Humanitarianism: Religion Enriches Secularism

Koberg, Antonia

Humanitarianism: Religion Enriches Secularism

Antonia C. S. Koberg

s2042347

Leiden University

MA Religious Studies

Den Haag, 15.06.2021

Supervisor: Dr. John-Harmen Valk

Second Reader: Dr. Callum Pearce

Word Count: 15 000

Antonia Koberg, s2042347

Contents

Introduction

Secularisation Theory claims that modernisation leads to the decrease of religion in the public sphere and shifts it into the private sphere until its ultimate demise (Berger 1967; Luckmann 1967; Wilson 1966). The idea of secularisation also stretches to other fields within the public realm like humanitarianism (Calhoun 2012, 351). The end of the Cold War terminated the secular assumption that religion has to be in the public sphere because religion was a driving force in ending the Cold War (Sahliyeh 1990, 5). The terrorist attacks of 9/11 in the United States in 2001 was the most significant event that expressed that religion resurrects into the public realm (Pabst 2011, 168). Nevertheless, Secularisation Theory seems to remain at the heart of politics, and thus it also does not abate from humanitarianism. The current humanitarian system has its foundation in Secularisation Theory and its accompanying features, claiming that secularity ensures fair treatment for the people in need (Ager and Ager 2011, 2015). The current humanitarian system believes that religion and religious non-governmental organisations (RNGOs) must not be part of humanitarianism because they are biased and partial (Ager and Ager 2011, 2015; Wilkinson 2018a, 2018b, 2020). However, with the increase of natural disasters, humanitarian crises also multiply and request larger quantities of humanitarian response (Wilkinson 2018a), and as a consequence, the involvement of humanitarian actors also increases. The secular humanitarian system divides them into secular and religious actors, albeit they provide the same aid (Ferris 2005). In humanitarianism, RNGOs struggle to keep their religious background at a distance from humanitarian action. They often work in countries where religion plays a significant role in the public and private realm, but the organisations need to adhere to the secular humanitarian system (Wilkinson 2018a).

The Philippines and Indonesia are countries where religion is essential. The Philippines has a Christian population of 92%, and Indonesia has a Muslim population of 87% (PEW Research Center 2019). Coupled with their geographical location on the Pacific Ring of Fire (Bankoff 2001), the two countries are appealing cases to research. The Philippines experiences an average of 26 typhoons and earthquakes each year (The World Bank 2020). The worst typhoon that hit the country was Typhoon Haiyan in 2013; it was one of the worst measured tropical storms so far (Podbregar 2015, 151). The Government of the Philippines requested foreign aid to tackle the consequences of the typhoon (Reliefweb 2013). It makes Typhoon Haiyan an appealing case to study because it required a vast amount of humanitarian actors to tackle the humanitarian crisis. RNGOs struggled to abide by the rules of the secular humanitarian system when working in a religious environment (Wilkinson 2018a). Typhoon

Haiyan is also the disaster that gains the most scholarly attention in humanitarianism's secular and religious dynamics (Wilkinson 2018a, 2018b, 2020).

In contrast, Indonesia's most well-known natural disaster is the Indian Ocean Tsunami from 2004 (Mercy Corps 2020). Since then, Indonesia experiences one major natural disaster every year, except in 2018, where Indonesia experienced two tsunamis for the first time in one year (Mercy Corps 2020). Hence, the year 2018 is an interesting year to study; the research investigates the earthquake and tsunami in September because it was the fatal one (Mercy Corps 2020), and the Indonesian government requested foreign aid (United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs [UN OCHA] 2018b). Albeit the Indonesian government improved their Disaster Risk Reduction Management and focuses on national forces to manage disasters since the 2004 Indian Ocean Tsunami, the government requests foreign aid under specific conditions, if the disaster is too catastrophic (UN OCHA 2018b). For the 2018 September disaster, the Indonesian government only allowed foreign non-governmental organisations to help if the organisations have a local partner (ASEAN Coordinating Centre for Humanitarian Assistance on Disaster Management [AHA Centre] 2018, 3). Caritas Internationalis (Caritas) has KARINA - Caritas Indonesia as its local partner (Karina n.d.), Islamic Relief Worldwide (IRW) has Rumah Zakat as its local partner (Islamic Relief Worldwide [IRW] 2018d), and the local partner of Oxfam International (Oxfam) is Oxfam di Indonesia (Oxfam di Indonesia n.d.). Hence, their local partnership was decisive for choosing these three organisations as the unit of analysis. They were also among the first responders after Typhoon Haiyan left the Philippines (Caritas Internationalis [Caritas] 2013a; IRW 2013a; Oxfam International [Oxfam] 2013a). Consequently, the three organisations were crucial in the two countries, making them attractive for the research.

