. European Commission. General Guidelines on *Operational Priorities for Humanitarian Aid in 2018* (SWD (2017) 464 final) (Brussels: European Commission, 2017), 29. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/echo/who/accountability/strategy_en.
[251] Direct quote: 'Humanitarian Diplomacy (Advocacy) will continue to be central to ensure respect of IHL [international humanitarian law], enhanced access and protection of civilians' (European Commission, 2017, 29).
[252] Fiott, 'Humanitarian Diplomacy', 4, citing European Commission. *General Guidelines for Operational Priorities on Humanitarian Aid in 2015* (SWD (2014) 345 final) (Brussels: European Commission, 2014), 38. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/echo/who/accountability/strategy_en.

underlining humanitarian affairs as a "permanent element of Spain's foreign action".[253] Norway's humanitarian strategy entails its own section for humanitarian diplomacy under the heading of 'Effective Humanitarian Response: Implementing Norway's Humanitarian Policy'.[254] Germany holds the creation of humanitarian space and improving humanitarian access as one of its priorities for foreign action in humanitarian assistance, and sees humanitarian diplomacy as a central mean in achieving these aims.[255] For the Netherlands, humanitarian diplomacy is a means for increasing the effectiveness of the international humanitarian system, and the country sees, for example, its engagement in the Human Rights Council against breaches of IHL as humanitarian diplomacy.[256] Similarly, France strategizes humanitarian diplomacy as a way to increase compliance with IHL.[257]

Alongside its rising popularity in Europe, humanitarian diplomacy has gained national interest elsewhere in the world, such as in the Middle East and Asia-Pacific. In the Middle East, globally notable humanitarian donors such as the UAE and Qatar are also employing humanitarian diplomacy in their own ways. Deniz Gökalp argues that the UAE uses humanitarian diplomacy to counterbalance an otherwise militaristic orientation to the country's foreign policy, such as those exemplified in measures against Islamist fundamentalism.[258] The UAE directs its humanitarian assistance towards Yemen, Jordan, Syria, Sudan and Egypt, among others, and hence seeks to accommodate national security and political concerns in conflict areas and countries

[253] Spain. *Spain's Humanitarian Diplomacy*. (Madrid, 2018), 1. Retrieved from http://www.exteriores.gob.es/Portal/es/Documents/version%20ingles/20190305%20web%20Diplomacia%20Humanitaria%20(%20Ingle%CC%81s).pdf. See also, Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo (AECID, Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation). *Spanish Cooperation's Humanitarian Action Strategy 2019–2026* (Madrid: AECID, 2019). Retrieved from https://www.aecid.es/Centro-Documentacion/Documentos/201905%20Estrategia%20ingl%C3%A9s.pdf.
[254] Norway. *Norway's Humanitarian Strategy: An Effective and Integrated Approach* (Oslo, 2018). Retrieved from https://www.regjeringen.no/en/dokumenter/strategi-for-norsk-humanitar-politikk/id2608151/.
[255] Germany. *Federal Foreign Office Strategy for Humanitartian Assistance Abroad 2019–2023* (Berlin, 2019). Retrieved from https://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/blob/282228/3cfd87de36f30bb61eed542249997631/strategie-huhi-englisch-data.pdf.
[256] Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2019), Dutch Development Results, 'Humanitarian Aid', retrieved from https://www.dutchdevelopmentresults.nl/2019/theme/humanitarian-aid.
[257] France. *France's Humanitarian Strategy* (Paris, 2018). Retrieved from https://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/en/french-foreign-policy/emergency-humanitarian-action/france-s-humanitarian-strategy-2018-2022/.
[258] Gökalp, 'The UAE's Humanitarian Diplomacy'.

affected by the so-called 'Arab Spring' beginning from 2011.[259] Whereas Qatar has not integrated the term into its foreign policy, it continues to follow its autonomous and sovereign style of foreign diplomacy in humanitarian engagement.[260] This also extends into the realm of mediation in which Qatar presents a neutral, third-party mediator in humanitarian negotiation processes given its financial and political independence.[261]

In Asia-Pacific, humanitarian diplomacy has become a way for China to secure and advance geo-political and geo-economic interests in disaster relief and post-disaster reconstruction.[262] For example, in post-earthquake Nepal since 2015, China's humanitarian diplomacy and involvement has led to several national advances. These include bilateral partnerships, increased engagement with the international humanitarian community, and instrumentalized international relations towards China's interests.[263] Alistair D. B. Cook notes that Southeast Asian region is the world's most exposed when it comes to natural hazards, thus the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) has developed its humanitarian diplomacy expertise in relation to them.[264] In particular, and in seeking localized leadership to humanitarian responses, ASEAN's humanitarian diplomacy focuses on three dimensions: "ASEAN as a platform for engagement, sectoral approaches and a diversifying multi-stakeholder environment".[265] The region's humanitarian diplomatic engagement also has security policy elements. For example, in relation to Rohingyas' in Myanmar, Indonesia has conducted humanitarian diplomacy with an interest to intervene and prevent ethnic conflicts as a stabilizing measure for security concerns in Southeast Asia.[266] Yet, as a trend, the region's humanitarian diplomacy is closely linked with prevention and reduction of humanitarian emergencies due to natural disasters. As an example, Australia has worked closely with Indonesia sharing these types of interest, simultaneously indicating a conjuncture of humanitarian diplomacy and disaster

[259] Gökalp, 'The UAE's Humanitarian Diplomacy'.
[260] Barakat, 'Priorities and challenges of Qatar's Humanitarian Diplomacy'.
[261] Ibid.
[262] Lin, 'China's Evolving Humanitarian Diplomacy'.
[263] Ibid.
[264] Cook, 'Humanitarian Diplomacy in ASEAN'.
[265] Ibid, 1.
[266] A. Setiawan and H. Hamka. *Role of Indonesian Humanitarian Diplomacy toward Rohingya Crisis in Myanmar*. Paper presented at the 2nd International Conference on Social Sciences (Jakarta: ICSS, 2020).

diplomacy.[267] Similarly, New Zealand provides a clear geographic interest for its humanitarian diplomacy. It states that the country:

> actively engages in multilateral humanitarian diplomacy at an international level, and regionally in the Pacific and Southeast Asia. We leverage the convening power of international organisations and institutions to advance New Zealand's interests and to encourage multilateral agencies to deliver better outcomes, especially in the Pacific.[268]

These state examples across Europe, the Middle East, Asia, and the Pacific exhibit intersections of states regarding their humanitarian diplomatic interests and national foreign and security policies. Humanitarianism *as* diplomacy is a way for states to weave national interests into international contexts, whether they represent a means to an altruistic or instrumental end. In their critical inspection of governing a humanitarian crisis, Mariella Pandolfi and Phillip Rousseau similarly note: "Engaged as it now is in a sort of parallel diplomacy, humanitarianism itself has been increasingly co-opted and integrated into the agendas of states".[269] In light of these state illustrations, I argue that humanitarianism *as* diplomacy conducted by the states cannot be treated as equivalent to humanitarian diplomacy of humanitarian actors in humanitarian organizations and institutions. This humanitarian system vis-à-vis the international community of states operates based on different logics, in which "one system [is] driven by the logic of vital state interests versus another driven by logic of humanity".[270] Next, I elaborate further how humanitarian diplomacy, a prerogative of non-state humanitarian actors, manifests according to current research knowledge.

[267] O'Hagan, 'Australia and the Promise and the Perils of Humanitarian Diplomacy'.
[268] New Zealand. *New Zealand's Humanitarian Action Policy* (Wellington, 2019), 15. Retrieved from https://www.mfat.govt.nz/assets/Aid-Prog-docs/Policy/MFAT-Humanitarian-Action-Policy-2019.pdf.
[269] Pandolfi, M., and P. Rousseau, P. 'Governing the Crisis: A Critical Genealogy of Humanitarianism'. In A. De Lauri (ed.), *The Politics of Humanitarianism: Power, Ideology and Aid* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2016), 22.
[270] Barnett and Weiss, *Humanitarianism Contested*, 88.

4.2 Humanitarian Diplomacy – Art of Humanitarian Organizations and Institutions

Humanitarian diplomacy is recognized as a part of humanitarian action. It is its own, distinctive form of diplomacy that "encompass[es] the activities carried out by *humanitarian organizations* to obtain the space from political and military authorities within which to function with integrity'.[271] As these authorities also include states, humanitarian diplomacy is rests on the idea that humanitarian diplomacy is conducted by humanitarian practitioners and institutions. It is distinctively separate from traditional, state diplomacies and diplomats, even in the case where the latter deal with humanitarian issues and operate in humanitarian contexts.[272]

Whereas antagonists for conceptualizing humanitarians as diplomats exist, I concur that diplomacy and its means have been a part of the humanitarian mission since the beginning of humanitarian history.[273] As established earlier in this dissertation, humanitarians do not operate in a vacuum, rather they position as directly relational to other actors, events and circumstances occurring in the world. In advancing humanitarian interests in an otherwise non-humanitarian world, humanitarian practitioners pursue to influence others by means of dialogue, negotiation, compromise, and expressions of amity and enmity – classic elements of diplomacy. However, humanitarians are not on a level playing field in comparison to other stakeholders (e.g., political authorities), thus they "typically negotiate from a position of weakness".[274] For this reason, I argue that their tactic – the art of humanitarian diplomacy – differs from those of others and should be approached and understood distinctively as its own manifestation and set of circumstances.

Like state actor diversity, humanitarian diplomacy practised by humanitarian organizations is a diverse phenomenon, which currently has as many approaches as there are humanitarian actors engaged in it. It is a "multi-institutional and multi-

[271] Smith and Minear, *Humanitarian Diplomacy*, 1, emphasis added.
[272] Smith and Minear, *Humanitarian Diplomacy*.
[273] See, for example, O. J. Sending. 'United by Difference: Diplomacy as a Thin Culture'. *International Journal* 66 (3) (2011), 643–659.
[274] Clements, *Humanitarian Negotiations with Armed Groups*, 2; see also Smith and Minear, *Humanitarian Diplomacy*.

functional" modality of modern diplomacy, in which addition to multiple actors, humanitarian diplomacy operates both in "risk prevention and crisis management".[275] The plurality of its manifestations requires a contextual and actor-specific interpretation in discovering its meaning and usage. However, there are certain patterns that can be drawn across these actors. I argue that these include at least four elements: humanitarian diplomacy's operational levels; its manifestation and expression as both public and private; its engagement with official and non-official actors; and its absence from having a political authority or master.

First, humanitarian diplomacy occurs on several international and national levels of power. Whereas humanitarian diplomacy often locates within "institutionalized diplomatic protocols and norms", it also manifests as "field diplomacy".[276] These levels can be understood as "capital D Diplomacy and small [d] diplomacy": 'Whereas "capital D" Diplomacy tends to be high-level and formal, "small [d]" diplomacy is more terrestrial – even pedestrian.[277] It covers a host of humanitarian functions of a more day-to-day sort.' Instead of viewing humanitarian diplomacy as either/or,[278] humanitarian diplomacy can be seen more accurately as both and cross-cutting. Phillippe Régnier has offered a categorization for these levels as the following:

[275] Régnier, 'The Emerging Concept of Humanitarian Diplomacy', 1212–1214.
[276] Field diplomacy is also relational to Andrew Cooper's and Jérémie Cornut's concept of 'frontline diplomacy', in which diplomacy is essentially interested in activities at the field level, and gets shaped by those, Cooper and Cornut, 'The Changing Practices of Frontline Diplomacy', 300. Pease, *Human Rights and Humanitarian Diplomacy*, 62, 157.
[277] Smith and Minear, *Humanitarian Diplomacy*, 11–12.
[278] For example, Elise Rousseau and Achille Sommo Pende conclude that "unlike state humanitarian diplomacy, UN humanitarian diplomacy occurs at a very operational level" (Rousseau and Pende, 'Humanitarian Diplomacy', 264). In my own research with a focus on the UN's humanitarian diplomacy, I conclude that, like many other actors' humanitarian diplomacy, the organization's engagement cuts across all available levels, and these engagements depend on and complement one another directly. In addition, the authors' conceptualization of "state humanitarian diplomacy" (ibid, 263) can be seen as confusing given the tensions between humanitarian diplomacy and state diplomacy directed towards humanitarian issues, as discussed in the previous subsection.

- The international level (the global architecture of humanitarian governance);
- The national and local level (e.g., national governments with civil and military resources);
- The intermediate level (decentralized actors, e.g., local authorities); and
- The field level (the frontline actors in charge of operational implementation).[279]

The humanitarian diplomatic engagements at these various levels are influential and complementary to one another. Actions and events at the humanitarian operational frontline shape high-level diplomatic engagement and vice versa. At the field level, a common activity of humanitarian negotiation is interdependent, and at times synonymous, with humanitarian diplomacy:

> Indeed, some of the tactics deployed by humanitarian negotiators constitute humanitarian diplomatic action. Equally, humanitarian diplomacy in isolation from humanitarian negotiation is disconnected from field realities and unlikely to translate into substantive changes in the lives of those it purports to serve.[280]

Second, humanitarian diplomacy manifests in forms of both public and private diplomacies.[281] Humanitarian diplomacy can benefit from public advocacy and public approaches to humanitarian persuasion, such as through the means of digital diplomacy, yet often its more foundational approach is by private means. Through nurturing relationship-building, trust, and confidential dialogues, humanitarian diplomacy can reach actors and stakeholders that otherwise would shy away from

[279] Régnier, 'The Emerging Concept of Humanitarian Diplomacy', 1219–1222.
[280] Clements, *Humanitarian Negotiations with Armed Groups*, 137.
[281] See also 'Humanitarian Diplomacy: Interview with Jan Egeland' available at https://www.cmi.no/publications/7373-humanitarian-diplomacy-interview-with-jan-egeland. Slim, 'Humanitarian Diplomacy'.

public involvement or act differently in public domains. Here is also where some of the organizational differences present themselves. For example, historically MSF separated from the Red Cross movement for these silent policies and practices. Today, MSF still holds the act of 'témoignage' ('testimony' or 'bearing witness') as an integral part of their engagement as speaking out and publicly raising awareness on abuses and restricting policies.[282]

Third, humanitarian diplomacy is non-discriminatory in that it includes official and non-official actors.[283] As humanitarian diplomacy covers themes such as protection of civilians and refugees, conjecture of militarism and humanitarianism, and practical and ideological dealings with armed groups, its stakeholders represent a broad spectrum.[284] Humanitarian organizations and institutions operate in landscapes of humanitarianism, which is, to a certain degree, characterized by impromptu negotiations, emergencies, urgency and a continuously changing set of actors. Stakeholders that are seen as key constituencies depend on the context, for which humanitarian diplomatic engagements interact with a range of actors. These include, but are not limited to, governments, civilian entities, humanitarian beneficiaries, public and private militaries, non-state armed groups, terrorist groups, tribal groups, religious groups, media, local communities, other humanitarian actors, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), intergovernmental organizations, regional bodies, international bodies, et cetera.

Fourth, as humanitarian diplomacy does not convert to the international community of states, it lacks a "political master" or an authority in a similar sense.[285] Humanitarian diplomacy is a practitioner-led diplomatic engagement, in which humanitarian diplomats do not stand in parallel with state diplomats, as the latter represent their political masters. As such, humanitarian diplomacy operates on an ethos

[282] For more information, see MSF 'How we work: Temoignage, bearing witness and speaking out', available at https://www.msf.org/how-we-work. For a historical reflection on MSF's humanitarian diplomacy, see Moreels, 'Humanitarian Diplomacy'.
[283] Régnier, 'The Emerging Concept of Humanitarian Diplomacy'; Slim, 'Humanitarian Diplomacy'.
[284] Smith and Minear, *Humanitarian Diplomacy*.
[285] Fiott, 'Humanitarian Diplomacy', 5.

of cosmopolitanism within international politics.[286] The cosmopolitan idea driving traditional conceptualization of humanitarianism, in which human beings are worthy of universal and equal value, has shaped much of the Western political imagination.[287] In this sense, humanitarian diplomacy has similarities to human rights diplomacy. Both capture "the bargaining, negotiating, and advocating process involved in promoting and protecting international human rights and humanitarian principles".[288] Neither are confined in the Westphalian state system, albeit notably impacted by the states in possibilities, challenges, and limitations. Human rights deemed as universal, egalitarian, and inalienable features of humanity request the utmost respect where the need is the direst, often found in humanitarian settings. Rights, such as the right to life and freedom, and life without torture, cruelty, and discrimination, are threatened in crisis situations. IHL, which seeks to limit the effect of armed conflict, is measured by the same values and framework which human rights build upon – entitlement to respect of lives in their physical and mental integrity.

Finally, and in addition to these four elements, humanitarian diplomacy often necessitates similar skills from the humanitarian practitioners, in this dissertation referred as 'humanitarian diplomats'. These include, but are not limited to:

> an understanding of international humanitarian law [IHL], a sense of the drivers and dynamics of a given conflict in its own cultural setting; an ability to provide leadership across the diverse and often inchoate humanitarian sector; a familiarity with past efforts, successful or otherwise, to open up and maintain a humanitarian space; a battery of interpersonal qualities; and a keen sense of timing.[289]

[286] Fiott, 'Humanitarian Diplomacy'.
[287] M. Nussbaum. *The Cosmopolitan Tradition: a Noble but Flawed Ideal* (Cambridge MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2019).
[288] Pease, *Human Rights and Humanitarian Diplomacy*, 1.
[289] Smith and Minear, *Humanitarian Diplomacy*, 28.

These types of skill are employed in the humanitarian diplomatic engagement of the practitioners – in other words, humanitarian diplomatic practices, discussed in detail in the first and second articles of this dissertation. Before the articles, as the second-to-last section of this introductory part of the dissertation, I elaborate my overall research strategy of integrating the different components of the study in a coherent and logical way – the research design.

