

Operational Governance and Ethical Risk Management in Humanitarian Missions: Lessons from Médecins Sans Frontières



Dr./ Dahman Abdelheq ^{1,3}, Dr./ Adel Djareche ²

¹ Marmara University, (Türkiye)

² National Higher School of Political Science, (Algeria)

³ Corresponding Author: abdelheq.dahman@uskudar.edu.tr

Date of submission: 01/09/2025 Date of acceptance: 22/09/2025 Date of publication: 28/09/2025

Revision of the article: Pr./ Nur Özmen (Univ. of Uskudar)

Abstract:

The article analyzes the epistemological and operational frameworks that Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) uses to rebuild humanitarian governance systems and worldwide normative structures. The research uses qualitative deductive methods combined with postcolonial and biopolitical theory to explain how MSF creates ethical disputes and new norms through its decentralized structure and témoignage principle in crisis areas. The paper examines MSF's dual status as a neutral humanitarian organization and moral authority through its work in conflict zones within the context of increasing humanitarian securitization and politicization. The research investigates how MSF handles its legitimacy and sovereignty and representation power in postcolonial regions where epistemic inequalities and disputed territorial control exist. The research demonstrates that MSF breaks humanitarian conventions while maintaining power through its membership in international governance networks which reveals the complex structure of modern humanitarian intervention.

Key words: Médecins Sans Frontières; Humanitarian Governance; Operational Neutrality; Postcolonial Critique; Ethical Dilemmas.

Introduction:

International non-governmental organizations (INGOs) have become increasingly prominent in shaping the global humanitarian environment through their activities over the last thirty years. Non-state actors including Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) now function as major humanitarian responders because traditional state-led responses often fail during extensive conflicts. Since its inception MSF has led the transformation of global humanitarian practices through its emergency medical

response while establishing new humanitarian governance norms. The humanitarian organization MSF emerged from the Biafran crisis of 1971 through the initiative of French medical professionals and journalists who wanted to overcome standard humanitarian framework restrictions. MSF established its organization in 1971 with the dedication to maintain absolute neutrality and impartiality and independence (MSF, 2024; Radtke & Roepstorff, 2025, pp. 164–175).

MSF's operational approach transformed humanitarian intervention logistics while creating a new direction in humanitarian discourse. Through its core mission MSF integrates medical ethics and advocacy under the term *témoignage* to challenge the traditional aid approach of political detachment (Décobert, 2015, p. 21). The organization faces global scrutiny because it opposes human rights abuses and criticizes states and functions without external funding which positions it as a leading entity in humanitarian discussions about sovereignty and ethical responsibility. The organization faces criticism for being biased and showing neo-colonial tendencies since its positioning in postcolonial settings like Africa triggers accusations due to historical baggage and weak governmental structures and local suspicions about Western interference (Duffield, 2007, pp. 32–65).

The academic research about MSF shows its intricate position in the field. The evaluations of MSF continue to present mixed perspectives as scholars both praise and question the organization's political engagement and international connections. International organizations pursue diplomatic goals according to Barnett (2011, p. 21) which results in complications for genuine humanitarian assistance. According to Ticktin (2014, p. 280) MSF's global operations potentially strengthen existing power structures. The humanitarian governance networks in crisis zones present challenges according to Stellmach (2016, p. 110) which contradict the conventional view of altruism surrounding MSF. According to Rostis (2011, p. 21) the postcolonial perspective shows that humanitarianism exists within systems of dependence and governance structures. These perspectives enhance the understanding of MSF's function during health emergencies and its broader activities.

MSF operates where humanitarian action intersects with governance to establish humanitarian principles and challenge their development. The organization uses a dual operational approach to transform conventional humanitarian standards during conflict situations. The political environment demonstrates a transformation because state actors and INGOs maintain a dynamic relationship which results in ongoing negotiations about humanitarian foundational principles (Cunningham, 2017, pp. 1–10; Cunningham, 2018, pp. 30–31).

The paper addresses the requirement for additional research to analyze MSF's process of balancing ethical responsibilities with political circumstances in emergency response areas. The research examines MSF's governance framework consisting of decentralization along with local partnerships and operational independence while studying their relationships with host governments and international institutions and

affected populations. The dual role of MSF in South Sudan complicates the interpretation of both neutrality and legitimacy because the boundaries between humanitarian and development aid have become indistinct (Roth, Purkayastha, & Denskus, 2024, p. 6; Qaddour et al., 2025, p. 8).

An emergency medical relief organization will naturally become politically involved when it begins to provide long-term care and advocate for equitable drug access. This research uses qualitative deductive methods built on humanitarian governance principles to study how MSF affects and maintains global humanitarian standards (Barnett & Weiss, 2008, p. 15; Schopper et al., 2015, p. 11). The study enhances our comprehension of INGOs by demonstrating their status as multifaceted norm-establishing entities between ethics and politics and global governance systems.

This investigation demonstrates that the humanitarian legacy of MSF consists of both physical rescue work and fundamental examinations about humanitarian intervention boundaries. The analysis of MSF's political and ethical aspects stands crucial in our time because human suffering exists worldwide but global accountability systems remain fractured.

