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Abstract
This study explores motivations of two ‘new’ humanitarian donors, Brazil and India, by analysing debates from two of the agents in each country involved in the processes regarding humanitarian assistance - the Brazilian Federal Senate and the Brazilian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, as well as the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and Council of States - by means of a thematic analysis. This resulted in the identification of motivating factors for humanitarian spending in the form of themes. For Brazil the themes Priority, Humanitarianism, Regional Solidarity and International Integration could be identified. For India the themes identified were: Security Interests, Humanitarianism, Good Neighbour, Competence and Preparedness.

By comparing the findings of this study with the ‘Seven Frames relevant to Foreign Aid Policy’ of Western donors established by van der Veen, it could be concluded that new donors and Western donors share similar interests in the areas of power, security, international reputation and humanitarianism, which guide them as motivating factors in decisions regarding humanitarian assistance. Nonetheless, there are also differences for example with regards to economic interests and issues of obligation, which are present for Western donors, but could not be identified in motivations of the new donors Brazil and India. The study concludes that the framework established by van der Veen for Western donors is not sufficient to explain motivations of new donors in the area of humanitarian assistance. Instead, a new framework is necessary to explore the differing approaches and motivations of both Western and new donors in their complexity.
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1 Introduction

Humanitarian assistance is a sector that is highly important in the world today as it experiences rising occurrences of disasters and a growing number of people affected by them. But while this field is becoming more and more important, it is also growing more and more complex with the changing realities it is facing today. Humanitarian assistance is in its classic definition simple: it exists to save lives and to alleviate the suffering of those people affected by disasters, natural or man-made (Good Humanitarian Donorship, 2003). It can take many forms, from the basic provision of food, shelter and health care to providing security, investing in disaster risk reduction, promoting economic livelihoods and (much) more. A large part of the affected (not limited to the vulnerable and poor) rely on humanitarian assistance in the immediate aftermath of disasters and other emergencies. However, this can build up to the point, where, according to Development Initiatives (2013), humanitarian assistance can, to some countries, become more important than development aid.

Recently, the number of disasters and complex emergencies as well as the number of people affected by them, both short- and long-term, are increasing (EM-DAT, 2014; OCHA, 2015). This means that the scale of needs, the growing number of protracted crises and an additional interplay of new risks make humanitarian crises even more complex and also more difficult to manage and overcome. This is happening to the point, where the Global Humanitarian Assistance Programme (GHA, 2014) and the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA, 2015) observe, that in recent years there has not been one case where humanitarian assistance has met the financial estimate for humanitarian needs on the ground. Nevertheless, the overall amount of humanitarian assistance has risen, and recently there have also been a growing number of new donors contributing through bilateral, multilateral or private channels, as reported by GHA (2015).

Among the new donors are also states that are considered emerging powers in the global arena such as Brazil, India, China and South Africa. Databases that give an overview of contributions to humanitarian assistance, like UN OCHA FTS and OECD

---

1 The FAO defines protracted crises as “situations that are characterized by recurrent natural disasters and/or conflict, longevity of food crises, breakdown of livelihoods and insufficient institutional capacity to react to the crises.” (2010:12)
DAC, record most of these new donors among the category non-DAC\textsuperscript{2} contributions. In literature, they are generally referred to as new, emerging, non-Western or non-traditional donors\textsuperscript{3}. These databases also show that the number of non-DAC donors has been growing over the last decade (Development Initiatives, 2013). Although the volume of non-DAC humanitarian contribution is presently (not more than) 10\% of the global humanitarian spend, it is often argued that they are very important for some recipients and growing in influence (GPPi, 2010:7). For example, according to Development Initiatives (2013), the non-DAC contributions to emergencies in Yemen (in 2008), the Maldives (in 2009) and Bangladesh (in 2007) far outnumbered humanitarian assistance from DAC donors. This shows that non-DAC humanitarian contributions are, while relatively modest, still a part of the global humanitarian picture. This is only one example depicting the changing landscape of donorship in humanitarian assistance, as well as the growing importance and action of South-South cooperation in the area of humanitarian assistance. Still, there is only very little known about the interests, motivations, patterns and approaches of these new donors.

1.1 Research Problem and Academic Discourse

Although humanitarian aid workers make a point of separating themselves from other initiatives, whether military or developmental, humanitarian aid is often not separated from official development assistance (ODA) in analyses. However, the analysis of foreign aid without distinction between the areas where this aid is used, connects humanitarian assistance with political, economic or other motivating factors in contradiction to its principles, which distance humanitarian operations from non-humanitarian interests and influences (OCHA, 2012).

There are only few studies that examine the conditionality of humanitarian aid in conflicts (ODI, 2000; Montinola, 2010), for example as a tool for negotiation, or others such as Garavoglia (2012), who looks at factors influencing humanitarian aid in the context of natural disasters. The more recent theoretical connection of humanitarian assistance and development aid with security issues makes the arena where humanitarian organisations operate even more complex (Duffield, 2002; Watson, 2011).

\textsuperscript{2} the OECD Development Assistance Committee is a unique international forum of many of the largest funders of aid, including 29 DAC Members (OECD, 2015)

\textsuperscript{3} This study will be using the term ‘new donors’, but an overview of the terminology and the discussions surrounding it will be elaborated upon in the chapter on the theoretical framework.
The emerging nexus between security, development and humanitarianism portrays the seemingly inevitable interconnection nowadays between humanitarian assistance, politics, developmental issues and military operations. It relocates humanitarian issues from the margins of the security framework into the frames of developmental and security issues (Attinà, 2012). While a positive aspect is the acknowledgement of the multi-dimensionality of missions in complex disaster contexts, the approach to this multi-dimensional nature often results in humanitarian goals and principles, as well as development objectives, becoming subsidiary to operations in other areas that overlap with them. This securitization of development and humanitarian crises also makes an analysis of humanitarian assistance by itself more difficult.

There are many factors that may affect the extent of humanitarian spending of a donor country. Among them the scale of a disaster, the number of affected people and the damage done, but media attention and often other variables play a role as well, argues Garavoglia (2012) in a dissertation on humanitarian aid and natural disasters. There are quite a few studies on the motivations behind foreign aid in general (Stokke, 1989; Hook, 1996; Lancaster, 2007; Riddell, 2007), which are mostly centred around western donors’ interests, their motivations for aid grants and aid policies. Only some of them examine the ‘new’ donors (White, 2011; Stuenkel, 2012), and even fewer exclude or specifically analyse humanitarian spendings.

So far all of them have concluded that (bilateral) foreign aid is deployed for a number of reasons, pursuing various goals with regards to political, economic, regional and ideological interests (see Stokke, 1989; Hook, 1996; Lancaster, 2007; van der Veen, 2011; Garavoglia, 2012). But although there is now a change in the landscape of donors, as explained above, only a few studies have examined the so-called emerging or non-traditional donors. This means that, as of yet, there is only little known about the growing number of non-Western donors emerging in the arena of humanitarian assistance and development cooperation and how they influence the landscapes in these fields. But especially because of the growing number of donors, the need arises to know more about these new actors.

There are several studies and working papers that seek to shed light on the developments in this area, on the newly emerging donors and the changing landscape of humanitarian donorship. The Global Humanitarian Assistance Programme for example analyses the trends of non-DAC donors to humanitarian assistance in a report from 2011 (GHA, 2011). Organisations such as the Centre for Strategic and International Studies
or the Global Public Policy Institute have also published papers mapping the landscape of emerging non-Western donors (White, 2011; GPPi, 2010). There are some articles of newspapers that give an overview of the new donors (like The Guardian, 2011) and also ones that look at one of them specifically (ODI, 2010; devex 2013). Most of these studies however do not go beyond general descriptions like allocations of humanitarian assistance, quantitative data to this regard or a possible connection to perceived foreign policy interests of the respective countries.

While general trends and priorities of these new donors are well discussed, there are still many things only insufficiently known about them: The paper from the GPPi (2010) that takes a closer look at nine new donors (Brazil, China, India, the Republic of Korea, Russia, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Turkey and the United Arab Emirates) as part of a mapping study, highlights some of the areas for each of these donors where knowledge is still largely lacking. Gaps of knowledge are, for example, related to donors’ self-conceptions, their approaches to humanitarian assistance and the principles guiding them, as well as regional power structures, their aspirations and the influence all these have on the humanitarian spending of these emerging donors (GPPi, 2010:11-23).

What are their motivations and is there a difference between old and new donors? Such an understanding of emerging humanitarian aid donors’ motivations is necessary, argues Stuenkel (2012), “in order to identify common interests, room for cooperation and mutual learning.” In order to do that, it is first necessary to take a closer look at these new donors, find out what motivates them and whether there are similarities or differences to Western approaches of humanitarian assistance.

1.2 Objective and Research Questions

This research aims to understand thoughts about the goals and purposes of new donors and how these shape decisions regarding humanitarian spending. The idea is to explore motivations for humanitarian spending of Brazil and India as representatives of the ‘rising powers of the South’ and compare findings with such motivations already identified as relevant for Foreign Aid decisions of Western donors (van der Veen, 2011). Since in both Brazil and India there is a very complex system in place when it comes to humanitarian assistance⁴, this study will focus on two of the agents involved in these processes in each country and therefore only provide a limited, albeit relevant,

⁴ More explanation on this will be provided in the chapter ‘Background’.
understanding of motivations for humanitarian spending in these countries. The study will be done by analysing debates within the Brazilian Federal Senate (Senado Federal) and the Brazilian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Ministério das Relações Exteriores), as well as the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and Council of States (Rajya Sabha) by means of a thematic analysis.

The study is an attempt to separate humanitarian assistance from general foreign aid in analyses and address a research gap by exploring motivations of decisions regarding humanitarian assistance of new donors in accordance with the shifting landscape of donorship in this sector. An analysis will show what reasonings are presented in the institutions analysed for the two new donors and how these reasonings are used when discussing decisions regarding humanitarian assistance. By then applying the theoretical framework to the findings, possible similarities and differences between the new donors and Western donors will also be highlighted.

This study will therefore aim to answer the following research questions:

1. Why do decision makers in Brazil and India choose to contribute to humanitarian assistance?
2. What patterns can be identified?
3. How are the motivations of Brazil and India similar to or different from those of Western donors?

Brazil and India, which are alike and different at the same time, will make for an interesting exploration in this study of motivations for humanitarian assistance from non-Western donors. They portray two representatives of the “rising South” and are both among the BRICSs countries, which are on the forefront of emerging global players in the world today. Although they portray two geographically different sides of the world, Latin America and Asia, both show growing economies and increasing engagement in the global arena. Brazil as an emerging power and donor in South America is a country that is both donor and recipient of humanitarian assistance at the same time. India on the other hand is an emerging power and donor in Asia. It is a country that has to manage a lot of natural disasters within its own borders every year. It is therefore also recipient and donor of humanitarian assistance, and although different in other aspects also shares a similar status with Brazil. An analysis of the data will show whether they have similar motivations or patterns for granting humanitarian
assistance, and also whether these motivations differ from those established for western donors so far (see van der Veen, 2011).

1.3 Limitations

Limitations to this study include language barriers and availability of relevant data. Data collection will due to language constraints be limited to documents and other forms of statements in the English, German, Spanish and Portuguese language. However, by considering this in the process of identifying possible actors for this study, this particular limitation could be partly overcome. In the case of the chosen donor India, most data was transcribed in English, while for the case of Brazil a Portuguese dictionary additionally ensured accuracy.