5. Research Design

In this section, I delve into the research design and conduction of this study in detail. I begin by elaborating further on the choice of my case study, both with reference to the UN and OCHA. Later, I continue discussing technical details of the study in terms of the data collection and methodological choices that I have made in this dissertation, simultaneously framing and highlighting the conducted research in the realms of opportunities and limitations. I conclude this section with considerations on research ethics that have been applied throughout the study. To make these considerations transparent in how I have applied them during my research, I also add material to the appendix of this introductory part, such as the email invitation seeking research participation that I used when approaching potential interviewees, and the consent form for participation that was shared with all those who took part.

Before a detailed discussion on the case study, I wish to make a note to reader regarding the case study selection in relation to some of my ontological and phenomenological research assumptions. I see OCHA as an applicable example of humanitarian diplomacy conducted at the UN overall. However, I do not state this as conclusive of all manifestations of humanitarian diplomacy within the organization, as its funds, agencies, programmes, and entities operating in the UN humanitarian arm rely on their respective mandates for interventions. Also, for OCHA, its coordination role makes it distinctive. However, from a macro perspective and in relation to other actors, such as states, militaries, NGOs, and other non-UN actors, the humanitarian segments of the UN are more alike than they are not. Ultimately, they operate under the same organizational umbrella with shared ideology captured in the UN Charter, similar policy frameworks, and operational and funding patterns.[290]

The UN system's unity and distinctiveness in the international community of various actors is exemplified in initiatives such as 'Delivering as One' backed by the

[290] UN Charter is available at https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter.

UN General Assembly resolution A/60/1.[291] By focusing on "the unique experience and resources that the UN system brings to global issues", humanitarian assistance illustratively represents one area of the initiative.[292] Furthermore, this research has been conducted concomitantly with a UN System Reform, 'United to Reform', seeking to deepen collaboration across the UN system with stronger coordination, allowing a more comprehensive premise for shared interests and similar practices within its humanitarian action.[293]

5.1 Case Study Selection: The UN and OCHA

As discussed in the disciplinary location of this dissertation, the 'international community' is an essential part of humanitarianism in general and humanitarian diplomacy in particular. Cindy Collins and Thomas G. Weiss define the humanitarian actors within the international community more specifically, as:

> three categories: governments; international organizations, most particularly the United Nations and ECHO [The Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations, formerly known as the European Community Humanitarian Aid Office]; and nongovernmental organizations, such as CARE, the MSF, and the ICRC. The military, subsumed within the category of governments, is worthy of separate attention.[294]

[291] UN General Assembly 60 (1). (2005), *The 2005 World Summit Outcome*, retrieved from https://undocs.org/en/A/RES/60/1.
[292] UN General Assembly, retrieved from https://www.un.org/en/ga/deliveringasone/.
[293] For more information, see UN 'United to Reform', available at https://reform.un.org/content/development-reform.
[294] T. G. Weiss and C. Collins. *Humanitarian Challenges and Intervention: World Politics and the Dilemmas of Help* (Colorado: Westview Press, 1996), 40–41.

Further, in his distinction of central actors for humanitarian diplomacy, William Maley also notes that various parts of the UN represent major participants. Given its prominence in the humanitarian field and internationally as a central diplomatic platform, very little is known and documented about the UN's humanitarian diplomacy.[295] This lack of specific knowledge applies to both external and internal publications, in line with Leon Gordenker and Christer Jönsson's remarks regarding "knowledge about the UN" and "UN knowledge about the world".[296] Furthermore, limited scholarly attention has been paid to the UN's role in generating ideas.[297]

Despite the lack of its terminological prevalence, humanitarian diplomacy can be seen as having been a part of the UN for a long time,[298] arguably as long as the UN's humanitarianism has existed. Although the UN was originally mainly an American idea with a structure designed by American diplomats, the UN quickly became a central diplomatic body for the international community.[299] The organization uses diplomacy as both as an end and as a means, with the primary objective of conflict resolution by peaceful means.[300] Accordingly, the majority of what the UN does is on a diplomatic basis, including advancing the causes that it believes in, such as humanitarian beliefs.

There are several reasons why my focus of investigating the UN's humanitarian diplomacy is relevant for the research field of humanitarian diplomacy. First, UN agencies are expected to be present in complex humanitarian emergencies, and therefore need humanitarian diplomacy to gain access, support, and resources, among other enabling factors.[301] Second, the UN is among a handful of actors possessing the

[295] Maley, 'Humanitarians and Diplomats'. Some of the rare knowledge products on the topic include Smith and Minear, *Humanitarian Diplomacy*; M. Bowden and V. Metcalfe-Hough. 'Humanitarian Diplomacy and Protection Advocacy in an Age of Caution'. The Overseas Development Institute (ODI) (London: Humanitarian Policy Group, 2020), 1–17; and parts of Rousseau and Pende, 'Humanitarian Diplomacy'.
[296] L. Gordenker and C. Jönsson. 'Evolution in Knowledge and Norms'. In T. G. Weiss and S. Daws (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook on the United Nations* (2nd ed.) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), 105–108.
[297] The effort of bridging this gap in the UN's intellectual history, the United Nations Intellectual History Project (UNIHP) began in 1999 and completed its work in 2010 with seventeen published volumes. For more information, see http://unihp.org/. L. Emmerij. 'The History of Ideas: An Introduction to the United Nations Intellectual History Project'. *Forum for Development Studies* 32 (1) (2005), 9–20.
[298] Minear in Smith and Minear, *Humanitarian Diplomacy*, 7–35.
[299] S. Meisler. *United Nations: A History* (New York: Grove Press, 2011); B. Fassbender. *The United Nations Charter as the Constitution of the International Community* (Leiden: Brill, 2009).
[300] Smith in Smith and Minear, *Humanitarian Diplomacy*, 36–62.
[301] Minear in Smith and Minear, *Humanitarian Diplomacy*, 7–35.

rare capacity to respond to crises on a large scale, and this is chiefly due to its existing infrastructure and capacity to conduct humanitarian diplomacy.[302] Third, one of the most visible platforms for high-level humanitarian diplomacy is the UN Security Council, which remains to be analysed from this perspective.[303] Fourth, the UN's humanitarian intervention can be regarded from military and non-military viewpoints, which creates unique layers in its humanitarian diplomacy.[304] Fifth and finally, the UN's humanitarian diplomacy operates in a multilateral culture of its own, not directly comparable to traditions of other notable humanitarian actors, such as the EU, the International Red Cross movement, or MSF.[305]

At the entity level, widely known UN humanitarian agencies such as the recent Nobel Peace Prize-winner the World Food Programme (WFP), the UNHCR, and the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF) present some of the obvious candidates for scientific exploration, as little is known of their humanitarian diplomacy. Yet, in line with my argument for humanitarian diplomatic practices within the UN overall, there are similarities, overlaps, and complementary approaches across the field. In the case of the WFP, which is concerned with food security and dealing with 'the political economy of hunger', Masood Hyder, a former WFP Representative to Sudan, notes that like other UN aid agencies, the WFP's humanitarian diplomacy operates without sanction of force.[306] Nicholas Morris, a former Special Envoy to the High Commissioner at the UNHCR in the Balkans, reflected that on the ground the UN has 'sought to present a common front', in which 'any differences of approach at this level [UN operation as a whole] were usually

[302] Smith in Smith and Minear, *Humanitarian Diplomacy*, 36–62.
[303] M. Binder argues that the UNSC's selective politics for humanitarian interventions would be determined by three motivational factors: humanitarian sentiment; material interests; and institutional dynamics (M. Binder. *The United Nations and the Politics of Selective Humanitarian Intervention* (Cham: Springer, 2016). Further studies would be needed in investigating the role of humanitarian diplomacy within this context as ways to advance and lobby for humanitarian interests.
[304] N. MacQueen. *Humanitarian Intervention and the United Nations* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011).
[305] For the International red Cross movement, see, for example, Harroff-Tavel. 'The Humanitarian Diplomacy of the International Committee of the Red Cross'; Slim, 'Humanitarian Diplomacy'. For MSF, see Moreels, 'Humanitarian Diplomacy'.
[306] M. Hyder. 'Nurturing Humanitarian Space in Sudan'. In H. Smith and L. Minear (eds.), *Humanitarian Diplomacy: Practitioners and their Craft* (Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2007), 239–257, 241.

quickly resolved'.[307] UNICEF's former Representative to Sierra Leone, Omawale Omawale, reflected that in the case of negotiating release and rehabilitating child soldiers, the organization's intervention built upon complementary country presence of the UNCHR, the WFP, the UN Development Programme (UNDP), the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), UN Volunteers, the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), and the World Health Organization (WHO).[308]

In this foundational study of the UN's humanitarian diplomacy – which invites further similar investigations – I examine the humanitarian diplomacy of OCHA. The reason to depart from OCHA is the following: OCHA's mandate of coordination is central to the study of humanitarian diplomacy, as this UN Secretariat entity is expected to synchronize the wider humanitarian community on the ground, not only through the UN actors.[309] Thus, its mandate sits at the heart of what humanitarian diplomacy is perceived to be – gathering cross-cutting support for humanitarian action. Further, and as Philippe Régnier notes, "at the international level, a global architecture of governance for dealing with humanitarian crises is coordinated by the United Nations (Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, OCHA)".[310]

Whereas other UN agencies, funds, and programmes do provide interesting points of departure on inquiries of humanitarian diplomacy, OCHA is the only UN entity that has a sole focus on humanitarianism. Comparatively, for example, UNICEF combines humanitarian focus with interest in children; the UNHCR does the same with its focus on refugees; the WFP with food security in humanitarian settings; WHO brings forth health as its central intersection; and UN Women focuses on gender equality and women's empowerment in humanitarian affairs. OCHA has also held this central role for two decades now, as Alexander De Waal notes:

---

[307] N. Morris. 'The Balkans: The Limits of Humanitarian Action'. In H. Smith and L. Minear (eds.), *Humanitarian Diplomacy: Practitioners and their Craft* (Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2007), 347–371, 356.
[308] O. Omawale. 'Negotiating the Release and Rehabilitation of Child Soldiers in Sierra Leone'. In H. Smith and L. Minear (eds.), *Humanitarian Diplomacy: Practitioners and their Craft* (Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2007), 276–297, 280–281.
[309] OCHA. *This is OCHA*. United Nations (2021), 1–22. Retrieved from https://www.unocha.org/about-ocha/our-work.
[310] Régnier, 'The Emerging Concept of Humanitarian Diplomacy', 1220.

> By 1992, the United Nations had become the largest provider of humanitarian assistance worldwide, and in order to facilitate coordination, the UN created a Department of Humanitarian Affairs the same year, renamed the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs in 1997.[311]

OCHA has not claimed, officially or institutionally, ownership of the term. A closely related concept that OCHA uses is that of 'advocacy',[312] translating to "communicating the right messages to the right people at the right time":

> OCHA's public and private advocacy raises awareness of forgotten crises, promotes respect for international humanitarian law (IHL), brings the voices of crisis-affected people to the forefront, and helps people obtain access to humanitarian assistance. OCHA uses its unique role and responsibilities when briefing the Security Council to bring attention to action to uphold IHL, facilitate humanitarian access and promote the protection of civilians.[313]

As can be seen from the given definition, OCHA distinguishes the public and private forms of its advocacy, similar to the division made in humanitarian diplomacy. By public advocacy, the organization refers to media engagement and public appearance, such as "media interviews with the Emergency Relief Coordinator, public speeches, press briefings, digital campaigns".[314] With private diplomacy, OCHA makes a direct link to "quiet diplomacy with governments or negotiations with armed groups".[315]

[311] De Waal. '"The Humanitarians" Tragedy', 219.
[312] OCHA (n.d.), Advocacy, retrieved from https://www.unocha.org/our-work/advocacy.
[313] Ibid.
[314] Ibid.
[315] Ibid.

Furthermore, OCHA states that its advocacy occurs as both field-based and at high level, inclusive of:

> humanitarian agencies, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), community-based organizations, national governments, local and international media, parties to conflict, companies, donors, regional bodies, communities affected by emergencies and the general public.[316]

These elements – including the definition for OCHA's advocacy, public-private division, locations and levels, and common stakeholders – overlap with those often discussed in terms of humanitarian diplomacy. Advocacy and humanitarian diplomacy can, indeed, be seen as having an inherent and intertwined relationship. Dorothea Hilhorst, Maria Hagan, and Olivia Quinn refer to work of John Clark, Elizabeth Reid, Lester Salamon in their following definition of advocacy:

> Advocacy refers to the various interventions made by organizations on behalf of a collective interest or a given group, in an attempt to better their situation by negotiating with or putting pressure on governments with regards to specific policies, practices, legislations and so on.[317]

[316] OCHA (n.d.), Advocacy, retrieved from https://www.unocha.org/our-work/advocacy.
[317] D. Hilhorst et al. 'Reconsidering Humanitarian Advocacy through Pressure Points of the European "Migration Crisis"'. *International Migration* 59 (3) (2021), 126. Refering to J. Clark. 'Advocacy'. In H. Anheier and S. Toepler (eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Civil Society* (New York: Springer, 2010), 12–18; E. J. Reid. 'Nonprofit Advocacy and Political Participation'. In E.T. Boris and C.E. Steuerle (eds.), *Nonprofits and Government: Collaboration and Conflict* (Washington DC: Brookings, 1999), 291–325; L. M. Salamon. 'Explaining Nonprofit Advocacy: an Exploratory Analysis'. In *Center for Civil Society Studies Working Paper Series* (vol. 21) (Baltimore MD: John Hopkins University, 2002).

Further, the authors note that "advocacy was originally associated with humanitarian diplomacy".[318] I argue that this interconnectedness is still very much present, and in my conceptualization of humanitarian diplomacy I see humanitarian advocacy as one of the sub-functions of humanitarian diplomacy. Humanitarian diplomacy captures a broad field of activities, including advocating, strategizing, negotiating, persuading, lobbying, mediating, and compromising, inter alia, for humanitarian interests in a non-humanitarian world. In my view, diplomacy provides a larger conceptualization for representation compared to advocacy, as it indicates professionalization of the humanitarian activities in diplomatic spaces with a differing connotation. Advocacy, contrastingly in some contexts, might be seen as more closely related to concepts such as activism and boosterism. Therefore, to capture a discussion of this broad set of activities, I conceptualize OCHA's humanitarian advocacy as a part of its humanitarian diplomatic engagement.

This dissertation takes on the UN and OCHA-specific context for the second and third articles. By looking into OCHA's humanitarian diplomacy in terms of its practices (article two) and gendered aspects (article three), this dissertation breaks new ground in signposting an institutional context of humanitarian diplomacy for the UN overall, which otherwise remains under-explored.[319] Overall, OCHA is a case of the UN humanitarian diplomacy in its classic sense. Given its central role in humanitarian emergency responses, the diversity of actors that the organization engages with, and a multitude of operational contexts, understanding humanitarian diplomacy conducted at OCHA provides a valuable entry point to increased understanding of humanitarian diplomacy conducted at the UN. OCHA's case study can also be seen as an example of what William Maley titles "coordination diplomacy" as a form of humanitarian

[318] Hilhorst et al, 'Reconsidering Humanitarian Advocacy through Pressure Points of the European "Migration Crisis"'.

[319] A practitioner set of recommendations and examples of good practices in the context of OCHA has been previously written, which refer to humanitarian practitioner guidance in complex security environments. Whereas some of these practices draw elements related to humanitarian diplomacy (e.g., 'low-profile approaches' related to private diplomacy, see page 27 of the publication), this publication does not directly locate in nor discuss humanitarian diplomacy. See OCHA. *To Stay and Deliver: Good Practice for Humanitarians in Complex Security Environments* by Jan Egeland, Adele Harmer, and Abby Stoddard for OCHA Policy Development and Studies Branch, Policy and Studies Series (2011), 1–105. Retrieved from https://www.unocha.org/sites/unocha/files/Stay_and_Deliver.pdf

diplomacy, which he defines as "efforts to apportion responsibilities between different actors to establish structures through which decisions in times of need can be taken, communicated, and implemented".[320]

5.2 Opportunities and Limitations: Reflections on Data Collection and Methodology

Gathering evidence and data for research purposes simultaneously translates into setting boundaries for the scientific inquiry. The rationale for what is included and what is left out can, at times, be a difficult balance to strike. This dilemma is particularly present given the abundance of directions that an under-explored research field, such as study of humanitarian diplomacy, enables. In this subsection I discuss some of the choices that I made while conducting this PhD research. In the three articles included in this dissertation, the first is a desk study of a theory-driven model for conceptual building, and the second and third articles incorporate empirical material.[321] Therefore, my main focus in this subsection in terms of data collection considers the two latter articles.

As an overview, I conducted nineteen interviews with current and former staff members of OCHA by using online platforms (Microsoft Teams, Zoom, WhatsApp, and Skype). Whereas the online encounter was first and foremost guided by the Covid-19 pandemic and travel restrictions,[322] it turned out that I had a greater geographical access to interlocutors than sited fieldwork would have enabled. Out of the nineteen in-depth interviews conducted, which included nine women and ten men, their location-specific experiences with OCHA took place in Afghanistan, Chad, Colombia,

[320] For more information on the OCHA context of humanitarian coordination and its historical trajectory, please see OCHA. *Coordination to Save Lives: History and Emerging Challenges*, OCHA Policy Development and Studies Branch, Policy and Studies Series (2012), 1–40. Retrieved from https://www.unocha.org/sites/unocha/files/Coordination%20to%20Save%20Lives%20History%20and%20Emerging%20Challenges_0.pdf. Maley, 'Humanitarians and Diplomats', 203.