THE FIRST AXIS:

Literature Review and Theoretical Foundations

Research into humanitarian intervention reveals a complex multidimensional literature base specifically for international non-governmental organizations (INGOs) including Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF). The fundamental principles of humanitarian work such as neutrality and impartiality and independence face ethical and political and operational challenges which scholars Barnett & Weiss (2008, pp. 1–48; Chatwani & Islam, 2020, p. 655) analyze. MSF operates at the interface between operational practice and theoretical principle through ongoing negotiations between its emergency medical responsibilities and its engagement with governance structures and sovereignty concerns and moral advocacy.

1. Humanitarian Governance

Aid delivery in the current humanitarian era occurs through formal and informal systems which determine aid governance and population management during crises and establish global standards for social resilience and responsibility and intervention (Duffield, 2007, p. 33). Manyena (2009) explains that resilience functions as both an essential policy framework and a basic concept which underpins humanitarian relief work and development programs. Ager et al. (2015, pp. 202–221) demonstrate that local faith communities serve as vital resilience builders during humanitarian emergencies through their fundamental role in supporting social structures. These theoretical views demonstrate how humanitarian systems simultaneously develop resilience while establishing new standards during crises.

Through its operational independence and *témoignage* practice MSF demonstrates the conflicting demands of humanitarian neutrality. The documentation of suffering by MSF determines crisis narratives which modify global legitimacy assessments as shown in their Syria operations (Zeidan, n.d., pp. 1–12). The connection between political situations and humanitarian operations leads to complex urban care environments that test conventional neutrality yet adapt to local political frameworks (Davids, 2023, p. 10). The negotiation process between MSF and non-state armed groups in complex political environments shapes the extent and nature of their interventions (Carter & Haver, 2016, pp. 8–27). MSF executes humanitarian diplomacy and principled advocacy programs in addition to emergency medical care throughout high-conflict areas throughout the Global South (Furuhovde, 2022, p. 56). MSF utilizes its hospitals along with vaccination programs and refugee health care services as normative interventions which embody fundamental principles of human dignity alongside justice and solidarity.

2. Postcolonial and Ethical Critiques

MSF's ability to act independently has produced important debates about Western control and colonialist tendencies during operations in postcolonial regions. Fujita (2020, p. 18) suggests that such autonomy minimizes paternalistic perceptions since it enables organizations to exercise control under existing national legislation. Shagba (2023, p. 29) analyzes donor-led approaches to humanitarian intervention and identifies how these approaches introduce new forms of paternalism that expose power inequalities in humanitarian operations. MSF's crisis intervention through public declarations serves both as an advocacy tool and a performance that some interpret as an expression of moral superiority which potentially erases local decision-making powers.

The process of crisis communication generates complex storylines which can establish external authority as the primary force. Christensen et al. (2016, p. 5) highlight the critical need for effective governance systems to handle intricate “wicked” crisis situations. Chen (2018, p. 10) investigates how non-profits generate collective defensive responses while showing connections between communication efforts and both resilience and community self-empowerment. During the Rwandan genocide MSF encountered ethical problems because medical staff had to choose between maintaining neutrality and assuming political responsibilities. Givoni (2011, pp. 55–57) demonstrates that through testimony (*témoignage*) humanitarian ethics receives a new definition while Zeidan (n.d., pp. 1–12) explores the ethical issues that arise in crisis response operations. Humanitarian missions focused on saving lives occasionally become complicit in maintaining structural violence or remain silent in cases of injustice.

3. Theoretical Anchors: Biopolitics, Sovereignty, and NGO Legitimacy

This research uses biopolitics and sovereignty theory as its conceptual framework. According to Michel Foucault's biopower theory MSF functions as a health-based governing actor—managing life, risk, and suffering across borders (Kelly, 2004; Redfield, 2005, pp. 328–361). In areas with weak national health infrastructure MSF provides substitute state services thus participating in humanitarian sovereignty which operates without territorial authority and finds its legitimacy in moral emergencies (Calhoun, 2008).

The existing literature on NGO legitimacy demonstrates that INGOs including MSF create global norms which exceed their technical service delivery activities. MSF and other INGOs gain legitimacy from both their execution of tasks and their commitment to responsibility but also through their capability to unite seemingly contradictory elements between advocacy and neutrality and between short-term relief and long-term engagement and between global visibility and local rootedness (Rubenstein, 2019, p. 244, Slim, 2007, pp. 43–42). The decentralized governance system of MSF along with its context-based autonomy demonstrates how humanitarian organizations establish their authority and legitimacy beyond conventional state frameworks.

The following table (Table 1) presents a comparative overview of the key theoretical strands, principal scholarly contributions, and their relevance to MSF's operational and normative role in crisis contexts. This table serves to highlight the interconnections between humanitarian discourse and MSF's evolving legitimacy, while also clarifying how academic interpretations of neutrality, resilience, and governance converge in shaping contemporary humanitarian frameworks. By aligning these contributions thematically, the table provides a consolidated analytical lens for understanding how MSF embodies and contests global humanitarian norms.