Availability of relevant data was another limitation for this study. Not only for choosing actors for analysis, but also regarding accurate quantitative data on humanitarian spendings as well as existence of or access to documentation of relevant debates. Since there often is no separation between humanitarian assistance and other types of official development assistance in databases like the OECD-DAC, there are limits to what can be interpreted from this data if one focuses on humanitarian assistance. The author is aware of this limitation, but where possible (and due to a lack of alternative databases on humanitarian spending) quantitative data was handled by applying the concept of triangulation to ensure validity. Thereby, the limited availability of data could be partly overcome, although further research might show different results if more data on humanitarian spending is made available.

Still, both in Brazil and India, documentation regarding humanitarian assistance is still lacking and often their definitions of humanitarian assistance differ from those of other sources. Additionally, the involvement of a variety of institutions with decision-making power in the processes without a place where data is collected, made it necessary to focus the data collection on two relevant institutions for each country to ensure reliability and validity. The chosen institutions were the Brazilian Federal Senate (Senado Federal) and Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Ministério das Relações Exteriores) in Brazil, and the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and Council of States (Rajya Sabha) in India, due to data availability.

Another limitation for this study is the lack of a theoretical framework for humanitarian spending and decision-makers motivations for it. This lack of theoretical
frameworks on humanitarian spending behaviour led to the decision to use the “Seven Frames Relevant to Foreign Aid Policy” by van der Veen (2011) to look at the findings from the thematic analyses of debates on humanitarian spending in two institutions in both Brazil and India in this study. This means, that in this study a framework for motivations of Western donors regarding foreign aid in general will be used as a lens to look at motivations of new donors regarding humanitarian assistance in particular. However, this does not mean that the proverbial apples will be compared to pears. Being aware of the fact that the theoretical framework is about foreign aid in general and has its origin in Western foreign aid policy-making, the author is aware that there will be differences identified when using this framework to look at motivations of two new donors for humanitarian spending. This does not mean, however, that it is an invaluable comparison. Rather, it shows that there is need for a different theoretical approach to be able to properly research motivations for humanitarian spending of new donors. A section on Themes and Frames in the chapter elaborating on the theoretical framework will give some more insights into the possibility of comparing themes of this study with frames from van der Veen.

1.4 Delimitations

Development aid practices have long been criticised for caring more about the interests of donors, when really it is interests and opportunities of recipients that should matter. In the case of humanitarian assistance, though, while similar in nature, public portrayals of empathy and compassion sometimes seem to be enough to convince the society of noble intentions. There is a lot of promising and well-wishing, but there is also a gap from there to the actual willingness to live up to the public portrayal of a humanitarian spirit. This is why it is so important to also study and understand interests and motivations behind decisions regarding humanitarian assistance.

There are still many knowledge gaps when it comes to this sector and this study is an attempt to fill one small part of it by trying to understand thoughts about the goals and purposes of two institutional actors in the decision-making processes regarding humanitarian spending of the new donors Brazil and India and how these shape their decision regarding humanitarian assistance. Although it would be possible to focus such a study of debates about humanitarian assistance on a large multinational donor like the European Union or small local initiatives, only decision makers on the national level
will be analysed (i.e. institutions involved in decisions regarding humanitarian spending on the national level). Data on private aid flows and individual donations is highly unreliable and fragmented at best, as explained by Stoianova (2012:15) in a briefing paper on “Private Funding: An emerging trend in Humanitarian Donorship”. As there is such a complex system in place in both Brazil and India, this study will therefore only focus on two agents in each country involved in the processes and can only provide a limited, albeit relevant, understanding of the motivations shaping humanitarian spending in Brazil and India. Additionally, as the theoretical framework of this study focuses on national decision makers, it is necessary, that new donors’ motivations regarding humanitarian assistance are studied on a similar decision-making level to ensure validity for the comparison between North-South and South-South cooperation.

A study by Wallace et al. (2006) highlights how interconnected NGOs and their donors really are, showing among other things that the behaviour of Southern NGOs is often bound by funding conditionalities of international donors. This, argues a paper by the RSC (2013:11), also problematizes the idea of “South-South”-cooperation. Hence, an analysis of either local initiatives or multinational donors would make it difficult to draw relevant conclusions regarding differences between North-South and South-South cooperation. On the other hand, the design of this study makes it possible to make such a comparison.

In addition to the previously stated motives for choosing Brazil and India for the study, the choice was influenced by the mentioned limitations as well. Therefore, the choice was made partly after an initial search for debates in languages known to the author eliminated some countries (among others Turkey and Saudi Arabia). Brazil and India then were chosen from the remaining donors in accordance to availability of relevant data. The paragraphs below elaborate a bit more on the specific choices of Brazil and India.

The study was also delimited to data available as official documents and statements from the Brazilian Federal Senate (Senado Federal) and Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Ministério das Relações Exteriores) in Brazil, and the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and Council of States (Rajya Sabha) in India. While personal interviews or other more participative qualitative approaches might have produced a deeper understanding of underlying processes, these were not possible for this study.

It is noted that the limitations and delimitations of this study make it difficult to generalize results in the later parts of the study. Nevertheless, as this is a much
undeveloped area of inquiry, this study is only one small attempt to fill the knowledge gaps that surround ‘new donors’ and their efforts in humanitarian assistance. Future research can surely address many more gaps of knowledge to be filled and aspects to be considered. An analysis of motivating factors identified in debates of each two of the agents involved in the processes that shape decisions regarding humanitarian assistance of the two new donors Brazil and India should still provide for an interesting study.

**Brazil**

Brazil is one of the new humanitarian donors, which is both donor and recipient at the same time. Stuenkel (2012) describes how this donor also has an interesting approach to humanitarian assistance: avoiding a ‘donor hierarchy’ and increasingly linking relief and development for example by purchasing food aid locally. Nevertheless, there are many strategies and motivations that have not been explored or explained yet, especially with regards to how Brazil’s strategies and motivations for humanitarian assistance are impacted by its role as an emerging power, its regional leadership ambitions or its focus on South-South cooperation.

**India**

Similarly, India is another new humanitarian donor that – like Brazil – is both donor and recipient of humanitarian assistance. Similar to Brazil, India is one of the humanitarian donors, which is growing in importance recently, but has not been studied greatly in this context. Maybe more than Brazil, India is a country greatly affected by natural disasters, and therefore knows the importance of humanitarian assistance in times of such crises. But, according to Meier & Murphy (2011), its strategies and motivations in providing humanitarian assistance remain mostly suspected or unknown, even though its role as an emerging power, regional leadership ambitions and proneness to natural disasters make it an interesting case to study.

**1.5 Outline**

This first chapter has introduced the research problem and design of this study, which are characterized by the chosen topic Humanitarian Aid/Assistance and the focus on Brazil and India as representatives of the “rising South”, which are later contrasted with the “North” – or Western donors.
The following chapters on Methodology and Theoretical Framework will provide an elaboration on the research design of the study. The Methodology chapter will elaborate on the chosen qualitative approach, the method thematic analysis and the use of debates as a pool of relevant data. Additionally, the data set will be described in detail. The chapter on the Theoretical Framework will include a brief reflection on the terminology surrounding the “new” donors and elaborate upon the concept of “Humanitarian Assistance”. After that, Framing Theory will be introduced to provide some context and background for van der Veen’s (2011) “Seven Frames relevant to Foreign Aid Policy”. Furthermore, a small discussion will point out how frames and themes are compatible with each other for analysis.

The next chapter, Background, will provide some additional relevant information about the chosen actors, Brazil and India. This background information will include quantitative data regarding humanitarian spendings as well as information on institutional setups in the donor countries relevant to the processes of decision-making in this area.

A chapter on Findings will present the findings of the thematic analyses conducted on the debates and present patterns, which could be identified from the data, as themes. In this chapter the research questions 1 and 2: “Why do decision makers in Brazil and India choose to contribute to humanitarian assistance?” and “What patterns can be identified?” will be answered. The Analysis chapter will be the space for discussion. There, the themes established in the Findings will first be put into context with the quantitative data provided in the Background chapter. Then, van der Veen’s (2011) Frames relevant to Foreign Aid Policy of Western donors will be used as a lens to look at the themes identified as motivating factors of humanitarian assistance for new donors established in this study, thereby answering research question 3: “How are the motivations of Brazil and India similar to or different from those of Western donors?”

A concluding chapter will summarize the results and knowledge gained from this study and point out possible options for future research.
2 Methodology

For this study a qualitative research design will be used to conduct a thematic analysis of debates within relevant institutions of humanitarian assistance in Brazil and India. A qualitative research design was chosen to put emphasis on the meaning people give to a specific topic or phenomenon (Creswell, 2013:44) – in this case humanitarian assistance. It is also a useful means of investigation considering that the subject of this study is too complex to be answered with a simple yes or no result. The broad scope of the qualitative research design will also ensure that some useful data is generated even if results might be similar to findings of previous studies (Lancaster, 2009; v.d.Veen, 2011; Garavoglia, 2012).

The nature of the research makes a meaningful and reliable quantitative study almost impossible – unreliable quantitative data on humanitarian donations, data that differs depending on the database, as well as the difficulty of definition make a quantitative inquiry too difficult to pursue at this moment. Nevertheless, it is important to also include quantitative data into this study. According to Dey (2005:29f), numbers cannot be ignored when dealing with meanings, and meaningful conceptualisation is informed by numbers. Hence, quantitative data (from both primary and secondary sources) will be used to give an overall picture of humanitarian spendings for each actor and connect results from the thematic analysis to a bigger picture.

2.1 Thematic Analysis

This research aims to understand thoughts about the goals and purposes that shape decisions regarding humanitarian assistance in Brazil and India. To do this, debates within the Brazilian Federal Senate (Senado Federal) and the Brazilian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Ministério das Relações Exteriores) in Brazil, and the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and Council of States (Rajya Sabha) in India will be examined through a thematic analysis. Braun and Clarke (2006) define thematic analysis as “a method for identifying, analysing and reporting patterns within data” (2006:79). This is achieved by first coding, then categorizing patterns in the data. The method was chosen as a qualitative method that is more sensitive to context than a content analysis. This is very important, especially because the method will result in the creation of themes, which are by nature abstract, albeit meaningful. But while “abstractions are powerful
means of making comparisons [...]”, according to Dey, “we must also remember their origins and limitations” (2005:100). A thematic analysis that enables the researcher to be context-sensitive will make this easier.

Braun and Clarke (2006) have argued that to identify initial patterns in the data set, the researcher can make use of inductive coding or theory driven coding. This study used an inductive coding process, which was nevertheless influenced by the previous knowledge of the author of the analytical framework that would be applied to the data. Hence, the process of coding resulted in the creation of codes that would facilitate the comparative nature of the study. After looking for recurring patterns of meaning (ideas, motives, thoughts), themes were established from the initial codes and categories. A good theme needs to be backed by enough data to support it, have an internal coherency and a strong distinction from other themes. According to Braun and Clarke (2006) a theme “captures something important about the data in relation to the research questions” (2006:82). It represents a pattern in responses or statements that is meaningful within the data set and describes both, something that matters to the speakers and what specific meaning it has for them.