[321] For an elaboration how I conducted the conceptual building in article one, please see subsection 2.1 Article One: 'Humanitarian Diplomatic Practices'.

[322] For more discussion on Covid-19 pandemic effect on this research, see below in this subsection.

the Cook Islands, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Fiji, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Mali, Myanmar, Nigeria, the Occupied Palestinian Territories, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Switzerland (Geneva), Syria, Turkey, the United States of America (New York City), Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yemen, and Zimbabwe.

The respondents' work experience at OCHA varied between headquarter, regional and country levels. While two interviewees represented equivalent categories for junior professionals (P1 and P2 levels at the UN),[323] an unintended emphasis of the sampling ranged from technical level staff (seven interviewees were most recently located at P3 level with portfolios such as Humanitarian Affairs Officers) to high-level management (seven respondents latest at P5–D2 levels, with portfolios such as Country Directors, and one former Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator, USG level).[324] The interviewees were mainly from international staff category, except for one interviewee with national staff experience and two interviewees with both national and international experience.[325]

Overall, my research approach to OCHA as an example of humanitarian diplomacy taking place at the UN has been an example of an *exploratory* case study, "characterized by a lack of detailed preliminary research" and "the exploration of the hitherto unknown–in terms of scientific status quo".[326] This type of case study style stands in contrast to a *descriptive* case study, which is an articulation of what is already known and with a focus on descriptive theory building, and further, with *explanatory* case study that is used to explain causality and which often employs logic models.[327] Exploratory research is also contrasted with confirmatory social science research, in

[323] For more information on the UN staff categories see 'United Nations careers', available at https://careers.un.org/lbw/home.aspx?viewtype=SC.
[324] The remaining two respondent levels for the nineteen interviews included two representatives from P4 level.
[325] For an intersectional reflection on this, please see subsection 3.4 Inclusion of Gender.
[326] C. Streb. 'Exploratory Case Study'. In A. J. Mills, G. Durepos and E. Wiebe (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Case Study Research* (Thousand Oaks: SAGE, 2010), 372–373, 373.
[327] For case study selection and methodologies, see also R. K. Yin. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (5th ed.) (Los Angeles CA: SAGE, 2014). R. Tobin. 'Descriptive Case Study'. In A. J. Mills, G. Durepos and E. Wiebe (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Case Study Research* (Thousand Oaks: SAGE, 2010), 288–289. H. Harder. 'Explanatory Case Study'. In A. J. Mills, G. Durepos and E. Wiebe (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Case Study Research* (Thousand Oaks: SAGE, 2010), 370–371.

which the latter allows formulation of research order, for example, in terms of research process and hypothesis and research question development upfront.[328] However, given that the UN humanitarian diplomacy is an under-explored field, a rigid, cumulative research approach was not applicable for the subject of study. Rather, I have viewed exploratory means more suitable throughout the research. In conducting reliable exploratory research, Bernd Reiter emphasizes the need for "transparent, honest and strongly self-reflexive" approach, for which I have titled this subsection on data collection and methodology with the word 'reflections', and seek to follow such style.[329]

As the analyses of collected data are in the forms of the two last articles in this dissertation, I will provide a short meta-discussion on their analytical conduction herein. Prior to searching for interviewees and entering the interview settings, I formulated an interview guide to follow a semi-structured format for analytical purposes and cross-comparison of the interviews.[330] The guide's creation was thematically driven, rather than fixed on a rigid set of questions. These themes were inspired by existing research in the field of humanitarian diplomacy, and guided by an exploratory interest towards humanitarian diplomacy at the UN, mainly in what does the concept mean and how does it manifest according to OCHA staff members.[331] The themes also included specific interventions, such as 'leave no one behind' ideology,[332] as well as gender, which derived both from my own research interests and the sub-categories of inquiry of the overall HUMDIPLO research project that I am a part of.[333] Whereas the listed questions in the interview guide provide an insight into the

[328] B. Reiter. 'Theory and Methodology of Exploratory Social Science Research' . *International Journal of Science and Research Methodology* 5 (4) (2017), 129–150.
[329] Reiter, 'Theory and Methodology of Exploratory Social Science Research', 131.
[330] See appendix for the full interview guide.
[331] Such as published by Hazel Smith and Larry Minear (Smith and Minear, *Humanitarian Diplomacy*), Philippe Régnier (Régnier, 'The Emerging Concept of Humanitarian Diplomacy'), and Kelly-Kate Pease (Pease, *Human Rights and Humanitarian Diplomacy*).
[332] The theme of 'leave no one behind' and its related interview conversations are currently published as a working paper format outside of this PhD dissertation. The working paper with a title 'Gains of the Unfeasible: Manifestations of 'Leave No One Behind' in the United Nations' Humanitarianism', *CMI Working Paper* WP 2021:05, 1–12, available at https://www.cmi.no/publications/7882-gains-of-the-unfeasible-manifestations-of-leave-no-one-behind-in-the-united-nations-humanitarianism.
[333] However, on rare occasions these themes were not discussed for practical reasons, such as that the staff member had been a part of OCHA prior 'leave no one behind' conceptualization (which emerged in 2015 in liaison with the Agenda 2030 and its Sustainable Development Goals), or running out of interview time.

conversations, often the interviews were characterized by a level of liberty in formulating the conversation depending on the practitioner in question and their work experiences. Typically, the question served as a catalyst for a conversation in which the practitioner gave specific, empirical examples within their professional experiences and practices.[334]

In searching for the interviewees, and despite my direct personal and professional contacts with OCHA being narrow at the beginning of this research, my own practitioner background within the UN was beneficial in that I could start snowballing a sampling of OCHA employees within my own extended networks and online platforms that I was already a member of.[335] Snowball sampling represents a way of conducting research in which social networks and social capital play a role.[336] It presents both opportunities and limitations – the former in a form of increased and accelerated access to interlocutors, and the latter in possible skewed representativeness of the sampling. Becoming "trapped within a network of interlinked respondents", however, did not seem to become a case.[337] The interviewees who ended up participating in the study represented a randomized sampling, and their participation emerged from various sources (e.g., online groups, workshop encounters, research affiliates, second degree professional contacts, professional platforms, and 'cold calling', among others). Only a few interviewees represented a further snowballing effort of an interviewee who had already participated in the study.

Given my research interest in OCHA, I sought to engage only with former and current practitioners of the organization, setting a limitation for my inquiry. Another research avenue would have been to include other actors involved in OCHA's humanitarian diplomacy, and triangulate insights and information from their experiences in dealing with OCHA in this regard. These actors would have been, for

[334] Echoing the discussion in subsection 3.3 on Theoretical Framework, and Anthony Giddens' remarks on "practical consciousness", see subsection for further discussion and Giddens, 'The Constitution of Society', 131.
[335] See subsection 2.4 on Positionality.
[336] C. Noy. 'Sampling Knowledge: The Hermeneutics of Snowball Sampling in Qualitative Research'. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 11 (4) (2008), 327–344.
[337] E. Bleich and R. Pekkanen. 'How to Report Interview Data'. In L. Mosley (ed.), *Interview Research in Political Science* (New York: Cornell University Press, 2013), 87.

example, humanitarian actors coordinated by OCHA (both UN agencies and others), beneficiaries, local stakeholders, contractors, sub-contractors, donors, and local and national government representatives.[338] Their perspectives would have inherently added value to the overall analysis. However, given limitations in scope, time, and conducting research during a global Covid-19 pandemic,[339] certain limitations and challenges affected the data collection possibilities. Also, this methodological choice was based on the novelty of the study and its practice-theoretical approach in the interests of allowing OCHA practitioners themselves to identify OCHA's humanitarian diplomatic practices, thus my interest was to establish a first step in the related scientific inquiry.

My research interest in practitioner-engagement and their perspectives could, in principle, have had multiple different forms, particularly in qualitative studies. These could have included participatory observation and research, ethnography, direct observation, and document analysis such as memoirs (commonly used in diplomatic studies), among others. My choice of interviews was not a given, even a popular one, within the theoretical framework of practice theory.[340] This is dependent on how the ontology of practices is understood and thus how they are best observed.[341] Practices can be interpreted in multiple ways, requiring context-specific definition in research in how they are understood. My approach to practices, partially influenced by my own practitioner background, was that practitioners are experience experts, in which they are best positioned to identify their practices, or more specifically, daily engagements and actions that can be labelled as practices.[342] Depending on the practitioner in question, these would entail policy-level, 'high' diplomatic engagements, and/or field-level diplomatic engagements concerned with pragmatic priorities, and those in

[338] However, choosing to seek to engage with representatives from the 'beneficiaries' category would have needed careful consideration regarding the necessity of the intervention, given the heightened ethical considerations.
[339] For more discussion on Covid-19 pandemic effect on this research, see below in this subsection.
[340] See, for example, Wiseman. 'Diplomatic Practices at the United Nations'.
[341] For more discussion, see subsection 3.3 on Theoretical Framework.
[342] Drawing from Giddens, 'The Constitution of Society'; Hopf, 'Change in International Practices'; Schatzki, 'Practice Mind-ed Orders'.

between.[343] Given this premise and my constructivist interpretative approach, direct engagements and conversations in forms of interviews with practitioners offered a compelling research avenue.[344] This methodological choice also aided in overcoming "a culture of secrecy" in diplomacy, to which humanitarian diplomacy belongs and that prevents research access to a certain degree.[345]

As discussed in section 2 of this dissertation, the analysis of the collected data in the second article for the OCHA case study was based on the analytical model that I had created and published in the first article of this PhD dissertation.[346] My interview guide had been created separately from the build-up of this analytical model, for which I used key questions for each characteristic in data analysis. As examples of these: for the 'why' characteristic the questions from the interview guide included free definitions of humanitarian diplomacy and questioning about its phenomenological existence; for 'what' the interviewees were asked to explain what OCHA does as humanitarian diplomacy and what advantages and disadvantages such engagements have; for 'who' the interviewees were asked who do they see as humanitarian diplomats and who are included as actors in humanitarian diplomacy; for 'where' the questions were about the various OCHA's organizational levels and operational contexts, and humanitarian diplomatic engagement occurring in these; and for 'how' the interviewees were asked questions about combining humanitarianism and diplomacy under the same concept.

Whereas OCHA's case study is captured in the second article, the discussions on the theme of gender that took place during the interviews were developed into their own article, the third in this dissertation. Originally, I planned to include the gender aspect of humanitarian diplomacy in the second article, but with the abundance of material and clear interest from the interviewed practitioners to discuss this theme in detail, it turned out to be more meaningful to separate it into its own, self-standing

[343] Régnier, 'The Emerging Concept of Humanitarian Diplomacy'; Smith and Minear, *Humanitarian Diplomacy*.
[344] See subsection 3.2 on Philosophy of Science.
[345] Wiseman. 'Diplomatic Practices at the United Nations', 318.
[346] To summarize, how humanitarian diplomacy can be understood through its practices, and how these practices have five basic, analytical characteristics: 'why' humanitarian diplomatic practices take place; 'what' they mean; 'who' they include; 'where' they occur; and 'how' they are done.

conversation. In addition to practitioner interest that was mostly present during the interviews, the research field on humanitarian diplomacy also lacked a phenomenological and empirical conversation on gender, which, therefore, presented a useful research intervention for both audiences. The conduction of this analysis stemmed from the context of the second article (building on the analytical model of the first article), but drafting, editing, and commenting processes formulated it into an empirical argument of its own.

As humanitarian diplomacy, along with its gendered dimensions, as a concept or framework is not explicitly explained or trained within the organizational context of OCHA, an interesting research reflection is to discuss who or what kind of employees did partake in this exploratory study. Who is able to grasp the concept, and feels comfortable enough to discuss it? Many of my interviewees started with a certain level of hesitation, claiming that they are "not experts" in humanitarian diplomacy. Some were driven by curiosity to learn more through their own research engagement, and one of the motivations for participating in the research was to contribute to the related knowledge creation.[347] In making those calls of whether to participate, I have approached the potential interviewees consistently with similar, elaborative messaging.[348] In our further conversations about the possible participation, I pursued underlining the novelty of the area and the preliminary nature of my research, looking to summon OCHA's staff members' own views and experiences.

Given the current unoccupied nature of OCHA's, and further of the UN's, humanitarian diplomacy, the question of who gets to define it or take part in the processes of defining it also concerns power. This notion includes myself as a researcher looking to understand, locate, and define the phenomenon, and my interlocutors as conveyers of these experiences and information. These interviews represent elite interviewing, in the sense that all the participants were former or current staff members with the UN, a privilege of itself. Some of the interviewees represented

[347] In contributing to these interests and continuing the practitioner dialogue, I have sent regular updates to the research participants on the publications that I have produced on humanitarian diplomacy throughout my PhD research.
[348] See the appendix for the email invitation and consent form for research participation.

this categorization of elite interviews more clearly, such as Jan Egeland as the former head of OCHA and the UN Emergency Relief Coordinator. Matthew Beckmann and Richard Hall reflect elite interviews as the following:

> interviews with elite informants work best when designed to extract systematic information about practitioners' *actual behaviors* on *specific cases* in the *recent past*. Stated somewhat differently: we have found our theoretical and empirical objectives are best served by focusing the interview on elites' strengths (i.e., knowing what they did in a specific instance) rather than their weaknesses (i.e., making empirical generalizations or espousing theoretical explanations).[349]

Elite informants are able to discuss the 'actual behaviour' of the context or event in which they operate, showcasing, again, "practical consciousness" that also serves an empirical data collection purpose for practice theory.[350] However, pursuant to making generalizations of humanitarian diplomacy at OCHA, the elite informants are limited in their positionality for 'empirical generalizations' and in contributing to 'theoretical explanations', similarly noted by Theodore Schatzki.[351] Here is where my own elitism as inhabiting "the subjective position of 'researcher'" comes to question.[352] I have been a part of all the interviews and drawn synopses together of practitioner behaviour to provide an overview of their common practices. Therefore, I have been active in creating polyvocality based on individual, rather than group, encounters. The power of a researcher in these dynamics of subjectivity and knowledge creation has been centrally at play.

[349] M. Beckmann and R. Hall. Elite Interviewing in Washington, DC'. In L. Mosley (ed.), *Interview Research in Political Science* (New York: Cornell University Press, 2013), 198 (emphasis in original).
[350] Giddens, 'The Constitution of Society', 131.
[351] Schatzki, 'Practice Mind-ed Orders'.
[352] S. W. Riley, W. Schouten and S. Cahill, S. 'Exploring the Dynamics of Subjectivity and Power Between Researcher and Researched'. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 4 (2) (2003), 1.

One practical factor that played into the choice of my research methodology was its concurrency with the Covid-19 pandemic, which has had a hindering effect throughout academic research community.[353] Beginning this investigation in the spring of 2019, my initial research plans were drafted for pre-pandemic circumstances. For example, my intention was to conduct research stays in OCHA headquarter locations, New York and Geneva, and through fieldwork to expand my methods, such as participant observation and possible focus-group interviews. However, given the sudden change on a global scale of how research could be conducted, my approach turned into an online format. This was also a possibility given the focus on elite interviewees, their digital abilities and know-how, and availability through online platforms.

Furthermore, and to conclude this subsection on reflections on data collection and methodology, online interviews represent a digital form of encounter, and as such, can operate differently compared to in-person encounter. On one hand, "the informality of online communication can facilitate a closer connection with participants' feelings and values", compared to a formal, in-person interview setting.[354] On the other, building trust and a comfortable interviewing atmosphere between the interviewer and interviewee can require more effort given the lack of physical presence.[355] As a researcher leading the encounter, I often began the conversation on a casual note, asking about the interviewees' ongoing days and then elaborated further about the ongoing research and the conduction of our session.[356] Throughout the interview, the social engagement within the conversations relied heavily on verbal cues. In particular,

[353] The pandemic has had an impact in academia across the sector, and it has also been disadvantageous for completing PhD dissertations and postdoctoral terms. The Researchers' Association of Norway ('*Forskerforbundet*') surveyed PhD and postdoctoral fellows regarding how their work was affected by corona measures. Of the respondents questioned, 10.3 per cent (the sampling size and response rates are unknown) answered that their work has been delayed critically; 34.5 per cent said the same in terms of significant delay; and 38.4 per cent responded a moderate delay. Altogether this means that 83 per cent of the respondent PhD and postdoctoral fellows in Norway have experienced various degrees of delay due to the pandemic. For more information, see https://www.forskerforum.no/forskerforbundet-vi-kan-ikke-utsette-stipendiatene-for-dette-lenger/ (in Norwegian).
[354] N. James and H. Busher. *Online Interviewing* (London: SAGE Publications Ltd., 2009), 24.
[355] Although conducted through Covid-19 pandemic lockdowns and restricted movement contexts, the respondents were, perhaps, more enthusiastic and open to online encounters, as these were new daily practices within their professional lives.
[356] For more details, see the beginning of the interview guide in the appendix.

as the interviews were recorded, I asked the interviewees to turn off our video connections to ensure optimal sound quality. This emphasized non-verbal communication, which included chronemic communication (such as pacing, timing, and silence before response) and paralinguistic communication (such as variations in pitch and quality of voice).[357] Although the online platform enabled non-restricted geographical access, the interviewing language was English. This posed a limitation for the study, as OCHA (being a part of the UN) also operates on other official UN languages (which include Spanish, French, Arabic, Chinese, and Russian), thus making the research participation inaccessible for those unable or uncomfortable communicating in English.