Table 1: Theoretical Perspectives on MSF's Humanitarian Practice

Theme	Key Scholars & Sources	Core Arguments	Implications for MSF
Humanitarian Governance	Duffield (2007); Manyena (2009); Ager et al. (2015); Zeidan (n.d.); Furuho (2022); Carter & Haver (2016); Davids (2023)	Humanitarian governance is shaped by formal/informal systems; resilience and local communities play a role; MSF deploys <i>témoignage</i> as narrative practice	MSF reconfigures global legitimacy by engaging in principled neutrality, crisis narratives, and humanitarian diplomacy
Postcolonial &	Fujita (2020); Shagba (2023); Christensen et al. (2016);	Autonomy reduces perceived paternalism; donor agendas impose new forms of control; ethical	MSF is simultaneously a moral actor and a postcolonial subject, navigating

Ethical Critique	Chen (2018); Givoni (2011); Zeidan (n.d.)	dilemmas arise in politicized crises	accusations of neo-colonialism and epistemic authority
Biopolitics & Sovereignty	Foucault (via Kelly, 2004); Redfield (2005); Calhoun (2008); Rubenstein (2019); Slim (2007)	MSF governs biopolitically through cross-border care; humanitarian sovereignty emerges without territorial power; INGOs generate moral legitimacy	MSF acts as a transnational sovereign entity, shaping norms, substituting state functions, and embodying global ethical authority

THE SECOND AXIS: Research Methodology

The research design employs qualitative deductive analysis to explore the reciprocal impact of Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) on changing global humanitarian norms within conflict settings. The study implements humanitarian governance theory and postcolonial critique to extract illustrative data from MSF operations in Rwanda and Darfur. The analysis draws its examples from these contexts to showcase MSF's operational principles alongside its ethical challenges and its influence on worldwide humanitarian standards.

1. Methodological Approach

The study employs qualitative content analysis which is appropriate for studying humanitarian discourse and institutional and normative frameworks in scholarly literature. The research investigates Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) within humanitarian governance through peer-reviewed academic sources combined with theoretical writings and critical assessments of the organization.

The study evaluates MSF's practices and narratives and evolving identity as a humanitarian actor based on scholarly work from Donini (2012), Fassin (2012) and Barnett (2011). The analysis combines idealized MSF representations with analytical depth through these sources to minimize potential bias.

Creswell and Poth's (2018) framework for qualitative inquiry guides the methodological structure of this research. The research adopts thematic coding to extract recurring concepts and discussions about MSF's involvement in crisis zones from the available literature. Although the research references significant interventions like the Rwandan genocide (1994) and the Darfur crisis (2003–2009) these instances are used as examples instead of functioning as core research cases.

Through its commitment to *témoignage* along with medical neutrality and political resistance the literature portrays MSF as a practitioner of "rebel humanitarianism". Hempton (2024, pp. 32, 51) examines how humanitarian aid

becomes politicized while demonstrating that MSF operates outside apolitical norms. MSF confronts pharmaceutical interests in high-conflict zones according to Brauman (2016, p. 20).

The method enables researchers to conduct an organized and analytical assessment of MSF's academic representation without needing internal organizational data or field materials.

2. Theoretical and Analytical Lens

This study uses postcolonial along with critical humanitarian approaches to analyze MSF's position within worldwide political dynamics. Duffield (2007, pp. 32–65) and Clark (2011, p. 112) develop conceptual frameworks to analyze how MSF's operations simultaneously challenge global hierarchies and reinforce them. Vernon (2024, p. 1984) defines this dual nature of humanitarianism as the "coloniality of humanitarianism" where local communities view MSF through the lens of persistent conflicts between humanitarian ethics and Western paternalistic legacies. The insights prove particularly relevant in postcolonial situations where humanitarian interventions maintain foreign influence by presenting themselves as moral obligations.

This research analyzes scholarly literature which evaluates MSF's statements and operational practices instead of conducting original discourse research. The analysis centers on scholarly interpretations of MSF's crisis definitions alongside its self-established legitimacy claims and ethical framework applications. This secondary analysis provides reflective knowledge about MSF's discursive power in shaping humanitarian norms yet demonstrates awareness regarding the alignment or disagreement between local knowledge systems and political frameworks of host countries Rwanda and Sudan.

3. Contribution of Methodology

The research methodology provides a comprehensive and theoretical framework to conduct comparative studies about MSF's impact on humanitarian governance. The research combines discourse critique with postcolonial theory to provide a systematic and ethically sound method for evaluating humanitarian actors who operate across different fault lines that exist between neutrality and advocacy as well as ethics and politics and global norms and local realities.

THE THIRD AXIS:

Analysis and Findings

This research demonstrates that Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) functions as an actor of norm-shaping within global governance alongside its emergency medical service provision during humanitarian crises. The following analysis reviews scholarly

assessments of MSF's work in Rwanda and Darfur to understand its impact on evolving concepts of legitimacy and neutrality and responsibility in humanitarian practice.