Themes will therefore emphasize ‘what’ is said rather than ‘how’ it is said and highlight the usage of language as a direct route to meaning (Riessman, 2003:2). Nevertheless, according to Dey, meaning is always dependent on interpretation and understanding of context (2005:33). Therefore, the classification of themes will be thoroughly described and explained in the Findings-chapter by addressing five elements: What are the themes called? How are they defined? How can they be recognized in the data? What will be excluded? And at least one example for each of the themes will be given.

Still, it is important to note that the themes presented in this study are only interpretations of meaning, which have been categorized into themes to make them comparable and interconnectable.

2.2 Debates

According to the Oxford Dictionary (2015) a debate is defined as “a discussion or argument involving opposing points” or “an argument about a particular subject, especially one in which many people are involved”.
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As most humanitarian assistance from Brazil and India is channelled through recipient governments, it is important to look at the national decision-making level as an approach to inquiry for this study of motivations for humanitarian spending. The primary data will therefore consist mostly of debates on the decision-making level of political institutions in Brazil and India relevant for the respective countries’ humanitarian assistance actions and decisions. Debates within the Brazilian Federal Senate (Senado Federal) and the Brazilian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Ministério das Relações Exteriores), the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and Council of States (Rajya Sabha) were chosen as the main data source, because – as van der Veen argues – they will provide a window into the discourse of elites on the topic (2011:49), and thereby a representative (by definition) sample of decision-making narratives. In the case of individual decision-makers (i.e. states – in this case Brazil and India) debates in the chosen institutions will therefore be considered of high relevance in order to answer questions about motivations regarding humanitarian spending.

2.3 The Dataset

A total of 367 speeches and statements were analysed from debates between 2000-2013 in the Brazilian Federal Senate (Senado Federal) and the Brazilian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Ministério das Relações Exteriores), as well as the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and Council of States (Rajya Sabha). The total number of statements examined was closer to 466, but some did not contain explicit statements about the purposes of humanitarian assistance, and others only mentioned negative connotations (e.g. “it is very clear that this was not on the basis of humanitarian aid but was purely on the basis of a commercial transaction […]”; Senado Federal, 2009), which were not useful for the purpose of this study. The amount of statements about international humanitarian assistance varied over time, depending on the scope of disasters in the region or major crisis happening elsewhere. Hence, the total number of statements coded varied from year to year.

Because of the varying definition of “humanitarian assistance”, quantitative data provided as background information in the Background chapter includes numbers from databases such as the OECD DAC or the UN OCHA FTS, as well as data from the respective government institutions such as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and in the case of Brazil also the Brazilian Agency for International Cooperation (ABC). Numbers
from either are referenced accordingly, so as not to cause confusion or discussions regarding validity. Other limitations associated with the quantitative data for this study have already been discussed in the chapter on limitations and are (where necessary) repeated in parts of the analysis, where findings are put into context through association with the quantitative data.

Although this study is designed as a desk study, both primary and secondary sources were used in the research. Regarding the data used for the thematic analysis, most sources were transcripts or original texts of speeches and debates relevant to the study. Only some were secondary sources – statements relevant to the discussions about humanitarian spending described in communication papers from the respective institutions. The quantitative data – as explained above – was drawn from primary sources of the government institutions (official reports, budget papers), as well as from the databases by the OECD DAC and the UN OCHA FTS, which rely on information provided by the governments to use in the databases.

Considering the scope of this study, the use of both primary and secondary data is appropriate and balanced. While it would have been more desirable to do a long-term on-the-spot study, being present and listening to (if possible) parliamentary discussions or interviewing decision-makers, this was not possible for this study. Nonetheless, the quantitative data would have been the same: a mix of government sources and sources from international databases. While reliability of the data very much depends on the definition of concepts, as explained above, through the use of both official government sources and sources collected from databases of the OECD DAC and UN OCHA FTS reliability is ensured. For qualitative data, all sources can be accessed online through the government websites noted in the bibliography.
3 Theoretical Framework

3.1 ‘New’, ‘Emerging’, ‘Non-Western’ or ‘Non-Traditional’ Donors?

In a study, where the terminology of important aspects is unclear or highly contested, it is necessary to at least briefly reflect upon the terminology used herein. Ever since the ‘Rise of the global South’, terminology has been a tricky endeavour – from the limitations of oppositional terms such as North/South, West/East and Developed/Developing to such typologies, which more clearly imply hierarchical connotations or value judgements such as ‘First’ and ‘Third’ World, ‘developed’ or ‘developing’ (McEwan, 2009:12).

While it may be difficult to find a terminology that is free of negative connotations, it is equally difficult to make that terminology unbiased. In the case of humanitarian assistance, the prominent bias lies already in the assumption that the origin of humanitarianism lies within Northern practices and systems of knowledge. This view is only enhanced, argues Davey (2012:2), as the current international humanitarian regime is mostly influenced by Western organisations (NGOs and the UN) as well as the Red Cross Movement. While in recent years both policy makers and academics have begun to pay more attention to the ‘new’ or ‘non-traditional’ humanitarian actors with roots in the global South, according to a working paper of the RSC, this attention has “primarily focused on the financial contributions of high-GDP Southern donors states” (RSC, 2013:7). This means that there is still little known about (or little interest in) humanitarian efforts by low- and medium-GDP states, but generally ‘new’ Southern humanitarian donor states are becoming more visible and are more acknowledged now (GPPi, 2010).

In this study, the term ‘new’ donor is used, not because these donors are necessarily ‘new’, but to highlight the new reality their unique position creates: According to Six (2009), these new donors occupy a ‘dual position’ in the aid world. Their contemporary and historical positions contest the traditional reality of Southern recipients and Northern donors (Six, 2009:1110).

---

5 For a more elaborated review of the literature and the discussions surrounding the terminology of ‘new’ donors, see “Writing the ‘Other’ into humanitarian discourse - Framing theory and practice in South-South humanitarian responses to forced displacement” (RSC, 2013:3-10).
3.2 Humanitarian Assistance

Like the terminology of ‘new’ donors, the concept of humanitarian assistance has no universal definition. While this study refers to the definitions of humanitarian assistance as laid out by the Ministries of Foreign Affairs of Brazil and India (both described in the Background chapter), it is still important to provide some relevant information about the concept before continuing with the findings and analysis of this study.

Humanitarian assistance carries an ideology and power that shapes the relationship between donors and recipients in one way or another (Hossain, 2004). This seems somewhat paradoxical, since humanitarianism as a discourse and an ideal is on the side of the vulnerable and powerless, hence in confrontation with power. Nevertheless, Abu-Sada (2012) argues that what “started off as a powerful discourse, now is a discourse of power”, not only on an international, but also on national and local levels. Humanitarian organisations all over the world interact with politics, businesses and governments, moving and mobilizing great amounts of resources. Humanitarian assistance therefore constitutes a sector with huge amounts of financial, material and human resources at its disposal.

Nevertheless, its definition (in so far the most widely used form is considered) is free of power relationships. The Global Humanitarian Assistance Programme (GHA, 2015) defines humanitarian assistance as “the aid and action designed to save lives, alleviate suffering and maintain and protect human dignity during and in the aftermath of man-made crises and natural disasters, as well as to prevent and strengthen preparedness for the occurrence of such situations”. It can therefore constitute very different operations that can range from short-term to long-term initiatives. What distinguishes it from other forms of aid and foreign assistance are its core principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality and independence (IFRC, 2009; OCHA, 2011). Even so, humanitarian assistance is nowadays closely linked to development and security issues (Duffield, 2002; Watson, 2011).

Because of the diverse nature of humanitarian assistance, a description of what is spent in this sector can vary greatly depending on data sources. Although there are efforts to enhance transparency, there is no universal obligation to report expenditures for humanitarian assistance. Reported data varies even to the type of assistance that is considered humanitarian assistance and also lacks reliable data on private donations.

6 from 2006-2013 between US$14bn and US$9bn per year, according to Development Initiatives (2015)
Most attempts to quantify humanitarian expenditure therefore rely on data for international humanitarian response and domestic expenditures (GHA, 2015).

### 3.3 Framing Theory

The concept of framing is part of the philosophical approach of social constructivism. Contrary to the understandings of the rational choice theory, framing theory suggests that choice can be influenced not only by factors of logic or rationality, but also by factors of perception and presentation. This influence is exercised through the use of frames as tools of understanding.

The Oxford English Dictionary defines framing as “the action, method, or process, of constructing making or shaping anything whether material or immaterial” (1989:143). The word “frame” can be used as both, a noun and a verb. As a noun, a frame can be understood as a lens or specifically defined context through which something is interpreted or understood. As a verb, framing refers to the process of creating a frame, which can be done either unconsciously or strategically. In both cases the word “frame” describes a tool of communication and understanding, through which perceptions and interpretations are influenced deliberately or unconsciously.

Entmann (2004) argues that as a tool of communication, framing is “selecting and highlighting some facets of events or issues and making connections among them so as to promote a particular interpretation, evaluation, and/or solution” (2004:5), which often corresponds to the interest of elites. Nevertheless, framing is not per se a bad thing. On the contrary, it is part of human nature to use frames to make sense of the world around us. Frames make it easy for us to understand complex situations, they are often filters of our own making that highlight those aspects of an issue which is most important to us as an individual, a group or a society. However, as a part of human nature, it is also part of human communication and present in politics, as well as media, religion and any kind of negotiation. For this study, framing theory displays the importance of studying and thereby trying to understand human thoughts and perceptions. If each individual understands reality differently according to the frames they apply to what is happening, individuals who wield decision-making power may also shape reality in accordance to their perceptions and goals. The same underlying theoretical understanding inherent in framing theory provides the foundation for van der
Veen’s seven frames relevant to foreign aid policy of Western donors (2011), which is elaborated below.

3.4 Seven Frames of Foreign Aid Policy

Even though, according to van der Veen, “every advanced industrialized nation has a foreign aid programme” (2011:2), motivations shaping foreign aid still remain poorly understood. Factors that play an important role in one case seem completely irrelevant in another and vice versa. One of the more recent studies simply concludes that “there are too many interacting variables to justify a model that would be both parsimonious and insightful.” (Lancaster, 2007).

The theoretical framework applied to the data in this study has its foundations in Framing Theory. Applying those backgrounds to an analysis of foreign aid policy has already resulted in the creation of several frames, like those established by Lancaster (2007) or van der Veen (2011). While both are similar, the frames by Lancaster are more general than those established by van der Veen and cluster frames together, which need to be separated for gaining relevant insights in the case of this study. That is why for this study van der Veen’s seven frames relevant to foreign aid policy will be used. The frames, which have been created through the study of legislative debates in institutions of western donors, will be used for a comparison with those that will be established by this study for the new donors Brazil and India.