5.3 Ethical Considerations

Ethical considerations in my research centre on paying attention to the reputational risks of the people involved – particularly for current staff members. These interviewees could be exposed to potential professional hazards if and when expressing contrasting opinions and questioning the views of their employer and the context in which they currently work. Thus, their research participation could, undesirably, also result in an impact on their livelihoods. The privacy of the collected information, including personal data, was considered and assessed by the Norwegian Centre for Research Data (NSD). Also, the ethical risk mitigation relied on the application of the guidelines of the National Committee for Research Ethics in the Social Sciences and the Humanities (NESH). As discussed above, the selection of interviewees was guided by the focus of investigating OCHA through former and current employees of the organization. Informed consent for research participation was obtained in two ways: verbally and by signing participant consent forms that were then sent electronically to me.[358] In both cases each participant received the same consent form for their review.

[357] J. Salmons. 'Designing and Conducting Research with Online Interviews'. In J. Salmons (ed.), *Cases in Online Interview Research* (Thousand Oaks: SAGE, 2012), 1–30.
[358] See the appendix for a copy of the full consent form for research participation.

All of the interviews were treated as anonymous, with the only exception being my interview with Jan Egeland, whose edited interview has been published with his permission and was therefore cited with his own name in interview quotes.[359] The interviews were anonymized to enable current staff members to speak freely in comparison to former staff members, as current staff are exposed to a different organizational and career dynamic in voicing their experiences and opinions compared to those who no longer work for the organization. The quotes included in this PhD research reveal the respondent's gender and whether they represent a former or current OCHA staff member. Whereas I occasionally reveal further information in relation to a specific quote in the articles (e.g., policy or field level experience of the respondent), this is done in a manner that does not disclose the respondent's identity. In line with this approach, details of nationalities, periods, and locations of employment, and other identifying characteristics have been disguised.

The rigid approach to anonymity has been a cognizant choice in the design and execution of the research, also bearing the cost of potential research credibility within academic circles and its related critique – having such a rigid approach to the interlocutors' anonymized identities divides opinions in academia. Some researchers may find that summarizing "interviews as a body" might hide issues in the representativeness of the sampling, raising issues in research transparency.[360] Concealing information – such as specific experiences with OCHA, positions within the organization's organogram, and spatial details – also makes any attempts at research replicability unavailable. Disclosing research participant information has also different traditions varying according to different disciplines. One example being analytical differences in how details of the specific subjects of the study are perceived to enrich and dictate the collected empirical material and its related analysis, particularly in qualitative studies.

[359] 'Humanitarian Diplomacy: Interview with Jan Egeland' available at https://www.cmi.no/publications/7373-humanitarian-diplomacy-interview-with-jan-egeland.
[360] Bleich and Pekkanen, 'How to Report Interview Data', 87.

However, in my research view full anonymity has been both a necessity and an enabling condition. Several interviewees, mainly current staff members, reconfirmed the anonymity before or after the interviews, indicating a need for it from the research participants' side. Prior to beginning each interview (except for Egeland), I have also repeated the anonymity of the research design. Some of the research participants stressed its importance during their answers, directly indicating that their responses would have differed (often in the degree of criticism and empirical details given) if they would have lacked the protection that anonymity provides. Therefore, the choice of anonymity has, in my view, enriched the empirical data collected for this study, wherein partial or lack of anonymity would have yielded less nuanced data.

6. Main Findings and Suggestions for Future Research

Before moving to the research articles of this PhD project, in this concluding section of the introductory part of the dissertation I briefly elaborate on the main research findings and reflect on future research avenues for humanitarian diplomacy. I also make some suggestions regarding policy implications. However, as my interests within this PhD project have been in contributing to academic discussion on humanitarian diplomacy and engaging with some of its practitioners, policy audience has not been a primary audience for my interventions. Also, as policy realm can be approached both outside humanitarian organizations (such as states' policies) and policies within humanitarian organizations (such as the UN and OCHA policy frameworks), recommendations in this section are directed towards the latter.

In this PhD dissertation I argue and find that humanitarian diplomacy can be ontologically and analytically treated as its own, self-standing diplomatic manifestation. Despite the fact that states engage in national and international diplomacy with humanitarian interests – and also labelling such engagement as 'humanitarian diplomacy' in some occasions – humanitarian diplomacy remains in the prerogative of non-state humanitarian actors. In particular, this ownership of humanitarian actors and institutions is something that makes humanitarian diplomacy distinctive – it is a diplomatic creation definitive of its contrast to the Westphalian state system constituted of national interests. Humanitarian diplomacy is driven by humanitarian interests and ideologies, to the extent of representing them when they do not align with states' interests in humanitarian action.[361]

In line with some scholars in diplomatic studies, I concur that the umbrella concept of diplomacy is no longer the preserve of states.[362] Non-state actors (e.g., NGOs), and global businesses (e.g., transnational corporations), increasingly engage

[361] For full discussion, see section 4. State of the Art.
[362] See, for example, Acuto. 'Diplomats in Crisis'; Constantinou et al., 'Transprofessional Diplomacy'; C. M. Constantinou, P. Kerr and P. Sharp. *The SAGE Handbook of Diplomacy* (SAGE, 2016).

in diplomatic activities.[363] The field of diplomacy has expanded drastically since its state-related conceptualization, along with modern-day technological, multistakeholder, and globalized advancements, among other things. Diplomacy of non-state actors is at its height with an increasing trend ahead, alongside broad diplomatic diversity. The category of 'non-state actors' includes a multitude of interests and forms in which their respective roles vis-à-vis one another and states remain indistinct.[364]

Although a distinctive diplomatic category of its own, humanitarian diplomacy does not present a ubiquitous and consistent manifestation across the humanitarian actors and institutions. Humanitarian diplomacy is shaped by a range of actors and their communication , and its perception and meanings can be as varied as the actors using the term 'humanitarian diplomacy'.[365] NGOs, including some human-rights organizations, and humanitarian bodies provide more entry points into various understandings of humanitarian diplomacy, such as MSF, Amnesty International, and the Order of Malta exhibit.[366] At the macro level, in the current, unoccupied junction regarding what humanitarian diplomacy means, each actor engaging in it has the power to tailor and define it for meso and micro level purposes. As elaborated by Hugo Slim, former Head of Policy and Humanitarian Diplomacy at the ICRC:

> Humanitarian diplomacy is a technique: It is empty until you fill it up with something. So you cannot do humanitarian diplomacy unless you know what you want to persuade and influence people about, and how you want to change things.[367]

[363] R. Langhorne. 'The Diplomacy of Non-State Actors'. *Diplomacy & Statecraft* 16 (2) (2005), 331–339.
[364] Ibid.
[365] Fiott, 'Humanitarian Diplomacy'. De Lauri, *Humanitarianism*; Régnier, 'The Emerging Concept of Humanitarian Diplomacy'.
[366] Moreels, 'Humanitarian Diplomacy'; Veuthey, 'Humanitarian Diplomacy'.
[367] Humanitarian Diplomacy podcast, Episode 4, circa 11min 30 sec. Available on Spotify, at https://open.spotify.com/episode/1E15Aqn70zCw7cISgZ58DG.

Through this research, I find that humanitarianism itself presents a global challenge with geopolitical and ideological complexities in which humanitarian diplomacy represents a means to address these. In contrast to Michael Barnett's claim that "there are no humanitarian solutions to humanitarian emergencies", humanitarian diplomacy may well present an option.[368] Humanitarian diplomacy builds on the negotiated nature of social relations, and thus presents a strategic way to grasp and navigate the heterogeneity of complex humanitarian environments with various, often opposite and competing, interests at stake. Understanding humanitarians as diplomats – rather than advocates, lobbyists, or supporters – offers a shift in thinking that corresponds to strategic positioning of humanitarians in their complex operational environments. This shift may, with increasing pressure, become a necessity in meeting modern-day humanitarian needs effectively.

However, this shift, as any potentially paradigmatic change, comes with labour pains: Coining the term 'humanitarian diplomacy' brings certain tensions. Diplomacy has been rooted in a political understanding of a state, also interested in practicality, pragmatic dealings, compromise, and remote political representation. Humanitarianism has been seen as an apolitical opposite to state, pursuing a higher morality and apolitical purpose. Therefore, humanitarian diplomacy can be seen as an oxymoron. For Larry Smith, humanitarians serve a singular purpose of providing humanitarian assistance for those in need in respect to IHL.[369] Then, in contrast, diplomats and diplomacy as commonly associated with states, serve multifarious national interests. Herein humanitarianism, or other seemingly ethical ways of operating, may or may not be included.[370] These political liaisons and connotations capture a common cause for the current uneasiness of using the term among some humanitarian practitioners.

However, its oxymoronic nature and build-in tension also encapsulates its biggest potential: I argue that humanitarian diplomacy offers a way of navigating the humanitarian political. Humanitarianism can be illustratively understood as an

[368] Barnett, 'Humanitarianism Transformed', 724.
[369] In Smith and Minear, *Humanitarian Diplomacy*, 36–62.
[370] Smith and Minear, *Humanitarian Diplomacy*.

intervention, which is a priori a political act. In addition to funds and logistic access, humanitarians also require political support. In harvesting these types of support, diplomatic acts of advocacy, negotiation, dialogue, persuasion, expressions of amity and enmity, and intelligence-gathering enter the humanitarian scene. Traditionally, diplomacy is understood as relationship maintenance between sovereign states. However, humanitarianism is both a stage and action for global politics. By active and cognizant engagement within diplomatic platforms and structures, humanitarians have more opportunities to advance their interests than choosing to avoid these politics by not taking part in the name of humanitarian principles, such as neutrality.

Engagement with the political dimension of humanitarianism in a more cognizant manner represents a transformation to traditional, Western humanitarianism. As all prognoses suggest an increasing deterioration of ongoing conflicts and emergencies worldwide, the need for humanitarian diplomacy is likely to intensify in the future. Efficient delivery of humanitarian aid by gaining support and resources for humanitarian action and bringing humanitarian issues to the global political agenda and media attention, are examples of humanitarian diplomacy. As an opposite, and as noted by Jan Egeland, failures of humanitarian diplomacy are "measured in human lives", contradictory to the mission humanitarians stand for.[371]

In addition to these ontological and phenomenological findings, this dissertation offers an exploration of an under-explored actor in the field, the UN. In investigating the UN through OCHA as a humanitarian diplomatic entity, I conclude that the UN humanitarian diplomats have turned to what Mark Bowden and Victoria Metcalfe-Hough label the "new period of humanitarian pragmatism".[372] UN humanitarians tend to be lenient towards principled pragmatism, in which the ideological guidance of the humanitarian principles and the goal of reducing human suffering in humanitarian contexts are met with operational realities. In other words, humanitarian diplomatic

[371] Egeland, 'Humanitarian Diplomacy', 353.
[372] Bowden and Metcalfe-Hough, 'Humanitarian Diplomacy and Protection Advocacy in an Age of Caution', 11.

practices at the UN aim to maximize the overall reach in a setting where meeting every humanitarian need remains an impossibility.

In considering where the UN's humanitarian diplomatic practices take place, the approach can be seen as twofold: external and internal contexts. However, the two are in continuous, mutual dialogue. The external context refers to any context in which humanitarian interests are at stake, and the internal one refers to the humanitarian diplomats themselves as well as organizational structuring, such as field, regional and headquarter levels. Within the external context, I see that the UN humanitarian diplomacy seeks to advance largely the traditional, Western conceptualization of humanitarian polity in the world. This polity – acting upon distant suffering of the vulnerably-deemed other – is represented in contexts wherein humanitarian interests are at stake, whether they are at the level of people in humanitarian need and beneficiaries themselves, engagements with local and national governments overseeing the given humanitarian territory, regional bodies and entities, or at the global level such as the UN Security Council. Within the internal context, the UN humanitarian diplomats continuously engage in, repeat, and recreate patterned actions that constitutes both the UN humanitarian diplomacy, and themselves as humanitarian diplomats within their institutional context. These internal aspects also include dynamics such as gender, that frames possibilities and limitations in carrying out humanitarian diplomatic practices. Gender, in particular, also cross-cuts the external context in which the humanitarians operate, both in terms of gendered patterns in conflict-driven humanitarian needs, and the sphere of diplomacy as a historically constructed male domain.

Although emerging from the Western tradition, the UN and OCHA also increasingly face the intersection of various, competing humanitarian paradigms that come into play.[373] As Dorothea Hilhorst has discussed, the classic, Dunantist humanitarian paradigm can be contrasted with a "resilience paradigm", in which the

[373] For more discussion on humanitarian paradigms detailed in the context of the UN, see also S. Gordon and A. Donini. 'Romancing Principles and Human Rights: Are Humanitarian Principles Salvageable?' *International Review of the Red Cross* 97 (897–898) (2015), 77–109.

notions of exceptionalism and international institutional intervention are challenged by a local response and by viewing crises as the new normality.[374] Therefore, the meanings of and motivations behind humanitarian diplomatic practices are altered accordingly. On a smaller scale, intra-organizational aspects within communities of practice, such as those related to status, identity, access to portfolios, and wages, also shape the context in which the UN humanitarian diplomatic practices take place, and with what kind of staff.[375]

Despite these changing landscapes regarding what humanitarian diplomacy and its practices consist of, the added value of the analysis in this dissertation's case study is straightforward: Exposing some of the contemporary practices in the classic paradigm that currently remain under-addressed. While OCHA's example does not automatically travel across other UN entities, funds and programmes within its humanitarian arm, from a macro scale of global humanitarian actors and institutions they are more alike than they are apart. Therefore, this case study does shed further light on one illustrative understanding of humanitarian diplomacy that takes place at the UN.

6.1 Looking Ahead

This dissertation has a twofold aim: to cater for both scholarly and practitioner audiences. Humanitarian diplomacy in its current modality is a practitioner-driven field and term. The scholarly knowledge rests on this practitioner-driven, empirical manifestation of humanitarian diplomacy and seeks to gain an academic understanding of it. Practitioners are not similarly dependent on the academic knowledge production of humanitarian diplomacy, but do have a chance to gain insight and ideas through its

[374] D. Hilhorst. 'Classical Humanitarianism and resilience Humanitarianism: Making Sense of Two Brands of Humanitarian Action'. *Journal of International Humanitarian Action* 3 (1) (2018), 1.
[375] See also M. Barnett. 'Human Rights, Humanitarianism, and the Practices of Humanity'. *International Theory* 10 (3) (2018), 314–349.

debates and processes. In this subsection I briefly discuss some suggestions looking ahead in terms of both audiences.

For scholars interested in humanitarian diplomacy – or those opposing the existence of humanitarian diplomacy as a self-standing diplomatic category – throughout this dissertation I present arguments about how humanitarian diplomacy ontologically, phenomenologically, conceptually, analytically, and empirically manifests in the world. My analysis is motivated by the exploration of humanitarian diplomacy as a new and illustrative concept that allows novel directions of analysis to examine the current status of international affairs. By supporting an overall argument in which diplomacy is a far richer and more transcending sphere than state-relegated views would suggest, I contribute to continued scholarly debates and knowledge production in the diplomatic studies' field.[376] Similarly, other 'new' and emerging fields of diplomacy can be set academically in parallel with humanitarian diplomacy in search of similarities and differences. For example, closely related fields such as peace diplomacy, military diplomacy, NGO diplomacy, and, potentially, business diplomacy that involves humanitarianism, offer compelling research avenues in relation to humanitarian diplomacy.

Yet, much remains to be discussed and discovered within humanitarian diplomacy as a scholarly field. Whereas I invite other, similar actor-specific analyses, overarching themes and structures, such as relationships to political actors and non-humanitarian interests, yearn for more discussion. Therefore, much is to be gained also from relational understanding of diplomacy.[377] Then, from a critical point of view, both altruistic and instrumental interests manifest in humanitarianism. When the alleviation of human suffering comes into contact with instrumentalized political, economic, and religious interests, humanitarianism transforms into new forms. Thus, the related humanitarian diplomacy can also be instrumentalized according to the actor who 'occupies' and takes ownership of the concept. Analysing humanitarian diplomacy of,

[376] See, for example, M. Acuto. 'Diplomats in Crisis'. *Diplomacy & Statecraft* 22 (3) (2011), 521–539; Constantinou. 'Everyday Diplomacy'; Constantinou et al., 'Transprofessional Diplomacy'.
[377] Sending et al., 'The Future of Diplomacy'.

in particular, non-traditional humanitarian actors would aid in situating the field more closely with ongoing humanitarian studies' debates on new, instrumentalized forms of humanitarianism. For example, can we then, any longer, talk about humanitarian diplomacy, or is the phenomenon something else? Also, transcending from traditional organizations (such as the UN, the Red Cross, MSF, among others) questions what constitutes a humanitarian actor – who is perceived legitimate to conduct humanitarian diplomacy? Particularly in relation to grassroots, civil/citizen, 'everyday', and individual levels of humanitarianism, the institutional line dictating who is understood and recognized as a humanitarian diplomat gets blurred easily.

In this PhD project, I have contributed analytical models for humanitarian diplomacy that are up for discussion, critique, and further development and implementation. Most notable is the framework that I developed for humanitarian diplomatic practices, discussed in detail in article one of this dissertation. Whereas I have applied it in the context of OCHA as an illustration within the UN, the model has potential for further application and analytical gains in exploring other humanitarian actors' diplomatic practices. In article two, I also present an idea of inverted pyramid of humanitarianism, in which humanitarian action is an umbrella for humanitarian diplomacy, which then further covers humanitarian themes such as negotiation and mediation. The figure is intended as a conversation starter and a suggestion of how humanitarian diplomacy can be located within the broader humanitarian sphere, inviting reflections and contributions from other scholars as well.

In contrast to traditional IR concerned with state actors and actions, I discuss how humanitarian diplomacy as a social construction, with actors engaging in it, reduces down to people. This individual level offers a number of research interests for humanitarian diplomacy, which I see as an inductive way of building how humanitarian diplomacy is an interaction in international affairs. For example, some of my interviewees raised that humanitarian diplomacy is based on instincts, particularly at the operational level. What, then, drives these instincts and calls, and are they somehow, ultimately, intersubjective? I have begun the individual level discussion in regard to gender, as presented in article three, yet many other aspects remain intact.