1. Témoignage, Sovereignty, and Humanitarian Legitimacy

Through its commitment to *témoignage* MSF transforms what humanitarian responsibility means. MSF adopts ethical advocacy that supports political realities in order to promote accountability and justice beyond strict neutrality principles. Givoni (2011, pp. 46–52) analyzes this practice as an attack against the traditional humanitarian principle of political detachment. Claire (2021, pp. 55–75) explains how MSF connects reason and emotion through *témoignage* to build solidarity and transform humanitarian legitimacy in disputed territories.

The redefined framework introduces new complexities to state-INGO partnerships. The assertive moral position of MSF according to Cunningham (2018, p. 58) creates tension with host governments yet McLean (2018, p. 94) notes how it leads to conflicts regarding national authority. Cunningham and Healy (2025, p. 119) propose that strong advocacy from MSF may lead to authoritarian states adopting national security restrictions to block its activities.

2. Ethical Dilemmas and the Transformation of Humanitarian Norms

The Rwandan genocide marked a pivotal point in MSF's ethical development. The organization based its initial stance on neutrality until it faced atrocities which led it to speak out against violence thus transforming its identity into a moral force (Weil, 2001, p. 96). According to Terry (2000, p. 6) organizations like MSF must confront the potential ethical compromise of their moral authority when enforcing strict neutrality in catastrophic situations. According to Apikins (2023, pp. 50–54) the evolution of MSF occurred through its increased advocacy work for worldwide health equity as the organization actively implemented cholera prevention programs among displaced populations. Shannon et al. (2019, pp. 1–11) propose the implementation of unified health approaches that handle systemic gaps to build resilient systems for dealing with outbreaks.

MSF provides more than emergency healthcare services to the affected populations. Through their field reports and advocacy initiatives MSF has become instrumental in altering international conversations and delaying necessary intervention actions. MSF functions in two distinct roles by providing humanitarian assistance and political commentary thus demonstrating the ongoing conflict between operational ethics and worldwide political considerations.

3. The Darfur Dilemma: Humanitarianism and Political Contestation

The ethical and political challenges that MSF encountered during its operations in Darfur were comparable to those faced in other regions. Jemirade (2021, pp. 43–55) examines the restricted impact of international and NGO operations in this region by highlighting that humanitarian intervention fails because states maintain their

opposition. The situation became more complex for MSF due to the International Criminal Court issuing charges against Sudanese President Omar al-Bashir because this action politicized aid distribution and created negative reactions (Hempton, 2024, pp. 12-21).

MSF maintained an active operational base in Darfur despite espionage and political interference accusations because it delivered essential services including surgical care and reproductive health and nutritional assistance to displaced people. Through its work MSF introduced a new discourse which transformed worldwide standards regarding aid organizations' relations with state powers and international legal frameworks.

The rejection of government funds by MSF in conflict areas such as Darfur demonstrates its dedication to operating independently. According to Wilson (2017, p. 94) MSF's operational independence grows stronger through private donations combined with decentralized management in areas where governments limit access. Cochrane and Wilson (2025, pp. 319–335) explain that foreign donor conditionalities generate resistance from host governments yet MSF and similar NGOs decline funding to protect their core principles of impartiality and neutrality and independence and humanity.

4. Narrative Power, Representation, and Epistemic Politics

The narrative framework of MSF serves as an essential tool to influence worldwide views about crisis situations. Through their public communications the organization Pinaud, Tschunkert, and Nannerini (2024, pp. 539–554) establish the criteria for what constitutes a crisis while determining international response methods. The discursive power of these actors establishes representation imbalances that result in marginalization of local voices by dominant actors like the UN and international NGOs (Lokot et al., 2024, pp. 6–8). Such power dynamics demonstrate the requirement for humanitarian epistemologies which validate local agency while incorporating diverse perspectives.

5. Operational Challenges: Logistics and Local Adaptation

The severe logistical challenges caused by violence and state fragility forced MSF to operate in Rwanda and Darfur. The organization in Rwanda chose cooperative strategies to rapidly respond to mass atrocities according to Anschütz (2017, pp. 43–47). The extended crisis in Darfur required creative risk-reduction approaches to handle political turmoil and restricted access and poor coordination between humanitarian organizations (Malhouni & Mabrouki, 2024, p. 239; Jirouskova, 2014, pp. 7–8). The organization performed distinct functions in Rwanda and Darfur since it focused on emergency medical care in Rwanda but expanded into political advocacy about institutionalized violence in Darfur.

6. Norm Entrepreneurship and the Reconfiguration of Humanitarianism

The dual humanitarian work of MSF between emergency relief and normative advocacy positions the organization between traditional neutrality and transformative humanitarian practices. MSF operates as a norm entrepreneur according to Barnett and Weiss (2008, p. 86) by developing new ethical and governance standards in humanitarian and global practices. Through its advocacy of witness-based ethics and responsibility to protect the organization fights state-centric systems and extends humanitarian moral responsibilities.

Yet this influence is ambivalent. MSF strengthens humanitarian intervention's moral legitimacy but simultaneously merges humanitarian work with political activism which creates challenging issues regarding legitimacy consent and neutrality in disputed areas.

The humanitarian work of MSF in Rwanda and Darfur shows its role encompasses more than emergency medical assistance. Through its operational practices together with its ethical stances and public narratives MSF actively transforms international perspectives about responsibility and justice as well as humanitarian governance. The organization demonstrates both the potential for change and the built-in challenges of working between ethical and political domains during complicated crises.