The research investigates the humanitarian actions of Caritas, IRW, and Oxfam in the Philippines, which is predominantly Christian, and in Indonesia, which is predominantly Muslim. The secular humanitarian system declares that RNGOs cannot behave neutral and impartial because of their religious affiliation (Ager and Ager 2011, 2015; Wilkinson 2018a, 2018b, 2020). This research contests that claim by investigating how the humanitarian action of Caritas, IRW, and Oxfam after Typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines in 2013 and the September Earthquake and Tsunami in 2018 challenge the common renditions of the Secularisation Theory. The comparative nature of the research shows that Caritas and IRW can operate in countries and its disaster-affected population with whom they do not share their faith. Furthermore, the research illustrates that Caritas and IRW follow the rules of the secular humanitarian system,

albeit their religious affiliation provides them a different perspective to work with the disaster-affected communities. The research depicts how Oxfam, as a secular non-governmental organisation (SNGO), experiences disadvantages in the two countries because it adhered to the demands of the secular humanitarian system. Eventually, Caritas and IRW challenge Secularisation Theory applied in humanitarianism because their religious features do not hinder neutral and impartial humanitarian action. Instead, the religious features complement humanitarian actions because Caritas and IRW engage with the local communities and personalise the humanitarian actions in the Philippines and Indonesia. Despite their efforts, secularity dominates the humanitarian system because Caritas and IRW abide by the humanitarian principles of neutrality and impartiality.

The research of religious and secular dynamics in humanitarianism in post-natural disaster settings is a newly emerging field in Religious Studies and International Relations. Consequently, the literature and research to draw on are limited. Thus, this research adds to the existing literature by providing a comparative case study. The analysis of the cases draws upon press releases and annual reports of Caritas, IRW, and Oxfam to analyse the challenges to the common rendition of Secularisation Theory in humanitarianism. The press releases and annual reports give information about the activities that the three organisations performed in the Philippines and Indonesia and show their engagement with the local communities. For the analysis, the texts of the press releases and annual reports were grouped into two main categories, neutrality and impartiality, to highlight the relationship between the organisations to the disaster-affected communities and the humanitarian actions.

The research structure follows the division of neutrality and impartiality. The first chapter outlines the basics of the secular humanitarian system and the religion's role in it. It also describes RNGOs and Secular Non-Government Organisations (SNGOs) to inform the reader about the differences between the two forms of organisations. The chapter shows that although secularity dominates humanitarianism, religion returns to humanitarianism. The second chapter, then, discusses neutrality in humanitarianism. The chapter shows that Oxfam distances itself from the local population. Caritas and IRW personalise humanitarian action in the Philippines and Indonesia, but they remain neutral towards the respective populations. Eventually, the research turns to the impartiality principle. Impartiality focuses on modernisation processes and discusses whether Caritas and IRW foster development like Oxfam.

Chapter 1: Religious and Secular Dynamics in Humanitarianism

Religious missionaries were the first international actors who cared for people in need (Deacon and Tomalin 2015, 68). The end of the Second World War heralded the end of religious actors as primary custodians of humanitarian actions because the focus of development shifted away from religion (Deacon and Tomalin 2015, 68). The new focus of development was secularity, economy, and rationality; these principles changed religion's role in society (Deacon and Tomalin 2015, 68). Religion had to retreat into the private sphere and thus cleared the way for secularity, economy, and rationality to accede to the primary custodians of development and humanitarianism, which led to the modernisation of society (Deacon and Tomalin 2015, 68). Along with the flinch of religion, religious organisations lost their status as important humanitarian actors; secular organisations replaced them (Barnett and Weiss 2008). However, with the end of the Cold War in the 1980s, religion had its comeback (Sahliyeh 1990). Since the acknowledgment of the resurgence of religion in the international political sphere, and thus also in humanitarianism, the secular character of humanitarianism is questionable because humanitarian aid primarily happens in countries in which religion did not recede to the private sphere (Wilkinson 2020, 36). Nevertheless, the humanitarian system still follows the idea that humanitarianism must be independent of religion (Ager and Ager 2015, 22). The chapter introduces the challenges of the status quo of religious and secular dynamics in humanitarianism.