Also gender as a cross-cutting element is a broader discussion than an article can provide, and it links to greater gendered debates in humanitarianism and diplomacy that currently remain under-explored. For example, I argue that gender is under-research and understood from humanitarian aid providers side, as the onus of the research and analytical interest has been previously on the humanitarian aid receivers' side.[378] Then in studies of diplomacy, the gender inquiry presents an alternative approach to examine, for example, diplomatic history, institutions, and representation.[379] These can be expanded to consider humanitarian diplomatic equivalents of the same.

And finally for scholars, given the research interest of this PhD dissertation in humanitarian practitioners' perspectives, there is one dimension of humanitarian diplomacy that has been rather a side note than the main focus: legality. Humanitarian diplomacy has a strong legal aspect as traditional humanitarian action grounds on IHL. This legislative framework has been created to reduce human, particularly civilian, suffering at the time of armed conflicts. However, the ratification of IHL does not translate into compliance.[380] As a result, humanitarian diplomacy, in the Dunantist understanding of humanitarianism, stems from the need to persuade key stakeholders to adhere to IHL, and respect the four humanitarian principles of humanity, neutrality, impartiality, and independence, particularly of intervening humanitarian actors.[381] Better understanding IHL through the lenses of humanitarian diplomacy would unveil these types dynamics and real world examples that follow.

IHL also takes physical place on a territory of a state. States, indeed, are central in defining what humanitarianism means in its implementation.[382] Humanitarian diplomacy operates as a tool for discussion, negotiation, and debate in a manner that is already understood and integrated within the structure of states, namely diplomacy and legal frameworks in terms of international (humanitarian and human rights) law.

[378] See also Pasquier, 'Gender Diversity Dynamics in Humanitarian Negotiations'; Olivius, 'Refugee Men as Perpetrators, Allies or Troublemakers?'
[379] Aggestam and Towns. 'The Gender Turn in Diplomacy'.
[380] Rousseau and Pende, 'Humanitarian Diplomacy'.
[381] Fiott, 'Humanitarian Diplomacy'.
[382] Pease, *Human Rights and Humanitarian Diplomacy*.

However, the articulation of this humanitarian diplomacy's legal relationship remains unclear. Outside of legal scholars, this issue is also a central remark for IR scholars considering the following: International community and other humanitarian actors can influence state actors by leaning on humanitarian norms, but similarly states can manipulate these norms for national interests and benefits, sometimes in the guise of humanitarianism.[383] A similar threat occurs in the realm of human rights when human rights' language expands to include most political and social claims as a 'right', then less and less attracts the protection of human rights, instead, possibly these claims become a weapon for generating governmental legitimacy.[384]

Moving onto the recommendations for humanitarian practitioners and humanitarian organizational policymakers: As I argue in this dissertation, humanitarian diplomacy as a humanitarian tool has growth potential in meeting the world's humanitarian needs in an increasingly complex operational landscape. As highlighted by the OCHA respondents seeking to "alleviate human suffering" and "[help] those most in need", humanitarian diplomacy is a way of preserving human dignity.[385] Some humanitarian organizations, such as the Red Cross movement, are further along in their development regarding integration of humanitarian diplomacy in the organization context, which allows a potential in cross-organizational learning. However, in the end, humanitarian diplomacy requires organization-specific tailoring to occupy the concept to unravel its most suitable potential. By and large, humanitarian diplomacy remains under-explored and under-acknowledged among many humanitarian actors and institutions.

As discussed in the exploratory case study of this dissertation, and in line with the UN's principled pragmatism approach to humanitarian diplomacy, meeting every humanitarian need remains unrealistic. In the context of the UN, and as Norrie MacQueen states, that despite the organization being a common political scapegoat and while noting its – at times dramatic – shortcomings, the UN should be viewed as "a

[383] Mills, 'Neo-humanitarianism'.
[384] C. Douzinas. 'The Many Faces of Humanitarianism'. *Parrhesia* 2 (1) (2007), 28.
[385] Pease, *Human Rights and Humanitarian Diplomacy*.

fundamentally decent activity in an often far from decent world".[386] The UN has saved thousands of lives in humanitarian crises during its existence, and its essential cause as a diplomatic body is built on humanitarian diplomacy.[387] Given this centrality of the phenomenon within the organization, there remains many actions to be taken in making the most of humanitarian diplomacy as a strategic tool in meeting the world's humanitarian needs.

As a first step, my research recommendation is to take institutional ownership of the concept. As discussed, the word 'diplomacy' in humanitarian diplomacy raises eyebrows among practitioners due to its political connotations. However, and paradoxically, systematically increasing engagement in humanitarian diplomacy might, in contradiction, lower political affiliations and impression among other, non-humanitarian actors. This is due to the systematization and professionalization that humanitarian diplomacy requires, and as Michael Barnett and Thomas G. Weiss write: "In short, professionalization [within the humanitarian field] would help create a body of knowledge, identifying what professionals need to know and how they should act. In this way, it would help remove it from politics".[388]

This was also one of the main practitioner findings of this study. Several of the OCHA practitioners felt that the lack of professionalization and institutionalization of humanitarian diplomacy and its practices is nourishing an institutional culture in which humanitarian diplomatic know-how rests on individuals themselves, and their previous exposure to applicable experiences. There is clearly an issue of knowledge management when it comes to humanitarian diplomatic experiences within OCHA. Currently, the lack of cognizant organizational reflection of their already existing humanitarian diplomatic engagement is translating into an under-developed culture, lacking policies, training, manuals, and capacity-building, and feeding into negative institutional structures, such as gender discrimination. Gendered patterns, such as homosocial interaction, can mean strengthening of male dominance by, for example,

[386] MacQueen, *Humanitarian Intervention and the United Nations*, xiv–xv.
[387] MacQueen, *Humanitarian Intervention and the United Nations*.
[388] Barnett and Weiss, *Humanitarianism Contested*, 117

sharing insights and experiences among male leaders of the organization with the exclusion of women.

Given the emerging nature of acknowledging humanitarian diplomacy at the UN, practitioners and organizational policymakers in the process of grasping the concept are provided with some theoretical and empirical insight in this study. Particularly through the practitioner quotes, by providing a glimpse into other practitioners' insights and experiences of their humanitarian diplomatic practices and engagement can assist these audiences further in identifying their own practices, and tailoring organization-specific policy recommendations. Humanitarians have long engaged in practices of diplomacy, albeit they had not been given such a label or been identified through humanitarian diplomatic lenses. The collection of these practices also enables organizational and policy-level responses to potential capacity-building, training, and strategizing in humanitarian diplomacy.

To conclude, the social demand in understanding humanitarian diplomacy is high. Regrettably, the world's humanitarian needs are expected to increase with prolonged ongoing humanitarian crises, growing complexities, and multiple stakeholders in armed conflict and natural disasters. Given the pre-emptive potential of humanitarian diplomacy, climate change in particular creates urgent pressure to excel in humanitarian diplomacy before its related humanitarian disasters take place. Understanding humanitarian diplomacy through its practices paves the way for increased organizational learning and integration for better positioning in meeting these social demands.

References

Acuto, M. ‘Diplomats in Crisis’. *Diplomacy & Statecraft* 22 (3) (2011), 521–539, doi:10.1080/09592296.2011.599661.

Acuto, M. (ed.). *Negotiating Relief: The Politics of Humanitarian Space* (London: C. Hurst & Co. Ltd., 2014).

Acuto, M. ‘On “Opening” Humanitarian Diplomacy: A Dialectic Space’. In M. Acuto (ed.), *Negotiating Relief: The Politics of Humanitarian Space* (London: C. Hurst & Co. Ltd., 2014) 259–270.

Adler, E. and V. Pouliot. ‘International Practices’. *International Theory* 3 (1) (2011), 1–36.

Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo (AECID, Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation). *Spanish Cooperation’s Humanitarian Action Strategy 2019–2026* (Madrid: AECID, 2019). Retrieved from https://www.aecid.es/Centro-Documentacion/Documentos/201905%20Estrategia%20ingl%C3%A9s.pdf.

Aggestam, K. and I. Svensson. ‘Where are the Women in Peace Mediation?’ In K. Aggestam and A. Towns (eds.), *Gendering Diplomacy and International Negotiations* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018), 149–168.

Aggestam, K. and A. Towns. ‘The Gender Turn in Diplomacy: a New Research Agenda’. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 21 (1) (2019), 9–28, doi:10.1080/14616742.2018.1483206.

Aggestam, K. and A. Towns (eds.). *Gendering Diplomacy and International Negotiation* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018).

Al Gasseer, N., E. Dresden, G. B. Keeney and N. Warren. ‘Status of Women and Infants in Complex Humanitarian Emergencies’. *Journal of Midwifery & Women’s Health* 49 (4) (2004), 7–13.

Alleyne, M. D. ‘The United Nations’ Celebrity Diplomacy’. *The SAIS Review of International Affairs* 25 (1) (2005), 175–185, doi:10.1353/sais.2005.0001.

Altunısık, M. ‘Turkey’s Humanitarian Diplomacy: The AKP Model’. *CMI Brief* 2019:08 (2019) (Bergen, Norway) 1–5. Retrieved from https://www.cmi.no/publications/6973-turkeys-humanitarian-diplomacy-the-akp-model.

Aolain, F. N. ‘Women, Vulnerability, and Humanitarian Emergencies’. *Michigan Journal of Gender & Law* 18 (2011), 1.

Asad, T. *On Suicide Bombing* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2007).

Atkinson, M. ‘Exploring Male Femininity in the “Crisis”: Men and Cosmetic Surgery’. *Body & Society* 14 (1) (2008), 67–87, doi:10.1177/1357034X07087531.

Autesserre, S. ‘United States’ “Humanitarian Diplomacy” in South Sudan’. *Journal of Humanitarian Assistance* (2002). Retrived from https://academiccommons.columbia.edu/doi/10.7916/D81N7Z78.

Ayoob, M. ‘Humanitarian Intervention and International Society’. *Global Governance* 7 (3) (2001), 225–230, doi:10.1163/19426720-00703002.

Bahng, G. ‘Professionalizing Humanitarian Work for the Woman Worker’. *International Association of Professionals in Humanitarian Assistance and Protection* (PHAP) (2013).

Bailey, A. *Flaunting: Style and the Subversive Male Body in Renaissance England* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007).

Banks, D. E. ‘Fields of Practice: Symbolic Binding and the Qing Defense of Sinocentric Diplomacy’. *International Studies Quarterly* 63 (3) (2019), 546–557, doi:10.1093/isq/sqz054.

Barakat, S. ‘Priorities and challenges of Qatar’s Humanitarian Diplomacy’. *CMI Brief* 2019:07 (2019), 1–6 (Bergen, Norway).

Barnett, M. ‘Humanitarianism Transformed’. *Perspectives on Politics* 3 (4) (2005), 723–740.

Barnett, M. *Empire of Humanity: A History of Humanitarianism* (Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press, 2011).

Barnett, M. ‘Human Rights, Humanitarianism, and the Practices of Humanity’. *International Theory* 10 (3) (2018), 314–349.

Barnett, M. and T. Weiss. *Humanitarianism Contested: Where Angels Fear to Tread* (vol. 51) (Abingdon: Routledge, 2011).

Barrett, F. J. 'The Organizational Construction of Hegemonic Masculinity: The Case of the US Navy'. *Gender, Work, and Organization* 3 (3) (1996), 129–142, doi:10.1111/j.1468-0432.1996.tb00054.x.

Beckmann, M., and R. Hall. Elite Interviewing in Washington, DC'. In L. Mosley (ed.), *Interview Research in Political Science* (New York: Cornell University Press, 2013), 196–208.

Belloni, R. 'The Trouble with Humanitarianism'. *Review of International Studies* 33 (3) (2007), 451–474.

Bennett, A., and J. T. Checkel. *Process Tracing: From Metaphor to Analytic Tool* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

Berridge, G. R. *Diplomacy: Theory and Practice* (5th ed.) (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015).

Binder, A., and C. Meier. 'Opportunity Knocks: Why Non-Western Donors Enter Humanitarianism and How to Make the Best of it'. *International Review of the Red Cross (2005)* 93 (884) (2011), 1135–1149, doi:10.1017/S1816383112000409.

Binder, M. *The United Nations and the Politics of Selective Humanitarian Intervention* (Cham: Springer, 2016).

Bleich, E., and R. Pekkanen. 'How to Report Interview Data'. In L. Mosley (ed.), *Interview Research in Political Science* (New York: Cornell University Press, 2013), 84–105.

Bode, I. 'Women or Leaders? Practices of Narrating the United Nations as a Gendered Institution'. *International Studies Review* 22 (3) (2020), 347–369, doi:10.1093/isr/viz004.

Bowden, M., and V. Metcalfe-Hough.' Humanitarian Diplomacy and Protection Advocacy in an Age of Caution'. The Overseas Development Institute (ODI) (London: Humanitarian Policy Group, 2020), 1–17.

Bueger, C. ‘Pathways to Practice: Praxiography and International Politics’. *European Political Science Review* 6 (3) (2014), 383–406, doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1755773913000167.

Bueger, C., and F. Gadinger. *International Practice Theory* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018).

Bull, H. ‘International Theory: The Case for a Classical Approach’. *World Politics* 18 (3) (1966), 361–377, doi:10.2307/2009761.

Butler, J. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York and London: Routledge, 1990).

Buvinic, M., M. Das Gupta, U. Casabonne, and P. Verwimp. ‘Violent Conflict and Gender Inequality: an Overview’. *The World Bank Research Observer* 28 (1) (2013), 110–138.

Carr, E. H. *The Twenty Years’ Crisis 1919–1939: an Introduction to the Study of International Relations* (2nd ed.) (London: Macmillan, 1946).

Cassidy, J. (ed.). *Gender and Diplomacy* (London, New York: Routledge, 2017).

Checkel, J. T. ‘The Constructive Turn in International Relations Theory’. *World Politics* 50 (2) (1998), 324–348.

Chouliaraki, L. *The Ironic Spectator: Solidarity in the Age of Post-humanitarianism* (Cambridge: Polity, 2013).

Chouliaraki, L. ‘Mediating Vulnerability: Cosmopolitanism and the Public Sphere’. *Media, Culture & Society* 35 (1) (2013), 105–112, doi:10.1177/0163443712464564.

Clark, J. ‘Advocacy’. In H. Anheier and S. Toepler (eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Civil Society* (New York: Springer, 2010), 12–18.

Clark, M. *Humanitarian Multi-Track Diplomacy: Conceptualizing the Definitive, Particular, and Critical Role of Diplomatic Function in Humanitarian Action.* (PhD, University of Groningen, 2018).

Clements, A. *Humanitarian Negotiations with Armed Groups: The Frontlines of Diplomacy* (1st ed.) (London and New York: Routledge, 2020).

Clough, P. ‘Judith Butler’. In G. Ritzer (ed.), *The Blackwell Companion to Major Contemporary Social Theorists* (Malden MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2003), 333–352.

Collins, P. H., and S. Bilge. *Intersectionality* (2nd ed.) (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2020).

Connell, R. *Masculinities* (2nd ed.) (London: Routledge, 2020 [1995]).

Connell, R. W. ‘Change Among the Gatekeepers: Men, Masculinities, and Gender Equality in the Global Arena’. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 30 (3) (2005), 1801–1825.

Constantinou, C. M. ‘In Pursuit of Crisis Diplomacy’. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy* 10 (1) (2015), 29–34, doi:https://doi.org/10.1163/1871191X-12341304.

Constantinou, C. M. ‘Everyday Diplomacy: Mission, Spectacle and the Remaking of Diplomatic Culture’. In J. Dittmer and F. McConnell (eds.), *Diplomatic Cultures and International Politics: Translations, Spaces and Alternatives* (London and New York: Routledge, 2016), 23–40.

Constantinou, C. M., N. Cornago and F. McConnell. ‘Transprofessional Diplomacy’. *Brill Research Perspectives in Diplomacy and Foreign Policy* 1 (4) (2016), 1–66.

Constantinou, C. M., J. Dittmer, M. Kuus, F. McConnell, S. O. Opondo and V. Pouliot. ‘Thinking with Diplomacy: Within and Beyond Practice Theory’. *International Political Sociology* 15 (4) (2021), 559–587.

Constantinou, C. M., P. Kerr and P. Sharp. *The SAGE Handbook of Diplomacy* (London: SAGE, 2016).

Cook, A. D. ‘Humanitarian Diplomacy in ASEAN’. *Asian Journal of Comparative Politics* (special issue) (2021), 1–14, doi:10.1177/20578911211019247.

Cooper, A. F., and J. Cornut. ‘The Changing Practices of Frontline Diplomacy: New Directions for Inquiry’. *Review of International Studies* 45 (2) (2019), 300–319.

Cooper, A. F., J. Heine and R. Thakur. 'Introduction: The Challenges of 21st-Century Diplomacy'. In A. F. Cooper, J. Heine and R. Thakur (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).

Cooper, B. 'Intersectionality'. In L. Disch and M. Hawkesworth (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Feminist Theory* (vol. 1) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 385–406..

Cornut, J. 'The Practice Turn in International Relations Theory'. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of International Studies* (2015), 1–26. Retrieved from https://oxfordre.com/internationalstudies/internationalstudies/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190846626.001.0001/acrefore-9780190846626-e-113.

Cornut, J. 'To be a Diplomat Abroad: Diplomatic Practice at Embassies'. *Cooperation and Conflict* 50 (3) (2015), 385–401.