THE FOURTH AXIS:

Discussion

MSF conducts its operations in crisis areas across Africa which demands a critical evaluation that transcends simple humanitarianism vs activism polarization. MSF's interventions in Rwanda and Darfur represent an operational framework which enables the organization to operate between neutrality and advocacy and independence and cooperation and emergency response and structural engagement. The comprehensive analysis of MSF's activities in Syria, Tigray (Ethiopia), West Africa along with other interventions demonstrates how the organization transforms humanitarian norms through flexible governance systems and ethical positioning and field-based diplomatic approaches.

1. Medical Neutrality and Operational Autonomy: Empowerment and Constraint

The dual aspect of medical neutrality together with operational independence represents a central challenge for MSF because it enables field operations yet limits political engagement. The Sudan case demonstrates how MSF defended humanitarian space through infrastructure attack condemnations to directly confront conflict actors (Messelken & Barbar, 2024, p. 14). The public statements of MSF against atrocities in

Tigray represented its obligation to *témoignage* although these declarations put its presence at risk. The operational space that consists of multiple factions alongside checkpoints demanded daily political negotiations to show that humanitarian access remains tied to local political forces (Geremedhn & Gebrihet, 2024, p. 15).

The practice of *témoignage* by MSF in Rwanda and Darfur demonstrated both moral and political dimensions according to Fassin (2012, pp. 203–226; Terry, 2002, pp. 105–203). MSF functions as an ethical actor through its decision to speak out which demonstrates that its neutrality does not mean being silent but actively engaged.

2. Decentralized Governance and Adaptive Field Strategy

The decentralized governance structure of MSF enables it to remain flexible when operating in unstable regions. This autonomy enables the organization to make quick decisions that match local requirements when responding to emergencies such as the West African Ebola outbreak (Qaddour et al., 2025, p. 14). MSF maintains operational independence but must accept specific trade-offs in its operations. MSF's refusal to join formal coordination mechanisms in Darfur and post-conflict Somalia has created problems regarding both accountability and fragmentation according to Qaddour et al. (2025, pp. 8–9). The organization uses private donations which grant flexibility for programming based on needs but creates doubts about transparency and horizontal accountability (Lilly & Bowden, 2024, p. 9).

The operational independence of MSF requires ethical autonomy and effective cooperation in multi-actor environments even though the organization resists governmental co-optation.

3. Selective Cooperation and Institutional Resistance

MSF maintains a selective approach to cooperation by maintaining distance from militarized or politically compromised actors while working effectively with local and international partners. MSF maintains humanitarian space through this strategy which prevents political involvement in its operations (Alqatabry & Butcher, 2020, pp. 250–255). According to Wilson (2017, p. 42) independence stands as a fundamental element which sustains MSF's credibility together with operational effectiveness. MSF defends its personnel and mission integrity by refusing to merge relief goals with military targets (Roth, Purkayastha, & Denskus, 2024, pp. 192–208).

This approach faces criticism despite its existence. MSF needs to maintain continuous dialogue regarding resource distribution and informed patient consent in Myanmar and South Sudan because these areas continue to present ethical challenges. Selim (2025) demonstrates that medical aid priorities create new power relationships between parties while Hussein (2018, pp. 279–283) examines how ethical failures in conflict-based health research diminish local trust.

MSF maintains control over its narrative through reports and media advocacy and testimony which can unintentionally silence local viewpoints. The issue echoes

postcolonial criticism that Northern-based NGOs fail to accurately represent the Global South according to Patel & McMichael (2004, p. 245).

4. Sustainability, Innovation, and Ethical Continuity

The survival of MSF's model faces two critical sustainability issues: financial stability and ethical and operational long-term preservation. The aid market competition combined with donor fatigue according to Lilly and Bowden (2024, p. 5) poses a threat to independent humanitarian organizations. The implementation of data-driven humanitarian technology systems creates privacy-related issues as well as surveillance problems and digital equality disparities which reach their peak in areas of conflict. MSF's ongoing value to society will depend on how well it combines technological progress with moral principles. The organization needs to maintain an ethics-first orientation throughout its expansion because this approach will safeguard both its legitimacy and trust.

5. Reimagining Humanitarian Governance: Localism, Ethics, and Norm Entrepreneurship

MSF's enduring impact emerges from its commitment to create ethical humanitarian practices by placing local populations as the primary focus of its operations. According to Zeidan (n.d.), the organization can build stronger humanitarian aid relationships through local voice priority which simultaneously increases both the credibility and effectiveness of aid. The organization's unique position between political complexities and principled independence according to Cunningham (2018) enables it to preserve humanitarian values within turbulent situations.

Through witness-based ethics practices and normative advocacy MSF demonstrates its role as a global governance actor rather than only a service provider. The organization creates changes in both policy and ethical standards and leads conversations throughout the humanitarian field. MSF demonstrates the characteristics of a norm entrepreneur (Barnett & Weiss, 2008, p. 86) by transforming humanitarian practices that oppose state-based systems while broadening international moral responsibility.