Van der Veen argues that “ideas about the goals and purposes of aid policy shape its formulation and implementation” (2011:2). The frames he established after an analysis of legislative debates in Belgium, Italy, the Netherlands and Norway represent these ideas and therefore portray motivating factors for decision-making and distribution in the context of foreign aid. The frames are:
The frames van der Veen established portray the political landscape of four Western donors with regards to foreign aid in general. In this study, the frames will be used as a theoretical framework on findings of a thematic analysis that examined debates of two agents in Brazil and India involved in the processes of humanitarian spending. Looking at the specific topic of humanitarian assistance from the perspective of new donors through this framework might result in finding one or more of van der Veen’s frames to be irrelevant for this combination. In addition to possibly identifying irrelevant frames for the specific context of humanitarian assistance of the two new donors Brazil and India, new frames might also be added based on the analysis. By using this theoretical framework to compare motivations for granting humanitarian assistance of new donors to motivations of Western donors, interesting insights with regards to differences and similarities between North-South cooperation and South-South cooperation might be gained.
3.5 Themes and Frames

Because applying a framework that relies on frames to themes from a thematic analysis might result in a discussion of one kind or another, it is important to take a look at the terminology and discuss the feasibility of the task. Frames have been defined above as a tool of understanding. They describe a way in which societies, groups and also individuals organize, perceive and communicate about reality. This study deals with frames of foreign aid and humanitarian assistance. Therefore, in this case, the frames are tools of organisation, perception and communication of foreign aid purposes and goals.

Themes on the other hand are plainly the main message or central point of a narrative, text or argument often summarized in one single word. A theme is general and can be the main idea of many different frames. As an example, when someone refers to his/her enemies as ‘evil’, ‘greedy’ or ‘murderers’, the theme from these sentences would be something like the ‘nature of the enemy’ as is in essence what the sentences are about, without giving value to the adjectives referred to. The way this ‘nature of the enemy’ is described, is the frame with which reality is perceived and communicated. In a way the table above taken from van der Veen (2011:10) is describing both frames and themes, although it is not presented as such.

Generally, frames and themes are very similar. The difference is that a frame is established by asking “how does this person communicate about or view this specific topic?” taking into account more of the individual and their background. A theme on the other hand describes the essence of a communication, without taking into account the background of the person, but the context of the communication as a whole. It is more neutral in a sense. In this specific case of frames connected to foreign policy decisions and themes connected to motivations regarding humanitarian spending, a comparison is hence both possible and valid.

3.6 Summary

The first chapter elaborated on the research problem of this study that knowledge about motivations for humanitarian spending from new donors is generally lacking. It

---

7 A discussion on what reality actually is will not be included here. The concept of frames and framing, however, is based on the philosophical understanding called social constructivism, which argues that reality is created by people themselves and hence can vary and differ for each person respectively.
connected the problem to the academic discourse on the development-security nexus and the discussions and speculations about new donors from the ‘rising South’, and briefly explained the research design. Next, the chapter on Methodology elaborated how this study will address this knowledge gap by analysing debates in the Brazilian Federal Senate (Senado Federal) and the Brazilian ministry of Foreign Affairs (Ministério das Relações Exteriores), as well as the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and Council of States (Rajya Sabha) by means of a thematic analysis. After the chapter Theoretical Framework outlined the theory of framing as the background to the theoretical framework used in this study, it introduced the Seven Frames relevant to Foreign Aid Policy of Western donors (v. d. Veen, 2011), which will be used for a comparison of Western donors’ and new donors’ motivations for granting humanitarian assistance. With this, the framework of the research design for this study stands. The following chapter will provide some background information on the institutional set-up of processes of humanitarian assistance in Brazil and India and provide the reader with some quantitative context to the humanitarian spendings of both countries.
4 Background

In order to better understand the context surrounding processes regarding humanitarian assistance in Brazil and India, this chapter will provide some background information on the institutional set-ups in each country, the definitions used for the concept humanitarian assistance, as well as some numerical facts about actual spendings of the two donors in the sector.

Before elaborating on the humanitarian spendings of the new donors, it is necessary to mention that, according to the Global Humanitarian Assistance Report (2014), donations from all non-DAC donors in 2013 together summed up to US$2.3 billion, adding to the DAC donations of US$14.1 billion to a total of US$16.4 billion (GHA, 2014:26). To put the two new donors analysed in this study into perspective, according to the same source, Brazil donated US$1.8 million and India US$2.6 million of humanitarian assistance in 2013.

4.1 Brazil

Over the last couple of years Brazil has established itself as a so-called new donor, both in the sector of international development cooperation and in the sector of humanitarian assistance. According to de Faria and Paradis (2013), the Brazilian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MRE) defines international humanitarian assistance as:

“Any action that contributes, in an immediate and effective way, to prevent, protect from, prepare for, reduce or alleviate suffering and to provide assistance to other countries or regions that are – temporarily or otherwise – in situations of emergency, public calamity, imminent or serious threat to life, to health, to the protection of human rights or the humanitarian rights of its population.” (MRE, 2010 cited in de Faria & Paradis, 2013)

Although it is also still a recipient of humanitarian assistance: US$1.1 million in 2013, according to GHA (2013), since the adoption of a new strategy in 2004, Brazil has also
become a donor of humanitarian assistance to countries in Africa, Latin America, South-East Asia and the Middle East. The Global Humanitarian Assistance Programme displays Brazilian humanitarian spendings of 2008-2013 to vary greatly, between US$4.1 million in 2008 and US$54.3 million in 2012, dropping to US$1.8 million for the year 2013, as shown in the figure below.

![Figure 2: Humanitarian Spendings of Brazil from 2007-2013 (GHA, 2015)](image)

Only recently has the Brazilian government begun to identify, recover and systematize the data and information of investments related to activities in the sectors of humanitarian assistance and development cooperation, where before the nature of actions and implementations was decentralized in nature. Because of this, at the moment, data on humanitarian spendings from the Brazilian government is available only up to 2010. The available data from reports on the Brazilian Cooperation for International Development by the Institute of Applied Economic Research (Ipea, 2014) show, that efforts in humanitarian spendings have evidently increased since 2007 (2014:72). While in 2007, humanitarian spendings amounted to R$31.8 million (~US$9.08 million), they were up to R$284.2 million (~US$81 million) in 2010 (ibid). The table below shows these trends.
As humanitarian assistance does not have a separate budget (it is handled as part of ODA), the Ministry of Foreign Affairs sets the limits of humanitarian spending, although additional contributions can be made, which must however be approved by the Brazilian Congress, according to a study by GPPi (2010:12). Putting the numbers above into the picture of ODA, reports by Ipea (2014) suggests that from the R$1.6 billion (~US$923 million) of total ODA, R$284.2 million (~17.7%) were spent on humanitarian assistance in 2010. However, comparing the data from GHA and Ipea makes clear that there are many differences. Normally, this would be surprising, but, as mentioned before, governments are not obligated to report humanitarian spendings, and depending on the definition of humanitarian assistance data may vary from database to database.

While the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has a lot of decision-making power, the nature of actions and implementation with regards to foreign aid in general has been highly decentralized. Almost the entire structure of the federal executive branch, meaning almost all ministries, has a structure for international affairs (Silva et al., 2010). Nevertheless, to improve operation and coordination in the sector of humanitarian assistance, in 2003 CGFOME was established as part of the MRE and 3 years later, in 2006, an Interministerial Working Group on Humanitarian Assistance (GTI-AHI), a body composed of representatives of 15 ministries, headed by the
Ministry of Foreign Affairs (CGFOME, 2013). This latter is, since its establishment, the main institutional mechanism that operates and coordinates matters regarding humanitarian assistance provided by Brazil. Still, there are a great number of actors involved in the provision of humanitarian assistance. The figure below, taken from de Faria & Paradis (2013) shows the actors involved and their mode of participation.

Figure 4: Actors involved in Brazilian Humanitarian Cooperation

The approach of Brazil’s humanitarian assistance is based on its experiences with their national Zero Hunger Programme, and desires to use strategies of both emergency response and long-term oriented structural operations (Ipea, 2014). While one aims to promote immediate relief of conditions of deprivation and suffering, the other seeks to
create socioeconomic development through for example buying necessary agricultural products locally. This has also gained much appreciation in international organisations such as the IFRC (IFRC, 2009:21).

Ipea (2011) also finds that, while in 2005 more humanitarian assistance was channelled through international organisation, the trend has now changed and saw about 97% of humanitarian assistance distributed bilaterally, and only about 2% distributed through international organisations in 2009 (2011:23). The report also identifies the nature and amount of resources allocated to humanitarian assistance: In kind supplies correspond to almost 65% of donations, followed by financial transfers (to embassies for the purchase of local agricultural products), which represent about 21% of the resources (ibid:24).

Regarding the distribution of humanitarian assistance regionally, data shows differing numbers, depending on the database. The GHA (2015) locate 52.8% of the total amount of Brazilian humanitarian assistance to African states, south of the Sahara, and 26.3% to Latin America and the Caribbean, with other minor contributions to the Middle East and South-East Asia. However, according to reports by Ipea (2011, 2014), Brazilian humanitarian assistance is predominantly given to countries in Latin America and the Caribbean (76%), followed by Africa (16,5%), Asia and the Middle East (2011:23f; 2014:79). Between 2005-2009 the largest recipients of humanitarian assistance from Brazil were Cuba, Haiti, Palestinian Territories, Honduras (Ipea, 2011:26), which together received almost 64% of the total amount of international humanitarian assistance allocated by Brazil between 2005 and 2009.

Many (researchers) see the growing interest of Brazil in international humanitarian assistance as a tool in a greater strategy of foreign policy, that is designed to contribute to a stabilization of Brazil’s leadership role in the region of Latin-America and the Caribbean (for example de Faira & Paradis, 2013; Aguilar 2012; Souza, 2012; Saravia, 2012). From the reports of the Global Humanitarian Assistance Programme one can see that most of the international humanitarian assistance from Brazil goes to countries from their region, or more recently also to African countries, that share with Brazil a colonial past under Portugal (GHA, 2015). This shows that regional interests play a role in the granting and distribution of humanitarian assistance, but also that it is not the only interest motivating such foreign policy.
4.2 India

Like the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Brazil, the Indian government has its own definition of humanitarian assistance. It usually uses the terms “humanitarian assistance” or “disaster relief” to describe short-term assistance, which refers to activities that address human suffering in the aftermath of natural disaster such as floods, earthquakes, droughts or cyclones. This definition does not include such assistance for people affected by armed conflicts, since Indian officials often highlight the importance of separating humanitarian assistance from political matters, according to Meier & Murthy (2011:5), and this cannot be granted in cases of complex emergencies. Nevertheless, India still provided humanitarian assistance in two cases of post-conflict situations, namely Afghanistan and Sri Lanka (Meier & Murthy, 2011; GHA, 2015).

Although it is still a recipient of humanitarian assistance, US$17.9 million in 2013, according to GHA (2015), India has recently gone to great lengths in order to change its image from a recipient of humanitarian assistance to a new donor in the area. The GHA puts humanitarian spendings of India from 2005-2013 to vary between US$1.3 million and US$35.8 million as the graph below illustrates.

![Humanitarian Assistance (in million US$)](image)

*Figure 5: Indian Humanitarian Spendings 2005-2013 (GHA, 2015)*

There are some interesting headlines connecting India and humanitarian assistance in recent years, among them two most notable illustrating India’s shift from recipient to donor of humanitarian assistance. One of them is from 2004, when the Indian government refused international humanitarian assistance after the Indian Ocean
tsunami caused havoc in the region (ODI, 2010b:21). Instead, they were quick to provide humanitarian assistance to neighbouring countries, which were also greatly affected by the tsunami (ODI, 2005:16), and insisted India was quite capable of dealing with the national consequences of the disaster. To some like Kragelund (2008:574), this was meant as a strategic perception shift for India from recipient to donor. The other headline, from 2005, occurred when an Indian army aircraft carried 25 tons of relief supplies to the victims of Hurricane Katrina in New Orleans (Stuenkel, 2012), an act which, according to many headlines, ‘revealed’ the donor India to the world.