Crenshaw, K. 'Why Intersectionality Can't Wait'. *Washington Post* (September 24, 2015). Retrived from https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/in-theory/wp/2015/09/24/why-intersectionality-cant-wait/;

D'Amico, F. 'Women Workers in the United Nations: From Margin to Mainstream?' In M. Meyer and E. Prügl (eds.), *Gender Politics in Global Governance* (Lanham MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999), 19–40.

Davies, M. J. 'From Arrow to Path: International Relations Theory and the Humanitarian Space'. In M. Acuto (ed.), *Negotiating Relief: The Politics of Humanitarian Space* (London: C. Hurst & Co. Ltd, 2014), 211–220.

Davutoğlu, A. 'Turkey's Humanitarian Diplomacy: Objectives, Challenges and Prospects'. *Nationalities Papers* 41 (6) (2013), 865–870, doi:10.1080/00905992.2013.857299.

De Lauri, A. (ed.). *The Politics of Humanitarianism: Power, Ideology and Aid* (London: I. B. Tauris 2016).

De Lauri, A. 'Introduction'. In De Lauri, A. (ed.). *The Politics of Humanitarianism: Power, Ideology and Aid* (London: I. B. Tauris 2016), 1–16.

De Lauri, A. 'Humanitarian Diplomacy: A New Research Agenda'. *CMI* (2018) (Bergen, Norway).

De Lauri, A. ‘Diplomacy’. In *Humanitarianism: Keywords* (Leiden: Brill, 2020), 44–46.

De Waal, A. ‘The Humanitarians’ Tragedy: Escapable and Inescapable Cruelties’. *Disasters* 34 (2010), S130–S137.

DeChaine, D. R. ‘Humanitarian Space and the Social Imaginary: Médecins Sans Frontières/Doctors Without Borders and the Rhetoric of Global Community’. *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 26 (4) (2002), 354–369.

Dobrowolska-Polak, J. ‘Humanitarian Diplomacy of the European Union’. *Open Europe: Cultural Dialogue Across Borders* 5: New Diplomacy in Open Europe (2014), 115–126.

Doh, J. P., N. M. Dahan and M. Casario. ‘MNEs and the Practice of International Business Diplomacy’. *International Business Review* 31 (1) (2022), 101926, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2021.101926.

Douzinas, C. ‘The Many Faces of Humanitarianism’. *Parrhesia* 2 (1) (2007), 28.

Du Pasquier, F. ‘Gender Diversity Dynamics in Humanitarian Negotiations: The International Committee of the Red Cross as a Case Study on the Frontlines of Armed Conflicts’. *Harvard Humanitarian Initiative, Advanced Training Program on Humanitarian Action* (Humanitarian Negotiation Working Paper Series, Paper #1) (2016), 1–22. Retrieved from https://www.alnap.org/system/files/content/resource/files/main/atha-gender-diversity-dynamics-in-humanitarian-negotiations.pdf.

Dunn, E. C. ‘The Chaos of Humanitarian Aid: Adhocracy in the Republic of Georgia’. *Humanity* 3 (1) (2012), 1–23, doi:10.1353/hum.2012.0005.

Egeland, J. ‘Humanitarian Diplomacy’. In A. F. Cooper, J. Heine and R. Thakur (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013) 352–368.

Ehrenreich, B., and A. R. Hochschild. *Global Woman: Nannies, Maids, and Sex Workers in the New Economy* (London: Granta Books, 2003).

Eichler, M. ‘Militarized Masculinities in International Relations’. *Brown Journal of World Affairs* 21 (2014), 81.

Emmerij, L. ‘The History of Ideas: An Introduction to the United Nations Intellectual History Project’. *Forum for Development Studies* 32 (1) (2005), 9–20, doi:10.1080/08039410.2005.9666298.

Enloe, C. ‘All the Men Are in the Militias, All the Women Are Victims: The Politics of Masculinity and Femininity in Nationalist Wars’. In *The Curious Feminist: Searching for Women in a New Age of Empire*, 1st ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004), 99–118.

European Commission. *General Guidelines for Operational Priorities on Humanitarian Aid in 2015* (SWD (2014) 345 final) (Brussels: European Commission, 2014). Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/echo/who/accountability/strategy_en.

European Commission. *General Guidelines on Operational Priorities for Humanitarian Aid in 2018* (SWD (2017) 464 final) (Brussels: European Commission, 2017). Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/echo/who/accountability/strategy_en.

Fassbender, B. *The United Nations Charter as the Constitution of the International Community* (Leiden: Brill, 2009).

Fassin, D. ‘Humanitarianism as a Politics of Life’. *Public Culture* 19 (3) (2007), 499–520.

Fassin, D. *Humanitarian Reason: a Moral History of the Present* (1st ed.) (Berkerley CA: University of California Press, 2012).

Fechter, A.-M., and A. Schwittay. ‘Citizen Aid: Grassroots Interventions in Development and Humanitarianism’. *Third World Quarterly* 40 (10) (2019), 1769–1780, doi:10.1080/01436597.2019.1656062.

Ferguson, R. B. ‘Masculinity and War’. *Current Anthropology* 62 (S23) (2021), S108–S120.

Ferris, E. ‘Faith and Humanitarianism: It’s Complicated’. *Journal of Refugee Studies* 24 (3) (2011), 606–625, doi:10.1093/jrs/fer028.

Fiott, D. ‘Humanitarian Diplomacy’. In G. Martel (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Diplomacy* (Online: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., 2018) 1–10.

Foreign Service Journal. ‘Humanitarian diplomacy: An experienced practitioner addresses today’s unprecedented challenges. Q&A with Kelly Clements, Deputy High Commissioner for Refugees’. *American Foreign Service Association* (April 2016). Retrieved from https://www.afsa.org/humanitarian-diplomacy.

Fox, F. ‘New Humanitarianism: Does it Provide a Moral Banner for the 21st Century?’ *Disasters* 25 (4) (2001), 275–289.

France. *France’s Humanitarian Strategy* (Paris, 2018). Retrieved from https://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/en/french-foreign-policy/emergency-humanitarian-action/france-s-humanitarian-strategy-2018-2022/.

Fraser, N. *Fortunes of Feminism: From State-Managed Capitalism to Neoliberal Crisis* (London: Verso Books, 2013).

Fréchette, L. ‘Foreword – Diplomacy: Old Trade, New Challenges’. In A. F. Cooper, J. Heine and R. Thakur (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013) xxx–xxxv.

Germany. *Federal Foreign Office Strategy for Humanitartian Assistance Abroad 2019–2023* (Berlin, 2019). Retrieved from https://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/blob/282228/3cfd87de36f30bb61eed542249997631/strategie-huhi-englisch-data.pdf.

Gibbings, S. L. ‘No Angry Women at the United Nations: Political Dreams and the Cultural Politics of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325’. *International Feminist Journal of Politics 13* (4) (2011), 522–538, doi:10.1080/14616742.2011.611660.

Giddens, A. ‘The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration – Elements of the Theory Structuration’. In G. Spiegel (ed.), *Practicing History: New Directions in Historical Writing after the Linguistic Turn* (New York and London: Routledge, 2005), 119–140.

Gioia, D. A., and A. L. Hamilton. ‘Great Debates in Organizational Identity Study’. *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Identity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 21–38.

Gökalp, D. ‘The UAE’s Humanitarian Diplomacy: Claiming State Sovereignty, Regional Leverage and International Recognition’. *CMI Working Paper* 2020:1 (2020) (Bergen, Norway), 1–11.

Goldstein, J. ‘War and Gender: How Gender Shapes the War System and Vice Versa’. In C. Ember and M. Ember (eds.), *Men and Women in the World’s Cultures* (vol. 1) (New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, 2003), 107–116.

Gordenker, L., and C. Jönsson. ‘Evolution in Knowledge and Norms’. In T. G. Weiss and S. Daws (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook on the United Nations* (2nd ed.) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), 104–115.

Gordon, S., and A. Donini. ‘Romancing Principles and Human Rights: Are Humanitarian Principles Salvageable?’ *International Review of the Red Cross* 97 (897–898) (2015), 77–109, doi:10.1017/S1816383115000727.

Gowan, R. ‘“Less Bound to the Desk”: Ban Ki-moon, the UN, and Preventive Diplomacy’. *Global Governance* 18 (4) (2012), 387–404. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/24526378.

Grundmann, M. ‘Social Constructions Through Socialization: the Perspective of a Constructivist Socialization Research’. In M. Pfadenhauer and H. Knoblauch *Social Constructivism as Paradigm? The Legacy of The Social Construction of Reality* (Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2019), 91–104.

Haack, K. ‘Breaking Barriers: Women’s Representation and Leadership at the United Nations’. *Global Governance* 20 (2014), 37–54.

Haack, K. ‘Gaining Access to the “World’s Largest Men’s Club”: Women Leading UN Agencies’. *Global Society: Journal of Interdisciplinary International Relations* 28 (2) (2014), 217–240, doi:10.1080/13600826.2014.887558.

Halberstam, J. *Female Masculinity* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1998).

Halberstam, J. ‘Global Female Masculinities’. *Sexualities* 15 (3–4) (2012), 336–354, doi:10.1177/1363460712436480.

Halme-Tuomisaari, M. ‘Methodologically Blonde at the UN in a Tactical Quest for Inclusion’. *Social Anthropology* 26 (4) (2018), 456–470.

Hamilton, K. and R. Langhorne. *The Practice of Diplomacy: Its Evolution, Theory, and Administration* (2nd ed.) (London: Routledge, 2011).

Haraway, D. 'Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective'. *Feminist Studies* 14 (3) (1988), 575–599, doi:10.2307/3178066.

Harder, H. 'Explanatory Case Study'. In A. J. Mills, G. Durepos and E. Wiebe (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Case Study Research* (Thousand Oaks: SAGE, 2010), 370–371, doi:10.4135/9781412957397.

Harroff-Tavel, M. 'The Humanitarian Diplomacy of the International Committee of the Red Cross'. *Relations internationales* 121 (1) (2005), 73–89, doi:10.3917/ri.121.0073.

Haywood, C., T. Johansson, N. Hammarén, M. Herz and A. Ottemo. *The Conundrum of Masculinity: Hegemony, Homosociality, Homophobia and Heteronormativity* (Oxfordshire: Routledge, 2017).

Haywood, C., and M. Mac an Ghaill. *Men and Masculinities: Theory, Research and Social Practice* (Buckingham: Open University Press, 2003).

Heine, J., R. Thakur and A. F. Cooper. *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).

Heinze, E. *Waging Humanitarian War: The Ethics, Law, and Politics of Humanitarian Intervention* (Albany NY: State University of New York Press, 2009).

Hilhorst, D. 'Classical Humanitarianism and resilience Humanitarianism: Making Sense of Two Brands of Humanitarian Action'. *Journal of International Humanitarian Action* 3 (1) (2018), 1–12, doi:10.1186/s41018-018-0043-6.

Hilhorst, D., M. Hagan and O. Quinn. 'Reconsidering Humanitarian Advocacy through Pressure Points of the European "Migration Crisis". *International Migration* 59 (3) (2021), 125–144.

Hill, D. B. '"Feminine" Heterosexual Men: Subverting Heteropatriarchal Sexual Scripts?' *The Journal of Men's Studies* 14 (2) (2007), 145–159.

Hilton, M., E. Baughan, E. Davey, B. Everill, K. O'Sullivan and T. Sasson. 'History and Humanitarianism: a Conversation'. *Past & Present* 241 (1) (2018), e1–e38.

B. Hocking. 'Multistakeholder Diplomacy: Forms, Functions, and Frustrations'. In S. Slavik (ed.), *Multistakeholder Diplomacy: Challenges and Opportunities* (Malta and Geneva: DiploFoundation, 2006), 13–29

Hoffmann, S. (ed.). *The Ethics and Politics of Humanitarian Intervention* (Notre Dame IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1996).

Hopf, T. 'The Logic of Habit in International Relations'. *European Journal of International Relations* 16 (4) (2010), 539–561.

Hopf, T. 'Change in International Practices'. *European Journal of International Relations* 24 (3) (2018), 687–711, doi:10.1177/1354066117718041.

Hoppe, K. (ed.). *Chasing Misery: an Anthology of Essays by Women in Humanitarian Responses* (North Charleston: CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2014).

Houldey, G. 'Humanitarian Response and Stress in Kenya: Gendered Problems and their Implications'. *Gender & Development* 27 (2) (2019), 337–353, doi:10.1080/13552074.2019.1615281.

Humanitarian Women's Network. *Humanitarian Women's Network: Full Survey Results* (HWN, 2016). Retrieved from https://www.humanitarianwomensnetwork.org/about.

Hurd, I. 'Constructivism'. In C. Reus-Smit and D. Snidal (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, (2009), 298–316.

Hutchings, K. 'Making Sense of Masculinity and War'. *Men and Masculinities* 10 (4) (2008), 389–404.

Hyder, M. 'Nurturing Humanitarian Space in Sudan'. In H. Smith and L. Minear (eds.), *Humanitarian Diplomacy: Practitioners and their Craft* (Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2007), 239–257.

ICRC, *Code of Conduct for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) in Disaster Relief* (Geneva: ICRC, 1994). Retrieved from https://www.icrc.org/en/doc/resources/documents/publication/p1067.htm.

IFRC, *Humanitarian Diplomacy Policy* (Geneva: IFRC, 2017). Retrieved from https://www.ifrc.org/sites/default/files/Humanitarian-Diplomacy-Policy_EN.pdf.

James, N., and H. Busher. *Online Interviewing* (London: SAGE Publications Ltd., 2009).

Johansen, C. B., and S. B. Waldorff. 'What are Institutional Logics – and where is the perspective taking us?' In Krücken, G. et al. (eds.), *New Themes in Institutional Analysis* (Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2017), 51–76, doi:10.1108/S0733-558X(2013)0039A&B008.

Jora, L. 'New Practices and Trends in Cultural Diplomacy'. *Romanian Review of Political Sciences and International Relations* 10 (1) (2013), 43–52.

Kaplan, M. A. 'Is International Relations a Discipline?' *The Journal of Politics* 23 (3) (1961), 462–476.

Kaplan, M. A. 'The New Great Debate: Traditionalism vs. Science in International Relations'. *World Politics* 19 (1) (1966), 1–20, doi:10.2307/2009840.

Kirecci, M. A. 'Humanitarian Diplomacy in Theory and Practice'. *Perceptions* 20 (1) (2015), 1–6.

Lafrenière, J., C. Sweetman and T. Thylin. 'Introduction: Gender, Humanitarian Action and Crisis Response'. *Gender & Development* 27 (2) (2019), 187–201, doi:10.1080/13552074.2019.1634332.

Langhorne, R. 'The Diplomacy of Non-State Actors'. *Diplomacy & Statecraft* 16 (2) (2005), 331–339, doi:10.1080/09592290590948388.

Lequesne, C. 'EU Foreign Policy Through the Lens of Practice Theory: a Different Approach to the European External Action Service'. *Cooperation and Conflict* 50 (3) (2015), 351–367.

Lin, P. ‘China’s Evolving Humanitarian Diplomacy: Evidence from China’s Disaster-Related Aid to Nepal’. *Asian Journal of Comparative Politics* (2021), 1–17 doi:10.1177/20578911211019255.

Lykke, N. ‘The Timeliness of Post-Constructionism’. *Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research* 18 (2) (2010), 131–136, doi:10.1080/08038741003757760.

MacQueen, N. *Humanitarian Intervention and the United Nations* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011).

Mahbubani, K. ‘Multilateral Diplomacy’. In A. F. Cooper, J. Heine and R. Thakur (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 248–262.

Maitlis, S., and S. Sonenshein. ‘Sensemaking in Crisis and Change: Inspiration and Insights from Weick (1988)’. *Journal of Management Studies* 47 (3) (2010), 551–580.

Maley, W. ‘Humanitarians and Diplomats: What Connections?’ In M. Acuto ed., *Negotiating Relief: The Politics of Humanitarian Space* (London: C. Hurst & Co. Ltd. 2014), 201–210.

Manohar, N., P. Liamputtong, S. Bhole and A. Arora. ‘Researcher Positionality in Cross-Cultural and Sensitive Research’. In P. Liamputtong (ed.), *Handbook of Research Methods in Health Social Sciences* (Singapore: Springer, 2019), 1–15.

Mascarenhas, M. *New Humanitarianism and the Crisis of Charity: Good Intentions on the Road to Help*. Bloomington IN: Indiana University Press, 2017).

McCarthy, H. *Women of the World: The Rise of the Female Diplomat* (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2014).

McCarthy, H. and J. Southern. ‘Women, Gender, and Diplomacy: a Historical Survey’. In J. Cassidy (ed.), *Gender and Diplomacy* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2017), 15–31.

McCourt, D. M. ‘Practice Theory and Relationalism as the New Constructivism’. *International Studies Quarterly* 60 (3) (2016), 475–485.

Meisler, S. *United Nations: A History*. (New York: Grove Press, 2011).

Mills, K. ‘Neo-humanitarianism: The Role of International Humanitarian Norms and Organizations in Contemporary Conflict’. *Global Governance* 11 (2005), 161–183.

Minear, L. *The Humanitarian Enterprise: Dilemmas and Discoveries* (Bloomfield CT: Kumarian Press, 2002).

Minear, L. ‘The Craft of Humanitarian Diplomacy’. In H. Smith and L. Minear (eds.), *Humanitarian Diplomacy:Practitioners and Their Craft* (Geneva: United Nations University Press, 2007), 7–35.

Mohanty, C. ‘Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses’. *Feminist Review* 30 (1) (1988), 61–88.

Moreels, R. ‘Humanitarian Diplomacy’. In F. Kalshoven (ed.), *Assisting the Victims of Armed Conflict and Other Disasters* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1989), 43–54.

Morris, N. ‘The Balkans: The Limits of Humanitarian Action’. In H. Smith and L. Minear (eds.), *Humanitarian Diplomacy: Practitioners and their Craft* (Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2007), 347–371.