MSF demonstrates the transformation of humanitarianism through its ethical framework combined with operational flexibility and political understanding of the 21st century. The organization maintains its position as a leader in humanitarian governance debates because it upholds ethical consistency alongside local partnership and moral advocacy. MSF's continued position as a transformative humanitarian actor depends on its ability to preserve independence without becoming isolated while maintaining advocacy without political interference.

The following table (Table 2) presents a systematic comparison of the main analytical findings from case-based and thematic discussions regarding MSF's strategic positioning across five core dimensions: operational autonomy, decentralized

governance, selective cooperation, sustainability, and norm entrepreneurship. This table provides a comparative view of how MSF's organizational structure enables and limits its humanitarian work through the connection of empirical examples to theoretical interpretations. The analytical overview provides insights into how MSF operates within complex governance systems while maintaining ethical standards in areas of high conflict.

Table 2: Strategic and Ethical Dimensions of MSF's Humanitarian Practice

Thematic Focus	Empirical Examples	Theoretical Anchors	Implications for Humanitarian Governance
Medical Neutrality & Operational Autonomy	Sudan, Tigray: témoignage vs. access; daily political negotiations	Fassin (2012); Geremedhn & Gebrihet (2024); Messelken & Barbar (2024)	Field presence is made possible by operational autonomy but témoignage creates challenges for neutrality and increases political risks
Decentralized Governance & Field Flexibility	West Africa (Ebola), Darfur: refusal to join formal coordination	Qaddour et al. (2025); Lilly & Bowden (2024)	Autonomy supports rapid response but challenges transparency and accountability structures
Selective Cooperation & Resistance	yanmar, South Sudan: ethics of consent, partner alignment, power imbalances	Alqatabry & Butcher (2020); Patel & McMichael (2004); Wilson (2017)	Selective engagement preserves integrity but risks perpetuating paternalism or representational imbalance
Sustainability & Ethical Innovation	Data systems, funding competition, digital equity issues	Lilly & Bowden (2024); Hussein (2018); Selim (2025)	Ethical sustainability depends on balancing technological integration with privacy and legitimacy concerns
Norm Entrepreneurship & Localism	yria, Darfur, Rwanda: advocacy for local voices and global standards	Cunningham (2018); Barnett & Weiss (2008); Zeidan (n.d.)	MSF redefines humanitarian norms through localized ethics and norm creation, bridging global policy gaps

Conclusion:

MSF's case demonstrates the evolving structure of worldwide humanitarian governance. The organization demonstrates its role in Rwanda, Darfur and other conflict-affected zones extends past emergency medical assistance as shown in this research. The organization continuously redefines humanitarian ethics and operational frameworks together with political aspects of humanitarian work.

The core foundation of MSF's distinctive approach stems from its decentralized governance model that follows principles of autonomy and impartiality and neutrality. MSF delivers flexible responses in dangerous environments through its commitments yet faces opposition from both state authorities and multilateral actors. The operational independence of MSF serves as an organizational benefit and a moral principle that protects aid from geopolitical manipulation and prevents humanitarian relief from being turned into strategic tools.

MSF maintains its distinctive identity because of its commitment to *témoignage*—the practice of bearing witness. MSF transformed from an ordinary technical service provider into an ethical and political actor through its moral stance in Rwanda and Darfur where it publicly condemned atrocities and shaped global discussions on humanitarian responsibility and legal accountability.

The organization has faced criticism despite its evolution. MSF encounters various challenges due to its alleged neo-colonial stance as well as its selective application of neutrality and ethical dilemmas from external intervention forces. The relationships with governments and local communities and peer organizations present ongoing problems regarding coordination and representation and accountability issues. The digital transformation of humanitarian operations together with donor influence requires MSF to resolve new challenges about data ethics and resource sustainability and institutional legitimacy within changing global aid frameworks.

MSF maintains a major role in reshaping global humanitarian standards despite ongoing conflicts. The organization has created vital discussions about aid demilitarization alongside neutrality politics and protection responsibilities. The organization combines political engagement with humanitarian principles to create a realistic yet ethical model which becomes crucial for present times marked by enduring conflicts and reduced humanitarian access and diminishing trust in established aid methods.

MSF demonstrates a modern humanitarian governance approach that combines adaptability with ethical foundations and political awareness. Through its operational achievements MSF creates intellectual change which questions how crises get defined along with aid distribution methods and responsibility allocation in our fractured world. Research should focus on understanding how MSF maintains ethical standards in its operational work while assessing how its shifting mission will influence humanitarian legitimacy and effectiveness in the modern era.