The chapter shows that secularity still dominates humanitarianism despite the resurgence of religion. It argues that religion finds its way back into humanitarianism and adds to it instead of diminishing it. The structure of the chapter discusses the humanitarian principles before it outlines the presumptions of neutrality and modernity. Next, the chapter describes the role religion holds in the humanitarianism system. Eventually, the chapter approaches SNGOs and RNGOs. The chapter then ends with a concluding remark.

Humanitarian Principles

Humanitarianism began in religion due to missionary work during colonial times (Barnett and Weiss 2008; Deacon and Tomalin 2015; Ferris 2011). However, humanitarianism abandoned its religious foundation after the Second World War because the international political community established and codified humanitarian principles (Ager and Ager 2011, 457). In essence, the codification of the humanitarian principles secularises humanitarianism; it heralded

the start of the secular humanitarian system. The humanitarian principles are significant because they set the framework for the engagement of humanitarian actors with victims of conflict, man-made or natural disasters (Barnett and Weiss 2008, 4). There are seven humanitarian principles: humanity, neutrality, impartiality, independence, voluntary service, unity, and universality (International Committee of the Red Cross [ICRC] 2020). The Code of Conduct for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and Non-governmental Organisations in Disaster Relief published the humanitarian principles in detail (ICRC 1994). The humanitarian sector emphasises the first four humanitarian principles as the most crucial ones because of their publication under the United Nations (United Nations General Assembly 2004), and they value human life and are apolitical and universal in their application (Barnett and Weiss 2008, 7; Bernard 2015, 8). The meaning of the first four principles are:

1. "Humanity: Human suffering must be addressed wherever it is found. The purpose of humanitarian action is to protect life and health, and ensure respect for human beings.
2. Neutrality: Humanitarian actors must not take sides in hostilities or engage in controversies of a political, racial, religious or ideological nature.
3. Impartiality: Humanitarian action must be carried out on the basis of need alone, giving priority to the most urgent cases of distress and making no distinction on the basis of nationality, race, gender, religious beliefs, class or political options.
4. Operational independence: Humanitarian action must be autonomous from the political, economic, military or any other objectives that any actor may hold with regard to where humanitarian action is being implemented." (UN OCHA 2018a, 16)

The four core humanitarian principles are also essential for the aid receiver as they must perceive the humanitarian actors as neutral and impartial (UN OCHA 2018a, 16). The secular humanitarian conventional wisdom claims that secularity ensures that humanitarian actors act according to these principles. Consequently, the secular humanitarian wisdom also claims that religious humanitarian actors do not abide by the humanitarian principles (Ager and Ager 2015; Wilkinson 2018a, 2018b, 2020). In other words, secularism infiltrates the humanitarian system, which creates the presumption of neutrality and modernity (Ager and Ager 2015). The next two sections discuss the presumption of neutrality and the presumption of modernity.

The Presumption of Neutrality

The humanitarian principle of neutrality focuses on the non-association of humanitarian actors with political, ethical, racial, gender, and religious elements of groups of a population in need

(ICRC 1994, 3). The humanitarian principle of neutrality has a close relationship with the humanitarian principle of impartiality (Ager and Ager 2015, 17). The neutrality principle is the precondition for the impartiality principle because only a neutral actor can distribute aid fairly (Ager and Ager 2015, 17). In other words, a humanitarian actor has to be neutral in order to be impartial. Non-association represents secularity because the secular humanitarian system believes that a humanitarian actor can only be neutral when the actor is secular and not under any ideology's influence (Wilkinson 2020, 37).

Any humanitarian actor who has an association with a specific group is not neutral. As a consequence, the conventional humanitarian wisdom claims that religious humanitarian actors prefer to help a community with which they share their faith because religion affiliates the actor with the community in need. In more depth, the conventional wisdom believes that Christian humanitarian actors favour Christian communities over other faith and non-faith communities. The same applies to Muslim humanitarian actors; Muslim humanitarian actors prefer to engage with Muslim communities over other faith or non-faith communities. Also, according to the secular humanitarian conventional wisdom, the secular humanitarian actor does not favour any community over another as their secular character ensures that the humanitarian actors treat everyone equally.