While the Indian Ministry of External Affairs (MEA) is the focal point for decisions regarding humanitarian assistance in India, according to a research paper by Meier & Murthy (2011) “the decision-making power is widely spread among different entities within the ministry.” There are approximately 16 geographic and functional divisions of the MEA which make and implement decisions regarding humanitarian assistance, either through a top-down or a bottom-up approach, depending on the circumstances (scale of disaster, political connection to affected country). The illustration below, taken from Meier & Murthy (2011), shows the gist of the system.
Three possible decision making processes in the Indian aid bureaucracy

**Figure 6: Decision-making Processes in the Indian Aid Bureaucracy**
Although the Technical and Economic Cooperation Division within the Foreign Ministry holds the mandate for implementing decisions on humanitarian assistance, the division does not seem to have control or overview over individual decisions by the joint secretaries of the MEA’s divisions (Meier & Murthy, 2011:8). The much decentralized institutional setup illustrated above leads to a lack of overview over matters regarding humanitarian spending, allocation of funds and decision-making, which is most likely why no relevant quantitative data about humanitarian assistance could be found on official sites of the Indian government. Additionally, humanitarian assistance does not have a separate budget line within the MEA - something quite usual as has been mentioned before - and hence no centralized bag of resources (ibid). However, since 2007 the Indian Parliament now approves an annual budget head called “Emergency Assistance for Natural Disasters” as part of the budget of the Ministry of Finance (ibid), a first step to overcome the institutional difficulties so far.

While the central government is responsible for foreign relations, federal states also play a role in foreign policy. They sometimes provide support to assistance efforts (as did the government of Tamil Nadu in in-kind assistance to Sri Lanka through the IFRC), although any such engagement in foreign affairs needs clearance from the MEA. India is generally wary of cooperation with international organisations and relies exclusively on the Indian army for implementing humanitarian assistance abroad, according to Meier & Murthy (2011:10). The example mentioned above was the only instance when India supported operations of the ICRC. Although India’s willingness for cooperation with multilateral organisations is changing, they mostly give bilateral aid, which does not undermine the sovereignty of the affected state and focuses on demand of the respective government rather than demand of the affected population (Meier & Murthy, 2011:5). Both factors are priorities of the Indian government when taking actions regarding humanitarian assistance, according to Meier & Murthy (2011), although this attitude may also have roots in India’s previous experiences as a recipient of international humanitarian assistance.

Most of Indian humanitarian assistance is granted to states from its neighbourhood in South- and Central-Asia (Meier & Murthy, 2011:15). However, humanitarian assistance to countries in the neighbouring area of India has another dimension in addition to relief of suffering: resilience. Chandran et. al. (2009:72-72) argue that the government in India realizes it can only fully explore the potential of India’s economic growth if the region is stable. The many varying types of disasters
which haunt South East Asia, however, inevitably create unfavourable consequences for thisendeavour, leaving India with a high interest in supporting the resilience of neighbouring countries to help prevent disasters. There are also other contributions that go to affected states in Africa and Latin America (as well as the US (!), as the example mentioned above shows). Resilience efforts in those cases could not be identified, though.

![Figure 7: Indian Humanitarian Spendings per region (2001-2010), taken from Meier & Murthy (2011)](image)

The geographic location of the recipient country also influences the way humanitarian assistance is contributed, is argued in a working paper on India by Meier & Murthy (2011). In-kind contributions like medical care, shelter and food aid will be distributed to countries easily reachable by sea or land, while countries farer away are more likely to receive contributions in form of cash, argue Harmer and Cotterrell (ODI, 2005:23). The only exception to this, according to Chaudhuri (2005), are contributions of medicine and drugs, which might be connected to India being the world’s third largest producer of pharmaceuticals.

This chapter has provided some background information on the institutional set-ups connected to processes of humanitarian assistance in Brazil and India, the definitions used for the concept humanitarian assistance in each country, as well as some numerical
facts about actual spendings of the two donors in the sector. This information will put into context the findings of the thematic analyses done on debates in the Brazilian Federal Senate (Senado Federal) and the Brazilian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Ministério das Relações Exteriores), as well as the Indian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Council of States (Rajya Sabha) presented in the next chapter.
5 Findings

This section will present the findings of the thematic analysis that was used to analyse statements regarding humanitarian assistance from debates in the Brazilian Federal Senate (Senado Federal) and the Brazilian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Ministério das Relações Exteriores), as well as the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and Council of States (Rajya Sabha). The intention is to answer the research questions “Why do decision makers in Brazil and India choose to contribute to humanitarian assistance?” and “What patterns can be identified?”

An initial coding process resulted in 45 preliminary codes, which summarized the main ideas of the 367 statements analysed for this study. These were then further categorized and resulted in 8 final themes representative of the main patterns identified from the debates. These themes will be presented for Brazil and India separately with several examples to further illustrate the theme construction. Later, general trends and notable issues will be highlighted. The theme Humanitarianism was identified in both countries, and will be explained in both contexts, although it will count as one theme.

5.1 Brazil

For Brazil, 4 themes could be categorized. These are: Priority, Humanitarianism, Regional Solidarity, and International Integration.

Priority
In the discussions about humanitarian assistance, not only motivational statements were given. Counter arguments were also presented and discussed. All statements by members of the Federal Senate or Ministry of Foreign Affairs that argued against the granting of humanitarian assistance to other countries were categorized into the theme Priority. Although initially the theme reflected mostly counter arguments that were presented as opposition to humanitarian spendings, most statements in this category also
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8 here are some examples: contra-position, in-state poverty vs outside generosity, international integration, display of responsibility, display of competence, humanitarian reasoning, priorities, balance of power display and companionship, diplomatic interests, regional leader, basic needs, national security, principles, generosity…..
highlighted the priorities of parties or individuals that should be addressed before considering the spending of many millions on emergencies abroad.

In the data this theme is recognized through negative connotations or directly confrontational arguments against humanitarian spending. It does, however, always come with logical reasoning. Statements like this: “it is very clear that this was not on the basis of humanitarian aid, but was purely on the basis of a commercial transaction[...]” (Senado Federal, 2009), while including a negative connotation to humanitarian assistance, are not included in this theme. There were also several statements in the data set, which referred to members of parliament being “against humanitarian assistance”. However, these statements were mostly in confrontation to such alleged opposition against humanitarian assistance and posed as defence or outrage against such statements, which is why they, too, will be excluded from this theme.

The lines of argumentation, which led to the identification of the theme Priority, were usually straightforward, expressed as critiques, although their influence on actual policy- and decision-making is hard to evaluate. An example of the theme in the data is: “Brazil has pockets of poverty that receive no official assistance, a fact that would advise against donating to other nations, no matter how strong the reasoning for humanitarian aid” (Roberto Cavalcanti, Senado Federal, 2010). The argument presented in this statement can be considered representative of most arguments in this category. Although there are variations, like such statements that specifically refer to instances where a request for money in another sector or cause was denied, because the state had no money, while on the other hand “large amounts of resources were designated to international donations” (Cicero Lucena, Senado Federal, 2010).

It was also clear from the statements, that contra arguments should not be understood as much as complete opposition, but rather as a matter of priority - hence the name of the theme. One senator put it very clearly, that making a statement against international humanitarian assistance does not mean that there is no compassion or concern for the people outside Brazil. Rather, she says: “Of course, I have much sympathy for the people of Africa, the Arab World and Latin America. There is no problem with that. I just want humanitarian aid to also be provided to Brazil.” and further:

“A government that throws 70% of the public budget in the mud of speculation, that chooses to fill bankers’ bellies
while emptying the plates, jobs and dignity of the Brazilian people has no moral authority to demand humanitarian aid, complaining that someone in this House was against it. No one is against it. Lies! [...] I will use this opportunity to ask the Government to send humanitarian aid to the flood victims in Alagoas, who, so far, did not receive any relief at all. Many children have died, buried underneath slopes of mud from the heavy rain. This is my appeal to humanitarian aid for flood victims.[...]. Solidarity with others, yes, but also solidarity with the Brazilian people!" (Heloísa Helena, Senado Federal, 2004)

Likewise, Alvaro Dias explains that

“My state, near the coast of Paraná also heard promises. They have not been met even today. The benefits did not arrive, the service was not completed, the victims were not rescued. [...] And we're allowing the Federal Government to benefit countries like Bolivia, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti and the countries of the Community of Portuguese Language Countries. Humanitarian aid is human solidarity. [...] But first, we want the needs of victimized Brazilians to be met.” (Senado Federal, 2011)

Although there were such statements of contra-positions, it seems that opposition was either small or did not have the necessary numbers to change decisions to grant humanitarian assistance. In most cases, the statements seemed to be a means to convey dissatisfaction with the way decisions were made or the priority of foreign aid over support in the nation itself. Still, arguments highlighted compassion for people suffering and moral principles that would guide the vote of the speaker especially in cases of emergencies (like for the case of Haiti in 2010).
Humanitarianism

Humanitarianism is the theme most frequently mentioned for motivating humanitarian assistance in debates. It is mentioned at least once for each debated subject. Although it was not the intention of this study to pay attention to the amount of times a statement or theme was uttered, the repeated appearance of this particular category is still worth mentioning. Indeed, humanitarian assistance in its ideal should first and foremost be about humanitarian motives. It is therefore not a bad sign, that it was mentioned so often in the debates that were analysed.

This theme can be recognized through the mentioning of humanitarian purposes as motivation for granting humanitarian assistance. The theme is representative of statements that include arguments of humanitarian nature by for example speaking to the sense and value of principles, morality, duty and global public goods. An example is: “It is to alleviate untold suffering for a significant portion of the civilian population of that region and for victims of atrocities [...]” (Inácio Arruda, Senado Federal, 2012). Logically, any arguments which do not motivate humanitarian spending through reasonings of humanitarian nature are not included in this theme.

It should be noted, that there are three ways in which humanitarian motives are used as arguments in the debates: They are either used to express compassion (“Of course, I have much sympathy for the people of Africa, the Arab World and Latin America.” Heloísa Helena, Senado Federal, 2004), simply motivate involvement and/or to create a feeling of urgency in the face of suffering (“In the face of all this chaos, this suffering, the responsibility of Brazil increases too, because the country is becoming increasingly a large international leader.” Renato Casagrande, Senado Federal, 2011).

Regional Solidarity

The theme Regional Solidarity is defined by arguments which used reasoning that spoke to a feeling of solidarity with the region. What is expected of a regional leader in situations of crisis is solidarity with its neighbours and the offer of immediate assistance. The display of capability is what displays leadership. As the saying goes: “With great power comes great responsibility”. In the debates, this theme can be recognized by arguments that highlighted the responsibility resting on Brazil as the greatest power in the region and the importance of solidarity with the region. Solidarity was an important factor in this theme as an argument that highlights bonds between
Brazil and its “brothers” (Magno Malta, Senado Federal, 2012) in need of humanitarian assistance.