References:

1. Ager, J., Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, E., & Ager, A. (2015). Local faith communities and the promotion of resilience in contexts of humanitarian crisis. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 28(2), 202–221. <https://academic.oup.com/jrs/article-abstract/28/2/202/1547290>
2. Apikins, M. W. (2020, July). Medical humanitarian logistics: A critical examination of the impacts of Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) or Doctors Without Borders (DWBS) in Nigeria. *International Journal of Scientific Research in Technology, Applied Sciences & Health Studies*, 4(1), 46–61.
3. Alqatabry, H., & Butcher, C. (2020). Humanitarian aid in Yemen: Collaboration or co-optation? *Journal of Peacebuilding & Development*, 15(2), 250–255. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1542316620907573>
4. Anschütz, K. (2017). Cooperation of INGOs in times of humanitarian crises: A case study from Rwanda. <https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2:1070967>
5. Barnett, M. (2011). *Empire of humanity: A history of humanitarianism*. Cornell University Press.
6. Barnett, M., & Weiss, T. G. (Eds.). (2008). *Humanitarianism in question: Politics, power, ethics*. Cornell University Press.
7. Brauman, R. (2016). War and humanitarian aid. *Centre de Réflexion sur L'Action et les Savoirs Humanitaires*. <https://www.academia.edu/download/77049635/6722-rb-2017-war-and-humanitarian-aid-puf.pdf>
8. Carter, W., & Haver, K. (2016). Humanitarian access negotiations with non-state armed groups. *Secure Access in Volatile Environments (SAVE)*.
9. Chatwani, N., & Islam, G. (2020). Humanitarian identifications: Heterogeneous responses to institutional complexity at Médecins Sans Frontières. *Cadernos EBAPE.BR*, 18(spe), 648–666.
10. Claire, A. (2021). Reason, emotion and solidarity in humanitarian advocacy. *Journal of Humanitarian Affairs*, 3(1), 46–52. <https://www.manchesterhive.com/view/journals/jha/3/1/article-p46.xml>
11. Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among Five Approaches (4th ed.)*. SAGE.
12. Chen, K. K. (2018). Interorganizational advocacy among nonprofit organizations in strategic action fields: Exogenous shocks and local responses. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 47(4_suppl), 97S–118S.
13. Christensen, T., Lægreid, P., & Rykkja, L. H. (2016). Organizing for crisis management: Building governance capacity and legitimacy. *Public administration review*, 76(6), 887–897.
14. Cunningham, A. J. (2017). Post-conflict contexts and humanitarian organizations: The changing relationship with states. *Journal of International Humanitarian Action*, 2(1), 7. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41018-017-0016-y>
15. Cunningham, A. J. (2018). *International humanitarian NGOs and state relations: Politics, principles and identity*. Routledge.
16. Cunningham, A., & Healy, S. (2025). Authoritarian practices on the rise? Reflections from a Médecins Sans Frontières research programme on the engagement between international humanitarian non-governmental organisations and states. *Frontiers in Political Science*, 7, 1358889. <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/political-science/articles/10.3389/fpos.2025.1358889/full>

17. Cochrane, L., & Wilson, A. (2025). Motivations behind donor funding refusal: Towards a typology of principled refusal. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 61(3), 319–335. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00220388.2024.2401414>
18. DAVIDS, Tom, et al. *Politics of Care in Local Humanitarian Aid-Implications for Neutrality and the Localisation Agenda*. 2023.
19. Décobert, A. (2015). *The politics of aid to Burma: A humanitarian struggle on the Thai-Burmese border*. Routledge.
20. Duffield, M. (2007). *Development, security and unending war: Governing the world of peoples*. Polity Press.
21. Fassin, D. (2012). *Humanitarian reason: A moral history of the present*. University of California Press.
22. Fox, R. C. (1995). Medical humanitarianism and human rights: reflections on doctors without borders and doctors of the world. *Social Science & Medicine*, 41(12), 1607-1616.
23. Fujita, Y. (2020). *Rethinking humanitarian aid from a postcolonial/decolonial perspective*. International Institute of Social Sciences, The Hague, Netherlands.
24. Furuho, A. B. (2022). *Challenges in Accessing humanitarian spaces in high-conflict contexts: ICRC, MSF, and NAC's practice of Humanitarian Diplomacy in Southeast Afghanistan* (Master's thesis, The University of Bergen). <https://bora.uib.no/bora-xmlui/handle/11250/3009673>
25. Geremedhn, M. A., & Gebrihet, H. G. (2024). The dynamics of humanitarian diplomacy during wartime: Insights from Tigray crisis in Ethiopia. *Social Sciences*, 13(11), 626. <https://www.mdpi.com/2076-0760/13/11/626>
26. Givoni, M. (2011). Beyond the humanitarian/political divide: Witnessing and the making of humanitarian ethics. *Journal of Human Rights*, 10(1), 55–75. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14754835.2011.546235>
27. Hempton, C. (2024). *Humanitarian Trojan horse? The politicization of humanitarian aid by INGOs in Sudan and the case of Médecins Sans Frontières* (Doctoral dissertation). <https://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/handle/2027.42/193912>
28. Hussein, G. M. A. (2018). *The ethical considerations in the health-related research activities conducted during armed conflicts: Case study of Darfur, West Sudan (2004–2012)* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Birmingham). <https://etheses.bham.ac.uk/id/eprint/8580/>
29. Jemirade, D. (2021). The failure of humanitarian intervention and the role of NGOs in Darfur. *African Journal of History and Culture*, 13(1), 43–55. <https://academicjournals.org/journal/AJHC/article-full-text/0B7BD6566183>
30. Jirouskova, P. (2014). *Humanitarian effectiveness in complex emergencies: South Sudan and Darfur* (Doctoral dissertation, Te Herenga Waka–Victoria University of Wellington). https://openaccess.wgtn.ac.nz/articles/thesis/Humanitarian_effectiveness_in_complex_emergencies_South_Sudan_and_Darfur/17008330
31. Kelly, M. (2004). Racism, nationalism and biopolitics: Foucault's Society Must Be Defended, 2003. *Contretemps*, 4, 58–70.
32. Lokot, M., Zreik, T., El Masri, R., Chaar, S., Ali, R., Meksassi, B. & El Chammay, R. (2024). Power dynamics and participation within humanitarian coordination groups: A case study of the MHPSS Taskforce in Lebanon. *PLOS Global Public Health*, 4(3), e0003041. <https://journals.plos.org/globalpublichealth/article?id=10.1371/journal.pgph.0003041>
33. Manyena, S. B. (2009). *Disaster resilience in development and humanitarian interventions*. University of Northumbria at Newcastle (United Kingdom). <https://search.proquest.com/openview/a9b26c6fd8c9f78fcb71a02c3dbeb98/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=51922>
34. Malhouni, Y., & Mabrouki, C. (2024). Mitigating risks and overcoming logistics challenges in humanitarian deployment to conflict zones: Evidence from the DRC and CAR. *Journal of*