While the secular system of humanitarianism maintains the position that secularity only works in favour of the suffering community, the religious understanding of humanitarianism rejects that notion. The religious humanitarian system believes that religious affiliation benefits the suffering community instead of harming the religious communities (Ghandour 2003; Wilkinson 2020). The religious humanitarian system believes that religious humanitarian actors have a comparative advantage over their secular colleagues (Tomalin 2012), which originates from the belief that the religious background eases the interaction with the local community (Ghandour 2003). The codification of the humanitarian principles installed a barrier regarding the interaction of humanitarian actors with religious communities because they insist that any humanitarian actor cannot associate itself with local groups as it would violate the humanitarian actor's reputation of neutrality (Ager and Ager 2015, 4). However, the people in need prefer a humanitarian system they can relate to as it increases their trust in humanitarian actors (Ghandour 2003; James 2009). In general, the humanitarian principles aim to support the most vulnerable people (UN OCHA 2018a, 16). The most vulnerable groups are also the most religious groups (James 2009); hence the religious humanitarian system is more appealing to them because it does not remove religion from the humanitarian response but acknowledge that

religion is vital for society in the public and private realm (Ager and Ager 2015). The idea of cultural proximity manifests this claim (Benedetti 2006; Bush, Fountain and Feener 2015; De Cordier 2009; Ghandour 2003).

Cultural proximity demonstrates that a religious humanitarian actor obtains better access and high trust levels among a community, which shares its faith (Benedetti 2006; Benthall 2012; Bush, Fountain and Feener 2015; De Cordier 2009; Ghandour 2003). To put it another way, Islamic humanitarian actors obtain better access and trust in Muslim-majority societies, while Christian humanitarian actors achieve better access and trust in Christian-majority societies. Initially, IRW established the term to justify the appropriateness of religious relief (Bush, Fountain and Feener 2015, 7). The principle concentrates on Islam and Muslim communities in need and how their shared faith supports interaction (De Cordier 2009; Ghandour 2003), but the principle behind cultural proximity also applies to other religions (Benthall 2012). Cultural proximity primarily focuses on the relationship among religious humanitarian actors because they fear forced conversion (Ghandour 2003). Disaster-affected communities appreciate the large quantities of aid from secular humanitarian actors, and they do not fear that secular humanitarian actors enforce conversion to another religion (Ghandour 2003).

The humanitarian principle of neutrality shall also protect against proselytism. Proselytism connotes the advertisement of an ideology or religion to a group (Lynch and Schwarz 2016, 636). Secular humanitarianism emphasises that proselytism is the forced conversion, promoted by religious humanitarian actors, to a specific religion (Ferris 2011; Ghandour 2003; Khafagy 2020; Lynch and Schwarz 2016; Mlay 2004). The term proselytism focuses, in particular, on Christianity (Ferris 2011, 608). Islam also has a denotation for proselytism; the Islamic term is *da'wa*. *Da'wa* means calling people to Islam which implies forced conversion of non-Muslim communities to Islam (Benedetti 2006, 856). This research uses the term proselytism for religious forced conversion. The assumption that religious humanitarian actors compel other communities to join their faith stems from history and religious traditions. For Christianity, the accusation emanates from the Christian missionary's activities during the colonial times (Barnett and Weiss 2008; Ferris 2005; Ghandour 2003; Lynch and Schwarz 2016). For Islam, the allegation originates from the idea that Islam considers its expansion a crucial religious commitment of Muslims to Islam (Khafagy 2020, 7). However, the two religions endeavour to support the poor through charity and solidarity because they do not want to proselytise but ease the suffering of the poor (Ferris 2005; Khafagy

2020). Islam and Christianity believe that well-off people have a religious duty to help the poor without any terms and conditions (Mlay 2004).

As mentioned above, proselytism also implies the advertisement of an ideology. Secularism is an ideology, and as a consequence, proselytism is a religious phenomenon and a secular one; secular humanitarian actors also proselytise (Lynch and Schwarz 2016; Wilkinson 2020). The donors of secular humanitarian actors assign them with terms and conditions that demand that the aid, funded with their money, is secular (Lynch and Schwarz 2016, 641). The terms and conditions of the demanded secular nature imply that secular humanitarian actors must apply and use specific methods, technologies, and programmes (Lynch and Schwarz 2016, 642). The demands are equal to the claims of religious proselytism; demanding specific programmes and technologies is analogous to handing out holy scriptures and obliging aid receivers to prayers (Lynch and Schwarz 2016, 642). These two conditions force the aid receiver to engage with specific faith and ideological conventions and thus violate the humanitarian principle of neutrality.