In the theme are not included arguments, which use the economic power of Brazil for reasoning or such statements that highlight the position of Brazil in the international forum. A very good argument exemplifying the theme is this:

“The Constitution preserves the search for Latin American solidarity as another of the most important purposes of our country. Consequently, given the lack of equipment, medicines and specialized personnel to deal with the huge tragedy in our brother’s capital, Brazil’s initiative to provide humanitarian aid to its brothers in Paraguay will surely be greatly appreciated.” (Juvencio Da Fonseca, Senado Federal, 2004).

Similarly, another senator argues that “Certainly, Senators, none of us Senators opposes humanitarian aid, none of us would oppose an act of solidarity with Latin American countries, especially considering our need to consolidate a Latin American policy, which grows with support and solidarity.” (Alvaro Dias, Senado Federal, 2004).

**International Integration**

The last theme identified for motivating humanitarian assistance by Brazil is *International Integration*. The theme *International Integration* is defined by the wish for recognition and acknowledgment on an international level - the feeling of being integrated, as the name suggests. This theme is closely linked with the theme *Regional Solidarity* as it directly connects to the dominant image of a leadership role of Brazil, the responsibility and the change in perceived power such a role brings with it. The theme *International Integration* picks up on this, and relocates it onto the international arena. That means not only having responsibility, but sharing it; not only having a voice, but being listened to. From another point of view, the arguments in this theme display all that, which Brazil wants its international counterparts to see it as: an equal global power player, capable of dealing with crises at home and in its immediate surroundings. The following statement clearly shows what the theme is about:
“In the face of all this chaos, this suffering, the responsibility of Brazil increases too, because the country is becoming increasingly a large leader internationally. This is a great opportunity - so we should make this reflection - of the nation exercising leadership, in solidarity, joining in cooperation with other countries to extend humanitarian assistance to Haiti.” (Renato Casagrande, Senado Federal, 2011)

As stated before, the themes Regional Solidarity and International Integration are similar to some extent. Arguments under both themes operate within the context of outside perceptions. One focuses on Brazil’s role in a regional context, while the other puts more emphasis on its role on the international level. They were categorized as distinct themes, because those statements that deal with regional perception had very different lines of argumentation (solidarity, but also the responsibility that comes with being a ‘leader’ in the region) and suggested a different kind of underlying reasoning than statements that focused on implications for the perception of Brazil on the international level. Generally, while one theme focuses on the way Brazil wants to be perceived in the region - as a capable leader, but also as someone who is loyal and does not only act out of underlying interests - the other focuses on the perception on the international level, on what is necessary to be seen as an equal global power.
5.2 India

From the debates in India, 5 themes were identified. These are: Security Interests, Competence, Good Neighbour, Humanitarianism, and Preparedness.

Security Interests
The theme Security Interests is exactly about that: Security interests of India, both nationally and internationally. In the data the theme can be identified by looking for arguments about both international and national security, or statements that highlight concerns of national security before concerns of other states’ interests. A statement such as: “We want a peaceful neighbour” (Rajya Sabha, 2008), during a discussion on the plight of Tamils in Sri Lanka, contrasts the need for conflict settlement for the sake of the people in Sri Lanka with conflict settlement for the sake of India, as an immediate neighbour. Another example that portrays how security interests interfere with decisions regarding the granting of humanitarian assistance is this: “This is a very delicate issue. It will also have its repercussions [...] I only hope that the Government will proceed further very cautiously. We have enough problems on our home-front. And we should not invite any new problem on us.” (Rajya Sabha, 2000).

As can be seen, some decisions regarding humanitarian assistance are very closely linked to concerns of national security. Especially in India this seems to be a very prominent concern, as the theme reoccurred very often in statements of debates. Sometimes, arguments under the category of Security Interests point out how involvement should be handled with caution, as portrayed above. Nevertheless, it seems that history also plays a role in the line of argumentation: “We should avoid direct military intervention from the side of the Government of India. We have already had some experience and we have burnt our fingers once.” (Rajya Sabha, 2000). Especially interventions are mentioned to be better handled by the international community: “If at all the Government is considering to help the civilians, they should send their help through international organisations like the Red Cross” (ibid).

Competence
The theme Competence presents a sort of opposition to the theme Security Interests mentioned before. Actions that speak to the competence and responsibility of a nation in
times of crises can be many, from the caring for refugees in the country to diplomatic efforts that use good relations with affected states to improve the situation for the affected population.

“With regard to giving humanitarian assistance to the Sri Lankan refugees in India - we are known for our hospitality and have been taking up this responsibility- I think, if we want to go beyond this, a wide discussion is needed within the country as to whether India should get herself involved in the affairs or not.” (Rajya Sabha, 2000)

However, the Minister of External Affairs at the time also stated that “We are concerned about the plight of the civilians caught in the hostilities and the growing number of internally displaced persons. We have emphasised to the Sri Lankan Government that the safety and the security of the civilians must be safeguarded at all costs and that food and essential supplies be allowed to reach them unhindered.” (MEA, 2008)

Principles also play an important role as is shown in the following statement: “But we have taken a stand on a political principle, even if [followed by consequences]” (Rajya Sabha, 2001). Standing up to principles also shows a form of competence.

In contrast to the careful considerations and holding-back strategies shown in the theme Security Interests above, the theme Competence categorizes statements that argue for taking a position, showing competences and responsibility, instead of choosing not to get involved in active participation. Taking responsibility and showing competence are statements that can also be argued to reflect the self-perception India has of itself as an emerging power on the international arena. As an emerging power that seeks to be acknowledged by other global players, showing responsibility in times of crises and portraying competence and capabilities by exercising this responsibility is also a strategic consideration.

Good Neighbour

The theme Good Neighbour is defined as a pattern that highlights regional relations of India and the wish to be perceived as a “good neighbour” by others. It includes arguments, which were used in debates on developments in the region and neighbouring
countries to the state of India. Logically, this theme therefore excludes statements about humanitarian donations outside the region. The following statement exemplifies the theme: In a discussion regarding the floods in Pakistan in 2010 an argument was that “we cannot remain unconcerned with this great humanitarian crisis of enormous magnitude in our immediate neighbourhood” (Rajya Sabha, 2010).

The name of the theme, “Good Neighbour”, was chosen to portray the ideal behind it, one both concerned and protective, that speakers in the debates seemed to pursue in their line of argumentation to motivate the granting of humanitarian assistance. The theme implies and connects to the themes of Security Interests and Competence explained above. The “good neighbour” figure has been used both, in contexts where too much meddling in foreign affairs was not a popular argument, and in other contexts, where responsibility and competence played an important role for the speaker. “In our vision of a cooperative and harmonious sub-continent, the relationship between India and Pakistan can be a critical building block.” (Rajya Sabha, 2009).

Another example came forth when discussing the effects of a cyclone in Bangladesh in 2007: “In keeping with our close ties and our empathy with the friendly people of Bangladesh in this hour of need, the Government of India has decided to respond immediately with a comprehensive relief package.” (Rajya Sabha, 2007). This statement also links the theme of the Good Neighbour to the theme Humanitarianism.

**Humanitarianism**

All argumentation categorized in the theme of Humanitarianism is bound to statements about need, suffering, necessity and responsibility like such: “On humanitarian grounds, India continues to look after these refugees. In consonance with this, India will work to mitigate the hardship inflicted upon civilians by the conflict and will render such humanitarian assistance as may become necessary.” (MEA, 2000). Or on the plight of the population in Sri Lanka:

“We view with grave concern the humanitarian crisis that is building up with every passing day in Sri Lanka. There are reports that over 70,000 civilians are trapped in the conflict zone in Sri Lanka and there is acute shortage of food, water and medicines. [...] The pause in hostilities
must be utilised to facilitate the movement of Tamil population out of the war-affected areas to secure locations where proper rehabilitation is possible and international aid organisations, as also the ICRC, have free access and scope to provide medical and other forms of humanitarian aid.” (MEA, 2009)

Despite such statements only on few occasions were debates actually centred on motivations for humanitarian assistance in the context of international disasters/crises. Most of the time, debates revolved around disasters in India and the requirement of humanitarian assistance for the local population: “Will there be additional disaster relief for the victims of the floods in Karnataka?” (Rajya Sabha, 2012), “Every year there are heavy rains and resulting landslides, and every year people die because of the lack of relief - we need more support for the victims of such disasters!” (MEA, 2011). This makes a lot of sense, as India is a country that is haunted by natural disasters every year and has to cope with them.

Preparedness

The theme Preparedness is mostly present in the above mentioned contexts of disaster situations in India. Especially in a country that experiences effects of natural disasters every year, ways to deal with and to prepare for them are essential in order to keep casualties and damages as low as possible. This theme therefore highlights the worry for preparedness and prevention measures against recurring natural disasters in India, but also in the region.

This is also reflected in the debates, where discussions about humanitarian assistance put emphasis on preparedness and resilience measures, especially considering rising numbers of natural disasters in recent years. “The disaster management policies must incorporate programmes to protect the most vulnerable segments of the society - the poor, marginalized, women, farmers, agricultural workers, SCs/STs, elderly people, children, who are the direct victims of all disasters. “ (Rajya Sabha, 2011) Many times it was also a lack of preparedness that was emphasized, considering that “India is prone to natural disasters [...] We had Tsunamis in the past; we used to have frequent cyclones;
we have earthquakes, and we have cloudbursts.” (Rajya Sabha, 2013) One speaker emphasized:

“Stranded people were struggling with lack of relief operations, with no water, medical arrangement, weak administration [...] and we are discussing the situation here in Parliament.... [Interruptions]... Yes, Sir, there was no forecast about such disaster, but there was information — expectation of heavy rains — according to the Indian Meteorological Department. Yet, no meaningful initiatives were put into motion, no preparation made. [...]” (Rajya Sabha, 2013)

5.3 Summary

From the thematic analyses of debates around humanitarian assistance in the Brazilian Federal Senate (Senado Federal) and the Brazilian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Ministério das Relações Exteriores), as well as the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and Council of States (Rajya Sabha), the following conclusions can be drawn:

Generally, while there is debate on the decision-making level in both countries about humanitarian spendings, the number of debates varies greatly from year to year and particularly in India a lot of debates also revolve around the national side of required humanitarian assistance. As has been mentioned above neither is surprising. Firstly, the contributions by Brazil and India to global humanitarian assistance together only reflect a small portion of total humanitarian spending in the world. Secondly, with regards to India, it is only logical for the Indian government to prioritize on crises requiring humanitarian assistance nationally before such requirements abroad, since India has to deal with several natural disasters every year.

For both countries themes were identified that represent motivational factors for granting humanitarian assistance, which were identified by analysing debates from two relevant institutions from both countries. In Brazil those themes are: Priority, Humanitarianism, Regional Solidarity and International Integration. For India the
themes identified are: Security Interests, Humanitarianism, Good Neighbour, Competence and Preparedness.

From the explanations above it is clear that the themes from each country relate to and are interconnected with each other. For one, in both cases pro- and contra-arguments were related to humanitarian principles and motives, highlighting compassion and speaking to each country's role conception of an emerging global power as one that should act with competence and shoulder responsibility. Additionally, themes that regarded the international standing of the countries (for Brazil: International Integration; for India: Competence) on both sides clearly related to their status as a rising or emerging power on the global arena - one that wishes to show competence and shoulder responsibility.