- Humanitarian Logistics and Supply Chain Management*, 14(3), 225–246.
<https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/JHLSCM-04-2023-0031/full/html>
35. Mclean, D. (2018). Humanitarian implications of a re-assertion of state sovereignty. *Humanitarian Alternatives*, 9, 20–35. http://alternatives-humanitaires.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/AH_N9_4_Forum_1_Mclean_VEN.pdf
36. Messelken, D., & Barbar, A. E. (2024). Challenging medical neutrality.
37. Patel, R., & McMichael, P. (2004). Third Worldism and the lineages of global fascism: the regrouping of the global South in the neoliberal era. *Third World Quarterly*, 25(1), 231–254.
38. Qaddour, A., Yan, L., Wendo, D., Elisama, L., Lindahl, C., & Spiegel, P. (2025). Leadership and governance, financing, and coordination and their impact on the operationalization of health interventions in the humanitarian-development nexus in South Sudan. *PLOS ONE*, 20(5), e0312788.
<https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0312788>
39. Roth, S., Purkayastha, B., & Denskus, T. (Eds.). (2024). *Handbook on humanitarianism and inequality*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
40. Radtke, K., & Roepstorff, K. (Eds.). (2025). *An Introduction to Humanitarian Action*. Taylor & Francis.
<https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=y7pCEQAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA1995&dq=Humanitarian+governance+crisis+zones+MSF+global+relief+norms+transformation+2023&ots=LajWDxo8tB&sig=ePWEomglbbqQtTcS69VmemaDvbK>
41. Rostis, A. P. (2011). Problematising crisis: Re-reading humanitarianism as postcolonial organizing. <https://library2.smu.ca/handle/01/23748>
42. Redfield, P. (2005). Doctors, borders, and life in crisis. *Cultural Anthropology*, 20(3), 328–361. <https://anthrosource.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1525/can.2005.20.3.328>
43. Rubenstein, J. C. (2019). The political legitimacy of international NGOs. *Nomos*, 61, 231–256. <https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.18574/nyu/9781479888696.003.0009/pdf?licenseType=restricted>
44. Schopper, D., Dawson, A., Upshur, R., Ahmad, A., Jesani, A., Ravinetto, R. & Singh, J. (2015). Innovations in research ethics governance in humanitarian settings. *BMC Medical Ethics*, 16(1), 1–12.
45. Shannon, K., Hast, M., Azman, A. S., Legros, D., McKay, H., & Lessler, J. (2019). Cholera prevention and control in refugee settings: Successes and continued challenges. *PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases*, 13(6), e0007347. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0007347>
46. Shagba, J. (2023). Localization as a new form of paternalism: Differentiated donor aid approaches based on geopolitical criteria: A comparative study of the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and Bosnia Herzegovina (BiH).
47. Slim, H. (2007). *Killing civilians: Method, madness and morality in war*. Hurst.
48. Slim, H. (2023, June 28). Painful choices: How humanitarians can prioritize in a world of rising need – A conversation starter for the climate emergency. Global Public Policy Institute.
49. Stellmach, D. (2016). *Coordination in crisis: The practice of medical humanitarian emergency* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oxford, UK).
<https://search.proquest.com/openview/7422c2f1e092eaa6c23bbdd9a087cbb/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=51922&diss=y>
50. Terry, F. (2002). *Condemned to repeat? The paradox of humanitarian action*. Cornell University Press.
51. Ticktin, M. (2014). Transnational Humanitarianism. In C. Gearty & V. Douzinas (Eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Human Rights Law* (pp. 274–293).
52. Wilson, R. (2017). *Politics of the apolitical: A study of operational autonomy and international non-governmental organizations*

(INGOs).<https://openworks.wooster.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=8632&context=independentstudy>

53. Zeidan, R. *Principles and Moral Challenges: A Perspective on Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) and Its Humanitarian Work in Syria*.