Murray, S. *Sports Diplomacy: Origins, Theory and Practice* (London: Routledge, 2018).

Neumann, I. B. ‘Returning Practice to the Linguistic Turn: The Case of Diplomacy’. *Millennium* 31 (3) (2002), 627–651.

Neumann, I. B. ‘The Body of the Diplomat’. *European Journal of International Relations* 14 (4) (2008), 671–695, doi:10.1177/1354066108097557.

New Zealand. *New Zealand’s Humanitarian Action Policy* (Wellington, 2019). Retrieved from https://www.mfat.govt.nz/assets/Aid-Prog-docs/Policy/MFAT-Humanitarian-Action-Policy-2019.pdf.

Ngo, B., and S. Hansen. ‘Constructing Identities in UN Refugee Camps: the Politics of Language, Culture and Humanitarian Assistance’. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies* 10 (2) (2013), 97–120.

Nick, S. *Use of Language in Diplomacy* (2001). Paper presented at the the Second International Conference on Knowledge and Diplomacy (February 2000), and the International Conference on Language and Diplomacy (January 2001), Malta.

Norman, L. 'Interpretive Process Tracing and Causal Explanations'. *Qualitative & Multi-Method Research* 13 (2015), 4–9.

Norway. *Norway's Humanitarian Strategy: An Effective and Integrated Approach* (Oslo, 2018). Retrieved from https://www.regjeringen.no/en/dokumenter/strategi-for-norsk-humanitar-politikk/id2608151/.

Noy, C. 'Sampling Knowledge: The Hermeneutics of Snowball Sampling in Qualitative Research'. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 11 (4) (2008), 327–344, doi:10.1080/13645570701401305.

Nussbaum, M. *The Cosmopolitan Tradition: a Noble but Flawed Ideal* (Cambridge MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2019).

Nygaard, L. P., and K. Solli. *Strategies for Writing a Thesis by Publication in the Social Sciences and Humanities* (London: Routledge, 2021).

OCHA. *To Stay and Deliver: Good Practice for Humanitarians in Complex Security Environments* by Jan Egeland, Adele Harmer, and Abby Stoddard for OCHA Policy Development and Studies Branch, Policy and Studies Series (2011), 1–105. Retrieved from https://www.unocha.org/sites/unocha/files/Stay_and_Deliver.pdf.

OCHA. *Coordination to Save Lives: History and Emerging Challenges*, OCHA Policy Development and Studies Branch, Policy and Studies Series (2012), 1–40. Retrieved from https://www.unocha.org/sites/unocha/files/Coordination%20to%20Save%20Lives%20History%20and%20Emerging%20Challenges_0.pdf.

OCHA. *OCHA On Message: Humanitarian Principles*. United Nations (2017), 1–2. Retrieved from https://www.unocha.org/sites/unocha/files/OOM-humanitarianprinciples_eng_28Feb2017_0.pdf.

OCHA. *Global Humanitarian Overview 2020.* United Nations (2019), 1–88. Retrieved from https://reliefweb.int/report/world/global-humanitarian-overview-2020-enarfrzh.

OCHA. *OCHA On Message: Gender-Based Violence*. United Nations (2019), 1–3. Retrieved from https://www.unocha.org/sites/unocha/files/OOM_GBV_in_emergencies.pdf.

OCHA. *OCHA On Message: Gender in Humanitarian Action*. United Nations (2019), 1–2. Retrieved from https://www.unocha.org/sites/unocha/files/OOM%20Template%20gender%20-%2005Aug2019%20%28002%29.pdf.

OCHA. *This is OCHA*. United Nations (2021), 1–22. Retrieved from https://www.unocha.org/about-ocha/our-work.

O'Hagan, J., and M. Hirono. 'Fragmentation of the International Humanitarian Order? Understanding "Cultures of Humanitarianism" in East Asia'. *Ethics & International Affairs* 28 (4) (2014), 409–424, doi:10.1017/S0892679414000586.

O'Hagan, J. 'Australia and the Promise and the Perils of Humanitarian Diplomacy'. *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 70 (6) (2016), 657–669, doi:10.1080/10357718.2016.1220495.

Olivius, E. 'Refugee Men as Perpetrators, Allies or Troublemakers? Emerging Discourses on Men and Masculinities in Humanitarian Aid'. *Women's Studies International Forum* 56 (2016), 56–65, doi:10.1016/j.wsif.2015.12.004.

Omawale, O. 'Negotiating the Release and Rehabilitation of Child Soldiers in Sierra Leone'. In H. Smith and L. Minear (eds.), *Humanitarian Diplomacy: Practitioners and their Craft* (Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2007), 276–297.

Ormhaug, C., P. Meier and H. Hernes. 'Armed Conflict Deaths Disaggregated by Gender'. *PRIO Paper* 23 (2009). Retrieved from https://www.prio.org/publications/7207.

Pajtinka, E. 'Cultural Diplomacy in Theory and Practice of Contemporary International Relations'. *Politické vedy* 17 (4) (2014), 95–108.

Pandolfi, M., and P. Rousseau, P. ‘Governing the Crisis: A Critical Genealogy of Humanitarianism’. In A. De Lauri (ed.), *The Politics of Humanitarianism: Power, Ideology and Aid* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2016), 17–32.

Paulmann, J. ‘Conjunctures in the History of International Humanitarian Aid During the Twentieth Century’. *Humanity: An International Journal of Human Rights, Humanitarianism, and Development* 4 (2) (2013), 215–238.

Pease, K.-K. *Human Rights and Humanitarian Diplomacy: Negotiating for Human Rights Protection and Humanitarian Access* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016).

Peterson, V. S. ‘Transgressing Boundaries: Theories of Knowledge, Gender and International Relations’. *Millennium* 21 (2) (1992), 183–206.

Peterson, V. S. (ed.). *Gendered States: Feminist (Re)Visions of International Relations Theory* (Boulder CO: Lynne Rienner, 1992).

Pouliot, V. *International Security in Practice: The Politics of NATO-Russia Diplomacy* (vol. 113) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

Pouliot, V. *International Pecking Orders: The Politics and Practice of Multilateral Diplomacy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016).

Pouliot, V., and J. Cornut. ‘Practice Theory and the Study of Diplomacy: A Research Agenda’. *Cooperation and Conflict* 50 (3) (2015), 297–315, doi:10.1177/0010836715574913.

Redfield, P. *Life in Crisis: The Ethical Journey of Doctors Without Borders* (Berkley CA: University of California Press, 2013).

Régnier, P. ‘The Emerging Concept of Humanitarian Diplomacy: Identification of a Community of Practice and Prospects for International Recognition’. *International Review of the Red Cross* 93 (884) (2011), 1211–1237.

Reid, E. J. ‘Nonprofit Advocacy and Political Participation’. In E.T. Boris and C.E. Steuerle (eds.), *Nonprofits and Government: Collaboration and Conflict* (Washington DC: Brookings, 1999), 291–325.

Reinisch, J. ‘Introduction: Relief in the Aftermath of War’. *Journal of Contemporary History* 43 (3) (2008), 371–404, doi:10.1177/0022009408091819.

Reiter, B. ‘Theory and Methodology of Exploratory Social Science Research’. *International Journal of Science and Research Methodology* 5 (4) (2017), 129–150, 131.

Reus-Smit, C. and D. Snidal. ‘Between Utopia and Reality: The Practical Discourses of International Relations’. In C. Reus-Smit and D. Snidal (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 3–37.

Reyes, V. ‘Ethnographic Toolkit: Strategic Positionality and Researchers’ Visible and Invisible Tools in Field Research’. *Ethnography* 21 (2) (2020), 220–240, doi:10.1177/1466138118805121.

Richey, L. A. ‘Conceptualizing “Everyday Humanitarianism”: Ethics, Affects, and Practices of Contemporary Global Helping’. *New Political Science* 40 (4) (2018), 625–639, doi:10.1080/07393148.2018.1528538.

Rieffer-Flanagan, B. A. ‘Is Neutral Humanitarianism Dead? Red Cross Neutrality: Walking the Tightrope of Neutral Humanitarianism’. *Human Rights Quarterly* 31 (4) (2009), 888–915. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/40389980.

Riley, S., W. Schouten and S. Cahill, S. ‘Exploring the Dynamics of Subjectivity and Power Between Researcher and Researched’. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 4 (2) (2003), 1–20.

Rouse, J. ‘Practice Theory’. In S. Turner and M. W. Risjord (eds.), *Philosophy of Anthropology and Sociology* (Amsterdam and Oxford: Elsevier, 2007), 639–681.

Rousseau, E. and A. S. Pende. ‘Humanitarian Diplomacy’. In T. Balzacq, F. Charillon and F. Ramel (eds.), *Global Diplomacy: An Introduction to Theory and Practice* (Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2020) 253–266.

Sadik, G., and H. Zorba. ‘Humanitarian Diplomacy for Syrian Refugees and Turkey-EU Relations’. *Göç Araştırmaları Dergisi* 3 (2) (2017), 10–39.

Sajjad, T. ‘Women Guerillas: Marching Toward True Freedom? An Analysis of Women’s Experiences in the Frontlines of Guerilla Warfare and in the Post-war Period’. *Agenda* 18 (59) (2004), 4–16.

Salamon, L. M. ‘Explaining Nonprofit Advocacy: an Exploratory Analysis’. In *Center for Civil Society Studies Working Paper Series* (vol. 21) (Baltimore MD: John Hopkins University, 2002).

Salmons, J. ‘Designing and Conducting Research with Online Interviews’. In J. Salmons (ed.), *Cases in Online Interview Research* (Thousand Oaks: SAGE, 2012), 1–30, doi:10.4135/9781506335155.

Schatzki, T. R. ‘Practice Mind-ed Orders’. In T. R. Schatzki, K. K. Cetina and E. V. Savigny (eds.), *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory* (London: Routledge, 2001), 50–63.

Schultz, M., and T. Hernes. ‘Temporal Interplay Between Strategy and Identity: Punctuated, Subsumed, and Sustained Modes’. *Strategic Organization* 18 (1) (2020), 106–135.

Schweizer, B. ‘“The Spirit of Geneva”: Humanitarian Diplomacy and Advocacy’. *Refugee Survey Quarterly* 26 (4) (2007), 163–165, doi:10.1093/rsq/hdi0275.

Seeger, H. ‘The Field: The Ever Receding Vanishing Point. In K. Hoppe (ed.), *In Chasing Misery: An Anthology of Essays by Women in Humanitarian Responses, edited by Kelsey Hoppe* (North Charleston SC: CreateSpace Independent Publishing, 2014), 31–35.

Sending, O. J. ‘United by Difference: Diplomacy as a Thin Culture’. *International Journal* 66 (3) (2011), 643–659. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/23104373.

Sending, O. J., V. Pouliot and I. B. Neumann. ‘The Future of Diplomacy: Changing Practices, Evolving Relationships’. *International Journal* 66 (3) (2011), 527–542.

Sending, O. J., V. Pouliot and I. B. Neumann, eds. *Diplomacy and the making of world politics* (vol. 136) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

Setiawan, A., and H. Hamka. *Role of Indonesian Humanitarian Diplomacy toward Rohingya Crisis in Myanmar*. Paper presented at the 2nd International Conference on Social Sciences (Jakarta: ICSS, 2020).

Seybolt, T. B. *Humanitarian Military Intervention: the Conditions for Success and Failure* (Stockholm: SIPRI Publication, 2007).

Shepherd, L. J. *Gender, UN Peacebuilding, and the Politics of Space: Locating Legitimacy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017).

Simms, B. and D. J. Trim. *Humanitarian Intervention: A History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

Slim, H. *Humanitarian Ethics: A Guide to the Morality of Aid in War and Disaster*. London: C. Hurst & Co. Ltd., 2015).

Slim, H. 'Humanitarian Diplomacy: The ICRC's Neutral and Impartial Advocacy in Armed Conflicts'. *Ethics & International Affairs* 33 (1) (2019), 67–77.

Smith, H. and L. Minear (eds.). *Humanitarian Diplomacy: Practitioners and their Craft* (Geneva: The United Nations University Press, 2007).

Smith, H. 'Humanitarian Diplomacy: Theory and Practice'. In H. Smith and L. Minear (eds.), *Humanitarian Diplomacy: Practitioners and Their Craft* (Geneva: United Nations University Press, 2007), 36–62.

Spain. *Spain's Humanitarian Diplomacy*. (Madrid, 2018). Retrieved from http://www.exteriores.gob.es/Portal/es/Documents/version%20ingles/20190305%20web%20Diplomacia%20Humanitaria%20(%20Ingle%CC%81s).pdf.

Spindler, M. *International Relations: A Self-Study Guide to Theory* (Opladen: Barbara Budrich Publishers, 2013).

Stamatov, P. *The Origins of Global Humanitarianism: Religion, Empires, and Advocacy* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

Standfield, C. 'Caught Between Art and Science: the Women, Peace and Security Agenda in United Nations Mediation Narratives'. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 22 (5) (2020), 629–651, doi:10.1080/14616742.2020.1716632.

Standfield, C. 'Gendering the Practice Turn in Diplomacy'. *European Journal of International Relations* 26 (1_suppl) (2020), 140–165, doi:10.1177/1354066120940351.

Straus, O. S., E. P. Wheeler, T. P. Ion, C. L. Lange, T. Marburg and J. Wheless, J. 'Humanitarian Diplomacy of the United States'. *Proceedings of the American Society of International Law at Its Annual Meeting (1907–1917)* 6 (1912), 45–59. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/25656434.

Streb, C. ‘Exploratory Case Study’. In A. J. Mills, G. Durepos and E. Wiebe (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Case Study Research* (Thousand Oaks: SAGE, 2010), 372–373, doi:10.4135/9781412957397.

Thaddeus Jackson, P., E. Adler, V. Pouliot, R. Adler-Nissen, O. J. Sending, C. Bueger and F. Gadinger. *The Practice Turn in International Relations* (2017). Paper presented at the An Internatational Studies Quarterly Online Symposium, https://www.dhnexon.net/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/ISQSymposiumBuegerandGadinger.pdf.

Tickner, J. A. ‘You Just Don’t Understand: Troubled Engagements Between Feminists and IR Theorists’. *International Studies Quarterly* 41 (4) (1997), 611–632, doi:10.1111/1468-2478.00060.

Ticktin, M. ‘The Gendered Human of Humanitarianism: Medicalising and Politicising Sexual Violence’. *Gender & History* 23 (2011), 250–265, doi:10.1111/j.1468-0424.2011.01637.x.

Tobin, R. ‘Descriptive Case Study’. In A. J. Mills, G. Durepos and E. Wiebe (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Case Study Research* (Thousand Oaks: SAGE, 2010), 288–289, doi:10.4135/9781412957397.

Towns, A. and B. Niklasson. ‘Gender, International Status, and Ambassador Appointments’. *Foreign Policy Analysis* 13 (3) (2017), 521–540, doi:10.1093/fpa/orw039.

Turunen, S. ‘Humanitarian Diplomatic Practices,’ *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy* 15 (4) (2020), 459–487, doi:10.1163/1871191X-BJA10008

Turunen, S. ‘Conceptualizing ‘Leave No One Behind’’. *CMI Working Paper* WP 2021:04 (2021), 1–10. Retrieved from https://www.cmi.no/publications/7881-conceptualizing-leave-no-one-behind.

Turunen, S. ‘Gains of the Unfeasible: Manifestations of ‘Leave No One Behind’ in the United Nations’ Humanitarianism’. *CMI Working Paper* WP 2021:05 (2021), 1–12. Retrieved from https://www.cmi.no/publications/7882-gains-of-the-unfeasible-manifestations-of-leave-no-one-behind-in-the-united-nations-humanitarianism.

Turunen, S. '"Have You Been Recruited Because You Are a Woman or Because You Are Good?" Gendered Humanitarian Diplomats at the United Nations'. *Diplomatica* 5 (1) (forthcoming in 2023).

Van der Waldt, G. 'Constructing Conceptual Frameworks in Social Science Research'. *The Journal for Transdisciplinary Research in Southern Africa* 16 (1) (2020), 1–9, doi:10.4102/td.v16i1.758.

Veuthey, M. 'Humanitarian Diplomacy: Saving it when it is Most Needed'. Paper presented at the Humanitarian Space, Webster University Geneva 16th Humanitarian Conference. (Geneva: Webster University, 2012).

Waldorff, S. B., T. Reay, E. Goodrick. 'A Tale of two Countries: How Different Constellations of Logics Impact Action'. In Lounsbury, M. and E. Boxenbaum, (eds.), *Institutional Logics in Action, Part A (Research in the Sociology of Organizations, Vol. 39 Part A)* (Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 2013), 99–129.

Walkerdine, V. 'Femininity as Performance'. Oxford Review of Education 15 (3) (1989), 267–279.

Weiss, T. G., and C. Collins. *Humanitarian Challenges and Intervention: World Politics and the Dilemmas of Help* (Colorado: Westview Press, 1996).

Whitworth, S. 'Feminism'. In C. Reus-Smit and D. Snidal (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008) 391–407.

Wille, T. 'Representation and Agency in Diplomacy: How Kosovo Came to Agree to the Rambouillet Accords'. *Journal of International Relations and Development* 22 (4) (2019), 808–831, doi:10.1057/s41268-017-0120-2.

Wiseman, G. 'Diplomatic Practices at the United Nations'. *Cooperation and Conflict* 50 (3) (2015), 316–333.

Yamashita, H. 'New Humanitarianism and Changing Logics of the Political in International Relations'. *Millennium* 43 (2) (2014), 411–428, doi:10.1177/0305829814554408.

Yin, R. K. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (5th ed.) (Los Angeles CA: SAGE, 2014).