Also identified in both countries were from each two themes that showed both similarities and distinctions. One regards the themes relating to regional power structures (for Brazil: Regional Solidarity; for India: Good Neighbour). While in Brazil the leadership role in the region was highlighted, Indian officials stressed the role of a good neighbour, which indicates two different role conceptions or mind sets behind the arguments. The other, regards themes connected to contra positions expressed against humanitarian spendings abroad (for Brazil: Priority; for India: Security Interests). Here, arguments in Brazil clearly indicated a factor of priority that should be taken into account, focusing on national issues first before spending money that would also be necessary locally, abroad. Contra-arguments in India on the other hand rather highlighted interests that concerned national security (and also international implications that could follow - a lesson well learned from history). These differences, however, might also have a connection to the respective regional contexts. Political crises or civil wars in the direct neighbourhood (as in the case of India, the crisis in Sri Lanka mentioned several times in the debates) would definitely influence the perceptions of the ruling elite and therefore also influence which reasonings are used when arguing about humanitarian assistance.

Besides the states’ similarities and differences, there is one more distinction that needs to be pointed out. For India one more theme was identified, which cannot be compared to Brazil as there it was not mentioned: the theme Preparedness. As explained above, it is quite natural for a country that is so regularly confronted with natural disasters in the region to have a specific concern for preparedness and resilience measures both within its own borders and abroad. Although it is a positive sign that
preparedness and resilience measures are being debated in the relevant institutions in India, most often it is the lack thereof which is discussed, making the theme both a motivation for granting humanitarian assistance, since ‘there were not enough preparation measures’ and one that displays that humanitarian assistance does not only have the dimension of immediate relief, but also one that operates on the long-term level of prevention, risk reduction and long-term resilience.
6 Analysis

This section will explore how the findings of the thematic analyses of debates from the Brazilian Federal Senate (Senado Federal) and the Brazilian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, as well as the Indian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Council of States (Rajya Sabha), compare to the frames of the theoretical framework of this study - the Seven Frames of Foreign Aid Policy established by van der Veen (2011). The analysis will be done in steps by using the frames established by van der Veen as a lens to look at the findings gained from the thematic analyses. It will then be analysed how the themes from this study are similar to or different from the frames from the literature. The analysis will be done step by step. Firstly, each frame by van der Veen is compared to the findings of this study, and then the knowledge gained from this comparison is put into a wider discussion on North-South vs South-South cooperation. By establishing how the findings fit into the theoretical framework, the analysis will aim to answer the research question “How are the motivations of Brazil and India similar to or different from those of Western donors?”

Generally, the findings presented above already show that decisions regarding humanitarian assistance are not separated from politics and interests that go beyond humanitarian ideals. Although humanitarian motivations also play a role in debates, for both Brazil and India additional interests were identified in the form of national, regional and international considerations. How these interests motivating humanitarian spending can compare to and differ from those identified by van der Veen (2011) for Western donors will be explained in the following.

6.1 Van der Veen’s Seven Frames and the Findings of this Study

Security

The frame Security as established by van der Veen (2011) for Western donors, expresses the desire to increase a donor’s physical security. This was to be achieved by for example supporting allies or opposing the ideology of communism.

In the case of the two new donors from this study, Brazil and India, the concept security was mentioned explicitly as an interest only in Indian institution’s debates addressing motivations for humanitarian assistance. In the findings section, this motivation was referred to as Security Interests. While the theme dealt with security as
an interest, it has a different underlying understanding of security as opposed to the policy goals that led van der Veen to create the frame *Security*. In his frame a donor’s physical security already reaches out far beyond national borders and takes into account allies and opposing forms of ideology (i.e. Communism). The security interests brought forward in debates in India referred to implications for national security (e.g. during a war in neighbouring countries), if the choice was inaction, and the possibility of repercussions from the international arena, if the choice was active engagement. As mentioned in the chapter Findings, the importance Indian decision-makers attribute to national security interests when discussing humanitarian spending, might also be connected to the regional context they are surrounded with (explicitly the political crisis in Sri Lanka is mentioned several times).

Although only debates in Indian institutions explicitly referred to security interests as an argument both for and against humanitarian assistance, it can be argued that the distributions of humanitarian assistance from both India and Brazil link to security interests: In both cases distributions are mostly regional with some exceptions and can therefore also be connected to regional security interests. Referring back to the definition of the frame *Security* established by van der Veen (2011) the regional distribution can also be explained as a ‘support of allies’. In the case of Brazil and India those can be regional in nature as well as in the form of South-South partnerships, which play an increasingly important role in the humanitarian arena.

From these observations, the frame *Security* seems relevant to both Western and new donors. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the frame, as established by van der Veen, implies active engagement by consciously supporting allies or withholding support from enemies. On the other hand, the theme *Security Interests* relevant in India has rather passive implications. Active engagement was usually rejected for fear of international implications (“[...] we should not invite any new problem on us.”, Rajya Sabha, 2000) and other arguments highlighted defensive actions for the sake of national security (e.g. “We want a peaceful neighbour”, Rajya Sabha, 2008). On another note, Brazil’s motivation referred to as *Regional Solidarity*, although not explicitly related to security interests by statements, could be interpreted as a ‘support of (possible) allies’. In this case the alliance would not necessarily be one of ideology, but rather one of regional affiliation.

Nevertheless, there are still important differences between the frame *Security* as understood by van der Veen and aspects of security interests that might play a role with
regards to humanitarian spending of the new donors Brazil and India. As stated above, only the theme *Security Interests* established for India clearly refers to the security concept. While arguments can be further developed in favour of finding security interests for both Brazil and India to play a role in their humanitarian spendings, the findings of this study cannot prove such arguments. Rather, the findings show that while there is mentioning of security interests in India, the context shows a completely different understanding of security interests, than that described in van der Veen’s frame.

*Power/Influence*

The frame *Power/Influence* established by van der Veen (2011) describes the foreign policy goal of power pursuit. This was to be achieved by increasing leverage over others, by winning allies and gaining positions of influence in the international fora (v.d.Veen 2011:10).

As established in the findings section, for both Brazil and India, access to and position in regional and international power structures were interests represented in the investigated debates regarding humanitarian assistance. Described in the themes *Regional Solidarity* and *International Integration* for Brazil and *Good Neighbour* and *Competence* for India respectively, influence and power play an important role in both countries’ decision-making processes regarding humanitarian assistance. While there was no indication in either donor country of an interest in ‘leverage over others’, increasing their standing and perception as new donors and global players in the international arena was highlighted in arguments. For both, Brazil and India, increasing their image/position in the international arena by showing responsibility and competence were very important arguments made in debates.

It can therefore be argued that the frame *Power/Influence* plays a very important role for the new donors, Brazil and India, as well as for Western donors when it comes to motivating humanitarian assistance decisions, although the initial positions are very different. Especially in a world that grows more interconnected day by day, one that faces many complex and varying challenges, positions of power and influence in the international arena are of great value. In order to be able to shape global decisions, policies and opinions such power and influence are very important. Considering that both Brazil and India belong to the group of states that is practically the face of “the
rising South”, it is logical that strengthening their power positions and influences are high priorities.

**Wealth/Economic Self-Interest**

The frame *Wealth/Economic Self-Interest* established by van der Veen (2011) describes the interest of the promotion of economic interests of the donor country by supporting export industries of the same. In neither Brazil nor India arguments in debates mentioned economic interests as motivating factors for humanitarian assistance. It was, however, in a different way mentioned as an argument against humanitarian spending in debates in Brazil. Described above under the theme *Priority*, statements against humanitarian spending argued that the wealth which is at the disposal of the Government of Brazil should first and foremost be used for the good of the people of Brazil. While this is no use of the frame *Wealth/Economic Self-Interest* in the way it was established by van der Veen, the argument does refer to the wealth of the donor country, although in a negative way with regards to humanitarian assistance.

Additionally, a connection can be made from background information on the kind of humanitarian assistance itself. As the third largest producer of pharmaceuticals, India distributes medicine in-kind, while Brazil as a major agricultural producer grants food aid in-kind. This connection however, has not been mentioned in debates of these donors and hence only describes a speculation, albeit a possible one. Apart from these considerations, the frame *Wealth/Economic Self-Interest* does not apply to motivations of the new donors Brazil and India for granting humanitarian assistance.

**Enlightened Self-Interest**

The frame *Enlightened Self-Interest* was established by van der Veen (2011) to describe the pursuit of global public goods such as peace, stability, environmental health and population control as goals related to foreign aid decisions by Western donors.

In the context of the two new donors explored in this study, only Brazil displayed factors relating to the pursuit of global public goods. Through the establishment of a separate project called CGFOME, which was introduced in the background chapter, specifically the eradication of hunger was targeted by the Brazilian government. Nevertheless, maybe especially because of the establishment of this
project, arguments addressing the pursuit of such global public goods are lacking in debates around humanitarian assistance. It is only referred to in descriptions of humanitarian projects, which are relying on experiences from local programmes against food insecurity. On the other hand, the definition of humanitarian assistance as understood by the Brazilian Ministry of Foreign Affairs displays how humanitarian assistance is primarily about immediate relief. While this argumentation relates more to interests of international peace and security than other global public goods, the rising number of natural disasters connects it also to interests of preparedness and resilience.

Nonetheless, the possibility of interpretation does not make arguments from agents in Brazil and India which could be connected to the frame *Enlightened Self-Interest* magically appear. It is therefore not representative of motivations regarding humanitarian assistance from the two new donors Brazil and India.

*Reputation/Self-Affirmation*

The frame *Reputation/Self-Affirmation* established by van der Veen (2011) describes the foreign policy goals of establishing and expressing a certain identity in international relations, improving one’s international status and reputation.

In debates from institutions in both Brazil and India arguments as described in this frame were also presented as motivating factors for granting humanitarian assistance. Described in the findings section under the themes *Regional Solidarity* and *International Integration* for Brazil and the themes *Good Neighbour* and *Competence* for India, similar arguments were identified. The portrayal of a certain role (leader in the region or a good neighbour) and the desire to improve the countries’ international status and reputation were described. Again, these interests were accompanied by the desire to show responsibility and display the competence and capabilities necessary to shoulder such responsibility.

These observations allow for a connection to be made between the two frames *Power/Influence* and *Reputation/Self-Affirmation*. Although van der Veen (2011) describes them distinctively, the motivations *Regional Solidarity* and *International Integration* identified for Brazil and the themes *Good Neighbour* and *Competence* identified for India connect aspects of both frames. This might be the case, precisely because Brazil and India are new donors. Their interest in aspects of power and influence builds on their desire to be accepted as an equal among global players in the
international arena. Similarly, the interests they display in connection to their reputation also build on their desire to be seen as a global player, which they think will be achieved by improving their international reputation and status. Hence, the frame *Reputation/Self-Affirmation* plays an important role in arguments regarding decisions about humanitarian assistance for both Western donors and the new donors Brazil and India.

**Obligation/Duty**

The frame *Obligation/Duty* established by van der Veen (2011) describes how obligations, such as those rooted in history (e.g. obligation to former colonies) or those associated with a certain position in the international system (e.g. ‘the hero’), present motivating factors to foreign policy decisions.