The Presumption of Modernity

As noted above, the humanitarian principle of neutrality has a close relationship with the humanitarian principle of impartiality (Ager and Ager 2015, 17). The neutrality principle is the precondition for the impartiality principle because only a neutral actor can distribute aid fairly (Ager and Ager 2015, 17). Impartiality means that "humanitarian action must be carried out on the basis of need alone, giving priority to the most urgent cases of distress and making no distinction on the basis of nationality, race, gender, religious beliefs, class or political options" (UN OCHA 2018a, 16). Additionally, the principle highlights that humanitarian action must consider the needs of the affected population. The needs refer to the basic and universal needs such as water, food, money, and shelter (Wilkinson 2020, 36). In other words, these needs are physical needs, which represent secularism in humanitarianism.

Secularism affects humanitarianism through rationalisation (Ager and Ager 2015, 15; Wilkinson 2020, 36). The rationalisation process, as Weber established, is essential for the development of the modern world (Little 2016, 653) as it creates the modern society (Hedoin 2009, 173). The rationalisation process ends the irrationality of religion and replaces it with the rationality of materialism (Hedoin 2009, 173; Little 2016, 653). The rationality of materialism comes with modernity (Little 2016, 653; Wilkinson 2020, 36). In other words, materialism is

modernity, which is rational. Consequently, modernity means that humanitarianism eliminates religion from the public sphere to advance society by satisfying their material needs because material needs require scientific and technological solutions (Little 2016, 653; Wilkinson 2020, 36). Therefore, the process of rationalisation and, in particular, modernisation represents a crucial statement of Secularisation Theory.

Secularisation Theory manifests itself in humanitarianism through its understanding of modernisation. According to Secularisation Theory, the process of modernisation and its accompanying features lead to the decrease of the necessity and acceptance of religion in a society's public sphere (Pollack 2015, 61). Modernisation banishes religion into the private sphere (Wilson 2018, 3). Modernisation implies the move from a traditional society to a modern, and consequently secular, society. A traditional country focuses on the religious interpretation of any phenomenon, and its economic activities are primary ones like fishing and agriculture (Ezrow, Frantz and Kendall-Taylor 2016, 27). The modernisation process abjures religious thinking as it does not fit into a secular and modern society regarding the modern society's scientific knowledge and technology (Kaufmann 1997, 81). Modernisation is the process of political, economic, scientific, medical, and educational advancement (Pollack 2015, 66). Consequently, the modernisation process results in the advancement of a traditional society to turn into a secular and modern society. Modern secular society focuses on scientific and technological understandings of any phenomenon coupled with the move beyond primary agricultural activities (Ezrow, Frantz and Kendall-Taylor 2016, 27). Humanitarianism as being part of development supports the modernisation processes (Ager and Ager 2015, 14).

Humanitarianism aims to modernise a community through material aid (Ager and Ager 2015, 14). To clarify, the presumption of modernity descends from the humanitarian principle of impartiality because of the basic needs. The basic needs are rational because they are material needs. In contrast, any aid that is not material aid is irrational and does not support modernisation processes. The irrationality of non-materialistic aid hinders modernisation because irrationality imposes restrictions on modernity (Little 2016, 563). Non-material aid in humanitarianism is psychosocial aid (Ager and Ager 2015; Ager et al. 2019). The secular humanitarian system considers psychosocial aid irrelevant compared to material aid (Ager, Abebe and Ager 2014). Psychosocial aid encourages engagement with the local communities in terms of religion and spirituality (Ager, Abebe and Ager 2014; Ager et al. 2019) because, within a crisis, religion helps the affected communities to cope with the disastrous event (Abbot and White 2019; Ager et al. 2019, 71). This engagement with the local communities regarding

their religion harms the humanitarian principles of impartiality and neutrality. Therefore, the secular humanitarian system discourages psychosocial aid. The religious humanitarian system supports psychosocial aid. Religious humanitarian actors were the actors that declared psychosocial aid as a necessary tool in humanitarianism (Ager, Abebe and Ager 2014; Ager et al. 2019) because psychosocial aid supports the community's hope and strength to keep going after a disaster (Abbot and White 2019, 68-69). Nevertheless, the dominant secular humanitarian system believes that material and economic aid supports the disaster victims better than any other form of aid because these two forms of aid have a long-term effect on the country (Bankoff 2001).