Yuval-Davis, N. *Gender and Nation* (London: SAGE Publications, 2013).

Zahra, T. '"The Psychological Marshall Plan": Displacement, Gender, and Human Rights after World War II'. *Central European History* 44 (1) (2011), 37–62, doi:10.1017/S0008938910001172.

Zerilli, L. 'Feminist Theory and the Canon of Political Thought'. In J. Dryzek, B. Honig and A. Phillips (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Theory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 106–124.

Zhukova, E. 'Vulnerability'. In A. De Lauri (ed.), *Humanitarianism: Keywords* (Leiden: Brill, 2020), 230–232.

Zurkuhlen, A. 'Book Review: Chasing Misery: An Anthology of Essays by Women in Humanitarian Responses by Kelsey Hoppe'. *Medicine, Conflict and Survival* 31 (3-4) (2015), 171–172, doi:10.1080/13623699.2015.1051366.

Appendix

Email Invitation to Research Participants

Dear [name of the research participant],

My name is Salla Turunen and I am a doctoral researcher on humanitarian diplomacy at Chr. Michelsen Institute (CMI, a leading multidisciplinary development research institute in Scandinavia) and the University of Bergen in Norway. I approach you with a research interview request considering former and current staff members of UN OCHA at all levels and locations.

I conduct PhD research on OCHA's humanitarian diplomacy, and this research is a part of the research project 'Humanitarian Diplomacy: Assessing Policies, Practices and Impact of New Forms of Humanitarian Action and Foreign Policy' (HUMDIPLO), hosted by CMI and funded by the Norwegian Research Council.

The main purpose of this PhD research is to explore the humanitarian diplomacy of OCHA as the main UN coordination body for humanitarian action. 'Humanitarian diplomacy' can be generally defined as persuading decision makers and opinion leaders to act at all times and in all circumstances in the interest of vulnerable people and with full respect for fundamental humanitarian principles. It is an emerging term and approach that can be seen as complementary to traditional forms of diplomacy and persuasion for humanitarian intervention. It occurs on several international and national levels of power, and is multi-functional as it is used by official and non-official actors.

These interviews are conducted through online video calls and are treated as anonymous. They surround the overarching topic of humanitarian diplomacy of

OCHA, including themes of contextual conceptualization, ‘leave no one behind’ ideology, and gender.

Should you be interested in taking part in this research, please find attached more information [consent form as attached file]. The interview will take from 45 minutes to an hour. There is no need for you to sign the consent form separately as long as you gain an understanding of the research participation and your rights as a participant.

I am happy to answer any questions you may have, and should you agree, we can schedule a video call upon your convenience.

With kind regards,

Salla Turunen
Doctoral Researcher
Chr. Michelsen Institute (CMI), Bergen, Norway
Email: salla.turunen@cmi.no
Phone: +47 902 70 234
https://www.cmi.no/staff/salla-turunen

CMI CHR. MICHELSEN INSTITUTE

Consent Form for Research Participation

Researcher contact information:
Ms. Salla Turunen, PhD researcher
Chr. Michelsen Institute (CMI), Bergen, Norway
salla.turunen@cmi.no
+47 902 70 234
https://www.cmi.no/staff/salla-turunen

Consent form for research participation

Would you like to participate in the research project with the working title 'Humanitarian Diplomacy – Role of the United Nations'?

This inquiry concerns your participation in a study of humanitarian diplomacy in the context of the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). This form provides you information on the objectives of the project and what participation will entail for you.

Purpose of the project

This PhD research is a part of the research project 'Humanitarian Diplomacy: Assessing Policies, Practices and Impact of New Forms of Humanitarian Action and Foreign Policy' (HUMDIPLO), hosted at Chr. Michelsen Institute (CMI) in Bergen, Norway, and it is coordinated by Senior Researcher Antonio de Lauri.

The main purpose of this PhD research is to explore the humanitarian diplomacy of the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) as the main UN coordination body for humanitarian action. In line with the HUMDIPLO project framework, also this PhD dissertation looks into the dynamics of negotiation of the humanitarian space and into the politics of compromise that is necessary to access populations in need in complex emergencies.

'Humanitarian diplomacy' can be generally defined as persuading decision-makers and opinion leaders to act at all times and in all circumstances in the interest of vulnerable people and with full respect for fundamental humanitarian principles. It is an emerging term and approach that can be seen as complementary to traditional forms of diplomacy and persuasion for humanitarian intervention. It occurs on several international and national levels of power, and it is multi-functional as it is used by official and non-official actors.

These interviews are conducted through recorded online video calls and are treated as anonymous. They surround the overarching topic of humanitarian diplomacy of OCHA, including themes of contextual conceptualization, 'leave no one behind' ideology, and gender.

This PhD research is funded by the Norwegian Research Council.

Who is responsible for the research project?

Chr. Michelsen Institute (CMI) is the institution responsible for the project. This project is also affiliated with the Department of Comparative Politics at the University of Bergen, Norway.

Why do you get questions about participating?

You have been selected to participate in this research due to your current or previous employment in OCHA. The research participants in this project are current and former

employees of OCHA from various levels and locations where the organization is represented.

What does it mean for you to participate?

Your participation involves an interview by me, a doctoral researcher from CMI, during which we discuss your views of humanitarian diplomacy in the context of OCHA. The recorded online video interview will last from 45 minutes to an hour, during which I will take notes and use an audio recorder for back-up saving purposes. Both video call and audio recording are used for transcription purposes should you not object. Both of these records will be deleted after transcription and they will not be used for other research purposes.

Your participation is voluntary and anonymous

Your participation in this project is voluntary and not paid for. You have the right to cease your participation at any time. During the interview, you can decline from answering any question you may wish not to answer and to ask for clarification for any question that is posed to you.

Your participation is also anonymous. Your name will not be published in the research and your personal and professional characteristics will be used in generic terms, such as 'female, management' / 'male, field staff'. Further information on your identity such as national, cultural, ethnic, economic, dis/ability, and sexuality traits will not be disclosed.

Your privacy – how we store and use your information

We will only use the information about you for the purposes we have explained in this form. We process the data confidentially and in accordance with data protection legislation as set for research conducted in Norway.

The data controller institution is CMI and access to your interview data is restricted to myself and to my two PhD supervisors, Professor Siri Gloppen and Senior Researcher Antonio de Lauri. Your confidentiality as a participant in this study will remain secure and the data collection and handling practices will protect the full anonymity of individuals.

What happens to your personal data at the end of the project?

This project is scheduled to finish in March 2022. At the end of the project the collected data is fully anonymized so that the identity of the participants cannot be traced and the original notes and recordings will deleted in a non-restorable manner.

Your rights

As long as you can be identified in the collected data, you are entitled to:

- Access the personal data that is being processed about you (i.e., the recording of the interview);
- Have your personal information corrected in case of any errors;
- Request that your personal data will be deleted;
- Receive a copy of your personal data (data portability); and
- Submit a complaint to the Data Protection Officer or the Inspectorate regarding the processing of your personal data (see contact information below).

What gives us the right to process personal data about you?

We process information about you based on your consent.

Commissioned by CMI, NSD – The Norwegian Centre for Research Data AS has assessed that the processing of personal data in this project complies with data protection legislation.

Where can I found out more information and who to contact?

If you have questions about the project, or would like to exercise your rights, please contact:

- CMI via PhD researcher Salla Turunen, salla.turunen@cmi.no
- PhD research supervisors Professor Siri Gloppen, siri.gloppen@uib.no and Senior Researcher Antonio de Lauri, antonio.delauri@cmi.no
- CMI Data Protection Officer Arne Strand, arne.strand@cmi.no; and
- NSD – The Norwegian Centre for Research Data AS, personverntjenster@nsd.no.

Sincerely,

Salla Turunen

Doctoral Researcher
Chr. Michelsen Institute (CMI), Bergen, Norway
salla.turunen@cmi.no
+47 902 70 234
https://www.cmi.no/staff/salla-turunen

Participant signature

I have received and understood information about the project with the working title ‘Humanitarian Diplomacy – Role of the United Nations’ and have been given the opportunity to ask questions. I agree to:

- participate in an interview with PhD researcher Salla Turunen.

I consent to the processing of my data until the end of the project, approximately March 2022.

_____

(Signature by project participant, date)

Interview Guide

Forewords:

Thank you for your participation in this study of humanitarian diplomacy in the context of the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). Before starting with the interview discussion, I would like to remind you of general notions concerning the study and this interview. This study is conducted under applicable research ethical guidelines, and therefore participation in the study is voluntary and unpaid, and you have the right to cease your participation at any time. This interview is also treated as anonymous. As you are participating to the study, you have the right to withhold from answering any questions you might not wish to answer. The interview is semi-structured, meaning that the questions cover general topics that are theory and practice-driven, but open-ended in that the interview will take its final form depending on our discussion. The levels of generality and personality in your answers depends entirely on you.

Do you have any questions considering the interview or the study as a whole before we commence?

Theme: Conceptualizations of Key Terms

Example questions:

– Using your own words, please describe the term ‘humanitarianism’. Similarly, please describe the term ‘diplomacy’.

– ‘Humanitarian diplomacy’ can be seen as an emerging term that developed in the 2000s. How do you understand this term? Is it familiar to you?

– Humanitarian diplomacy can be generally defined as persuading decision-makers and opinion leaders to act at all times and in all circumstances in the interest of vulnerable people and with full respect for fundamental humanitarian principles. What do you think of this definition?

– Diplomacy can be understood through the concept of compromise, whereas humanitarianism relies upon ideals of undivided human worth that cannot be compromised. According to you, what limitations or opportunities do these present for humanitarian diplomacy?

Theme: Humanitarian Diplomacy at OCHA

Example questions:

– Is the term ‘humanitarian diplomacy’ used in the organizational context of OCHA? If so, how?

– In your view, how does OCHA engage in humanitarian diplomacy?

– Do you see that humanitarian diplomacy brings value to OCHA and its work? If so, how?

Theme: Organizational Context

Example questions:

– OCHA's key mandate is coordination of humanitarian actors to ensure a coherent response to emergencies. In your view, does this coordination apply also in humanitarian diplomacy (i.e., in negotiating humanitarian intervention)?

– OCHA operates at country, regional, liaison, and headquarter levels. In your view, how do these different levels affiliate with humanitarian diplomacy, if at all?

– What advantages and disadvantages OCHA may carry in conducting humanitarian diplomacy?

Theme: Actors and Engagement

Example questions:

– Who do you perceive to be the humanitarian diplomats of OCHA?

– According to you, what does it mean to be a humanitarian diplomat for OCHA?

– In general terms, with whom does OCHA engage in humanitarian diplomacy? And how does this engagement happen?

Theme: Gender

Example questions:

– OCHA has currently 45 per cent of women and 55 per cent of men among their international staff. What do you think about this?[389]

[389] This question was updated in the interview process with new statistics made available both through internal inquiry and external data availability. Source: UN Secretariat Gender Parity Dashboard, available at https://www.un.org/gender/content/un-secretariat-gender-parity-dashboard.

– In international professional categories, OCHA has a female majority at P2, D2 and ASG levels, and men dominate the rest of the levels. What do you think about this?[390]

– In your view, does gender play a role in OCHA's humanitarian diplomacy? Or gender biases?

Theme: 'Leave No One Behind' Ideology

Example questions:

– In the context of the UN, the term 'leave no one behind' is often used. How do you understand this idea?

– In your view, does OCHA implement the idea of 'leave no one behind'? If so, how?

– What kind of opportunities and limitations does the idea of 'leaving no one behind' create for OCHA?

– Does 'leaving no one behind' play a role in OCHA's humanitarian diplomacy? If so, how?

[390] Ibid.

List of Other Publications Authored/Created During the PhD

Book Chapters:

- *Accountability in Humanitarianism: Keywords* (2020), Antonio De Lauri (ed.), Brill, available at https://brill.com/view/book/edcoll/9789004431140/BP000001.xml.
- *South-South Cooperation in Humanitarianism: Keywords* (2020), Antonio De Lauri (ed.), Brill, available at https://brill.com/view/book/edcoll/9789004431140/BP000092.xml.
- *Independence in Humanitarianism: Keywords* (2020), co-authored with Antonio De Lauri, Antonio De Lauri (ed.), Brill, available at https://brill.com/view/book/edcoll/9789004431140/BP000051.xml.

CMI Working Papers:

- *Conceptualizing 'Leave No One Behind'*, CMI Working Paper 2021:4, available at https://www.cmi.no/publications/7881-conceptualizing-leave-no-one-behind.
- *Gains of the Unfeasible: Manifestations of 'Leave No One Behind' in the United Nations' Humanitarianism*, CMI Working Paper 2021:5, available at https://www.cmi.no/publications/7882-gains-of-the-unfeasible-manifestations-of-leave-no-one-behind-in-the-united-nations-humanitarianism.

CMI Report:

- *Protection of Civilians – Norway in the Security Council* (2021), co-authored with Maria Gabrielsen Jumbert, Kristoffer Lidén, John Karlsrud and Astri Suhrke – Antonio De Lauri (ed.), CMI Report R 2021:01, available at

https://www.cmi.no/publications/7457-protection-of-civilians-norway-in-the-security-council.

CMI Reflections:

- *There Must be Something I can 'Help With'*, CMI Reflections 2020, available at: https://www.cmi.no/publications/7144-there-must-be-something-i-can-help-with.
- *Close Your Eyes and Picture 'A Humanitarian'. What Do You See?*, CMI Reflections 2020, available at https://www.cmi.no/publications/7343-close-your-eyes-and-picture-a-humanitarian-what-do-you-see.

Podcast:

- *The Humanitarian Diplomacy podcast* via Spotify (2021), available at https://open.spotify.com/show/2AReWxxtlGVLgdCYDR9H7I.
  - *Episode 1: Ethics of Humanitarianism*, with Kristoffer Lidén/Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO), available at https://open.spotify.com/episode/0yXJTpWL3I84sKtJad9Okt.
  - *Episode 2: Humanitarian Diplomacy at the Field Level – Where Gender Matters Too*, with Ute Kollies/the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UN OCHA), available at https://open.spotify.com/episode/56vNDB4pue8XZzk3HtZNHi.
  - *Episode 4: The Case of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)*, with Hugo Slim/Oxford University & the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), available at https://open.spotify.com/episode/1E15Aqn70zCw7cISgZ58DG.
  - *Episode 5: In Case of Emergency*, with Brian Lander and Rebecca Richards/World Food Programme (WFP), available at https://open.spotify.com/episode/13xPjtvTnP7rppCPK1hje4.

- *Episode 6: The Operational Edge*, with Reshma Adatia/Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF), available at https://open.spotify.com/episode/21CyT46RyFgtJzY9AzwdVG.

Practitioner Articles:

- *Humanitarian Diplomacy: Challenges and Strategies for Negotiating with Non-State Armed Groups* (2020), the Centre of Competence on Humanitarian Negotiation (CCHN, a joint initiative of the World Food Programme, the UNHCR, the International Committee of the Red Cross, Humanitarian Dialogue and Médecins Sans Frontières), available at https://frontline-negotiations.org/humanitarian-diplomacy-challenges-and-strategies-for-negotiating-with-non-state-armed-groups/.
- *The Role of The Humanitarian Negotiator in the Global Chain of Humanitarian Diplomacy* (2020), the Centre of Competence on Humanitarian Negotiation (CCHN), available at https://frontline-negotiations.org/the-role-of-the-humanitarian-negotiator-in-the-global-chain-of-humanitarian-diplomacy/

Blog Posts:

- *The Humanitarian Antaeus: Overcoming the Power Asymmetry between Humanitarians and Armed Groups in Frontline Negotiations* (2020), the Norwegian Centre for Humanitarian Studies, available at https://www.humanitarianstudies.no/2020/10/21/the-humanitarian-antaeus-overcoming-the-power-asymmetry-between-humanitarians-and-armed-groups-in-frontline-negotiations/.
- *The Helpers and the Helped: Troubling Ideas of Human Worth in Humanitarianism* (2020), Public Anthropologist, available at https://publicanthropologist.cmi.no/2020/11/06/the-helpers-and-the-helped-troubling-ideas-of-human-worth-in-humanitarianism/.

- *The Time of the Humanitarian Diplomat* (2021), the Norwegian Centre for Humanitarian Studies, available at https://www.humanitarianstudies.no/2021/07/06/the-time-of-the-humanitarian-diplomat/.

Popular Dissemination:

- *The Frontlines of Diplomacy: Humanitarian Negotiations with Armed Groups* (2020), with Ashley Jonathan Clements and Marte Nilsen, available at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vMKSa7oSdxI.
- *Humanitarian Diplomacy: Interview with Jan Egeland* (2020), CMI Popular Dissemination, available at: https://www.cmi.no/publications/7373-humanitarian-diplomacy-interview-with-jan-egeland.

Article One

Humanitarian Diplomatic Practices

Published in the Hague Journal of Diplomacy, Brill

Salla Turunen, 'Humanitarian Diplomatic Practices', The Hague Journal of Diplomacy 15 (4) (2020), 459–487, doi:10.1163/1871191X-BJA10008[391]

[391] Reference style and endnotes as in original, published format.

Article Two

The Principled Pragmatists: Humanitarian Diplomatic Practices at the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)

Under review in Journal of Humanitarian Affairs, Manchester University Press

Article Three

“Have You Been Recruited Because You Are a Woman or Because You Are Good?” Gendered Humanitarian Diplomats at the United Nations

Accepted for publication in Diplomatica, Brill.
Pre-print version for Diplomatica Vol. 5 Issue 1 (2023).

Graphic design: Communication Division, UiB / Print: Skipnes Kommunikasjon AS

uib.no

ISBN: 9788230867433 (print)
9788230867396 (PDF)