In the cases of Brazil and India no such reference occurred in debates that discussed humanitarian assistance. This makes sense in so far as neither Brazil nor India were colonial powers, but rather colonies themselves. Hence, the only argument motivating humanitarian assistance connected to obligation and with a link to history would be the distribution of humanitarian assistance to other former colonies, for example such that shared the same colonial ruler. While in the case of Brazil one could argue that there is a specific distribution of humanitarian assistance to countries in Africa with a colonial background connected to Portugal, in the case of India no such distributions could be identified.

Similarly, no motivating factors connected to a certain role or position in the international system could be found. Nevertheless, as has been argued above and described in the findings section, the image Brazil and India want to be connected with (leaders and global players) and regional power positions do play a role in motivating humanitarian spending. The theme *Regional Solidarity* in the case of Brazil exemplifies such a connection. Therefore, regional obligation/duty could be argued to describe a motivating factor fitting into van der Veen’s frame *Obligation/Duty.*
Humanitarianism

The frame Humanitarianism as established by van der Veen (2011) describes the promotion of well-being of the poorest groups worldwide and the provision of humanitarian relief as factors that motivate foreign policy decisions.

As has been mentioned above, similar arguments have been identified in the debates in India and Brazil. In both countries humanitarian reasons were mentioned for motivating humanitarian assistance. The reasons mentioned included arguments to alleviate suffering of the people affected, to promote the well-being of the poor and vulnerable (the establishment of CGFOME in Brazil also speaks to that) and to support other countries - especially neighbours - that face great crises.

Although it may seem only logical to encounter such arguments when looking for factors motivating humanitarian spending, in a world where ulterior motives are often seen as primary motivations it is reassuring to know that humanitarian motives also play a role.

6.2 North-South vs South-South

What has been described above - the categories identified as motivating factors of humanitarian assistance for Brazil and India and the frames established by van der Veen (2011) for motivating factors of foreign aid policy for Western donors - are a small window that can give partial insight into differences between North-South and South-South cooperation.

What can be seen from the comparison is that from the seven frames identified by van der Veen (2011) for Western donors - Security, Power, Wealth, Enlightened Self-Interest, Reputation, Obligation, Humanitarianism - four were also represented in the patterns of findings from Brazil and India. The frames Wealth, Enlightened Self-Interest and Obligation on the other hand could not directly be identified from the debates analysed in this study. Although connections could be argued for through referencing to spending habits and/or in-kind distributions, this would only be speculation.

While the frames Security, Power, Reputation and Humanitarianism established by van der Veen for Western donors could also be identified in the themes describing motivational factors for humanitarian spending of the new donors Brazil and India in
this study, they often do not share the same context (with an exception of the theme *Humanitarianism*). The findings showed indications of the concepts *Security, Power* and *Reputation* were represented in the themes of Brazil and India. However, the presence of such concepts does not indicate a complete parity between the themes from the new donors Brazil and India and the frames by van der Veen. As stated before, the context is important and differs accordingly.

There are also one or even two additional motivational factors which were discovered in this study. The categories *Priority* and *Preparedness* do not have an equivalent in van der Veen’s frames. In the category *Priority* the importance of support for intra-state affairs was highlighted. This is logical both in point of view of the degree of vulnerable population and the location of Brazil and other new donors, which are mostly located in areas that are prone to natural disasters and have a great percentage of the population vulnerable to them. The theme *Preparedness* shows the growing importance of concepts of resilience and preparedness, especially for countries which experience natural disasters regularly and whose population is vulnerable to them. From the background information on humanitarian assistance by India it can be seen that this concern for resilience and disasters risk reduction is not only relevant in national projects, but also translates to humanitarian action abroad.

Both categories are additions to motivational factors established by van der Veen (2011), although it remains unclear if they resulted from one of the specifications of this study (i.e. new donors, Brazil and India, humanitarian assistance) or if factors of time, amount of humanitarian spending of the donor countries and/or their proneness to natural disasters could also be cause of some of the differences highlighted.

What this study tells us, however, is that there is need for more research on motivations for humanitarian spendings of new donors in general and how their efforts and purposes compare to those of Western donors. For this, a new framework for new donors is needed, as the one established for Western donors by van der Veen does not seem to apply to the new donors Brazil and India. It could be seen that not all seven frames as established by van der Veen are relevant for the new donors Brazil and India. Although there are similarities, the frames *Wealth, Enlightenment* and *Obligation* are unrepresented in debates in the countries under study. Still, the thematic analyses also brought out two additional frames, *Preparedness* and *Priority*, which reflect a concern for both the geographical position of the countries and knowledge of their own vulnerability.
Although some of the frames from van der Veen (2011) can also be found in the debates in Brazil and India, there are still little differences that show a different approach to humanitarian assistance specifically. Such details can be found in the context of the frames Security, Power/Influence and Reputation.

As can be seen in the explanations above, the frame Security as established by van der Veen (2011) focuses on a donor’s physical security through active engagement in security affairs outside their own border. When a donor’s security was mentioned in debates in India or Brazil however, it was usually connected to passive behaviour like non-engagement and giving priority to national security over matter of security in the region or internationally.

The frame Power/Influence, which is exactly as the name implies about the pursuit of power, in its definition by van der Veen (2011) very general and applies to power pursuits in both regional and international arenas. In the cases of Brazil and India on the other hand, while there are also tendencies of both regional and international power pursuits, the goal seems to be primarily to further international ambitions by securing regional power positions.

Just like the frame Power/influence is connected to the frame Reputation, the importance of regional power positions described in one can be related to the other. In fact, for the cases Brazil and India the frames become essentially one. What has been argued in debates in both countries clearly relates the securing and maintaining of a regional power position to a desired reputation abroad (although international reputation is highlighted here, it is inseparably connected to regional reputation also). From this, both aspects, that of reputation and that of a power position, seem to be equally important foreign policy goals.

In addition to the aspects mentioned above, there are still three more patterns, which stand out from the findings and analysis, and which can be argued to also be part of the differences between South-South and North-South cooperation in the area of humanitarian assistance: The focus on regional cooperation, which is also supported by quantitative data provided in the background chapter; the concepts of responsibility and competence, as they are mentioned to be directly related to international perceptions of the two new donors Brazil and India; and the aspiration of international recognition, which could be argued to connect all of the patterns described so far.
What sticks out as a main difference between the approaches of Western donors as described by van der Veen (2011) and the approaches of the new donors, Brazil and India, which have been described in this study, is the focus on regional cooperation. This might sound wrong when considering that the largest international governmental organisations known today, the United Nations and the European Union, are a form of cooperation between Western donors. However, when a crisis occurs in the US, in France or Germany, the respective governments are (mostly) expected to deal with these problems themselves. It is therefore interesting to see that the approach of both Brazil and India is one that considers regional cooperation as a very important factor in providing humanitarian assistance. Naturally, the context is not quite the same for them as for Western donors. For example, their geographical location makes their regions more prone to natural disasters than most of the European countries. Nevertheless, regional cooperation in both Brazil and India is also about solidarity, as was exemplified in the themes *Regional Perception* and *Good Neighbour*. This alone gives the concept of South-South cooperation a very different underlying message than the concept of North-South cooperation, which is often associated with dictation of terms and exploitation.

The very discussion about North-South and South-South cooperation is generally biased. The terminology alone sees to that, as has already been discussed briefly in the chapter on the theoretical framework of this study. Whether one views it from the perspective of someone idealistic or someone critical has great implications for interpretation. Considering humanitarian assistance alone is a difficult endeavour. From what has been shown in this study, there are many differences, small and big, between the two approaches - if one sees van der Veen’s frames (2011) as representative of Western donors, and if one chooses to see what could be established as themes for two of the new donors in this study as representative of all new donors. Circumstances and context, however, also play a very big role in these approaches, and they are also not set in stone.

In addition to the focus on regional cooperation, the preoccupation with perceived responsibility and the willingness to display competence are also worth mentioning. Both of these are not so different from the essence of North-South cooperation. There are numerous examples of instances, where donors like the US have taken up the responsibility to act upon a certain issue, because of one (or more) of the frames as laid out by van der Veen (2011). This is as much a way to display power in
the international arena, as is the willingness to exhibit competence. For new donors like Brazil and India, both are a way to engage in interaction with global players, show their capabilities and gain international recognition.

This wish for or rather play for international recognition is another factor that might be both a difference and a similarity between South-South and North-South cooperation. Since in recent years critiques have grown louder with regards to the modalities of North-South cooperation, it can be argued that the wish for international recognition is also present there, although not as directly.

Very generally, the three additional factors mentioned above may even link together to an overarching concept of resilience and sustainability for new donors. Both concepts are somewhat already present in the theme Preparedness identified for India’s motivations regarding humanitarian assistance. However, the combination of regional cooperation, taking responsibility and showing competence to gain international recognition can create a platform for new donors to establish sustainable growth, resilient communities and a (at least regional) stability based on competence and mutual growth. That is, if these factors are not exclusive to the humanitarian sector of South-South cooperation.
7 Conclusion

In this study on motivations of new donors regarding the granting of humanitarian assistance, a thematic analysis of debates in the Brazilian Federal Senate (Senado Federal), the Brazilian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Ministério das Relações Exteriores), as well as the Indian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Council of States (Rajya Sabha), found eight themes representative of motivational factors for humanitarian spending.

In Brazil those themes are: **Priority, Humanitarianism, Regional Perception and International Integration**. For India the themes identified are: **Security Interests, Humanitarianism, Good Neighbour, Competence and Preparedness**. It was also found that the themes from each country relate to and are interconnected with each other, both among themselves and with the themes from the other country. However, the themes differed for each country and had exceptions as well as similarities to each other. The two main differences are represented by the themes **Priority** and **Preparedness**. While in Brazil arguments against international humanitarian assistance were frequent, in India almost no statements were made in this direction. On the other hand, arguments in India highlighted the importance of preparedness, while this was not mentioned in statements from Brazil.

Using the theoretical framework, van der Veen’s “Seven Frames relevant to Foreign Aid Policy” (2011), as a lens to look on these findings showed that of the seven frames - Security, Power/Influence, Wealth/Economic Self-Interest, Enlightened Self-Interest, Reputation/Self-Affirmation, Obligation/Duty and Humanitarianism - which represent Western donors motivations for granting foreign aid, only Humanitarianism, Reputation, Security and Power were represented in motivation statements of the new donors. This means that out of seven frames, three were not applicable or relevant to the context of the two new donors of this study, Brazil and India. This comparison of goals and motivations of humanitarian spending between the ‘traditional North’ and the ‘emerging South’ provided another angle of interpretation and represents a first attempt to fill the knowledge gaps that surround ‘new donors’ and their efforts in humanitarian assistance.

From what has been shown in this study, there are many differences, small and big, between the two approaches of Western donors as established by van der Veen (2011) and the two new donors Brazil and India as established in this study. Although there is still much left to know about new donors and their reasonings for granting humanitarian assistance, this study was designed to serve as a stepping stone for other
research to follow and fill the many knowledge gaps surrounding new donors. The study provided an interesting analysis of motivating factors of two decision makers in both India and Brazil with regards to humanitarian assistance and took a step toward comparing how these motivations of two new donors differ from motivations established for Western donors. Nevertheless, more research will need to be done and more data needs to be made available to establish a more general theory or approach that might be explanatory and representative of all that constitutes ‘South-South cooperation’. The study showed that a new framework is necessary to grasp the different motivations of Western and new donors in their variety and complexity.
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