The end goal of the presumption of modernity is to modernise the disaster-affected country; one way of achieving this goal is material aid, the other way is economic development. Both are part of the modernisation processes introduced through the concept of rationalisation by Max Weber, as mentioned above. Hence, the secular humanitarian system believes that secular humanitarian actors support and engage with economic aid (Rudnyckyj 2015, 408). Consequently, the secular humanitarian system considers religious humanitarian actors opponents of economic aid because it assumes that religion hinders modernisation (Little 2016, 563). However, the religious humanitarian system supports economic aid and development to lift people out of poverty (Clarke 2016; Krafess 2005, 340). The Christianity and Islam focus on reducing inequality with their aid and taking care of the most vulnerable individuals (Clarke 2016, 185-187). Therefore, the religious humanitarian actors do not infiltrate their aid with any terms and conditions; they focus their economic aid solely on reducing poverty (Clarke 2016; Krafess 2005, 335). In comparison, the secular humanitarian actors concentrate their economic aid on the presumption of modernity, aiming to advance the disaster-affected country (Rudnyckyj 2015, 406-408).

The Role Religion Plays in Humanitarianism

As stated in the introduction of this chapter, religion has not played a role in humanitarianism since the Second World War (Deacon and Tomalin 2015, 68). However, since the end of the Cold War, humanitarianism has experienced a revival of religion (Deacon and Tomalin 2015, 68). Nevertheless, the humanitarian system still prefers secularity over religion, and under those circumstances, the humanitarian system imposes three roles on religion: instrumentalisation, marginalisation, and privatisation (Ager and Ager 2011, 2015; Wilkinson 2018b, 2020).

First, the instrumentalisation of religion in secular humanitarianism implies the misuse of religion. The humanitarian system uses religion only if it aligns with the objectives of humanitarian actors (Wilkinson 2020, 45). The secular humanitarians recognise the benefit they gain from engagement with religious actors, for instance, in terms of funding (Wilkinson 2020, 45). Consequently, without benefits of religion to the secular humanitarian system, the humanitarian actors would not engage with religion. Second, the marginalisation of religion in secular humanitarianism indicates that humanitarians do not consider religion and its actors as vital components of humanitarianism. The discourse of secular humanitarianism disempowers religion by either undervaluing or excluding its narrative (Ager and Ager 2015, 12; Wilkinson 2018b; 2020). Eventually, secular humanitarianism privatises religion. Secularism separates the public and private sphere (Pollack 2015), and secularism transfers this separation to humanitarianism (Ager and Ager 2015, 12). Consequently, religion belongs within the private sphere in humanitarianism, and it does not have any legitimacy in the public sphere (Ager and Ager 2015, 12). In other words, secular humanitarianism excludes religion by diminishing it to the private sphere.

Humanitarian Actors: Religious and Secular Non-Governmental Organisations

The previous sections referred to humanitarian actors; this research represents Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) as humanitarian actors. It focuses on Caritas, IRW, and Oxfam. The three organisations represent two RNGOs focusing on Christianity and Islam and one SNGO. Scholars of Developmental Studies, and subsequently within the humanitarian field, who research RNGOs and SNGOs (Benedetti 2006), have accepted Martens's (2002) definition of NGOs: "*NGOs are formal (professionalized) independent societal organisations whose primary aim is to promote common goals at the national or the international level*" (282). The definition reveals five important concepts: NGOs are

- formal organisations,
- independent organisations,
- social actors, and
- NGOs, as the brackets indicate, can be professionalised, and
- NGOs promote common goals.

Although the definition displays a useful blueprint of NGOs, it fails to take Faith-Based Organisations (FBOs)[1] into account. Martens established definition is secular. The ignorance of religion in the definition illustrates the secularity of humanitarianism because scholars use Martens's definition for their research about FBOs and SNGOs. However, FBOs are on the rise within the humanitarian field. Therefore, NGOs' definition needs to expand to include RNGOs, or otherwise, RNGOs require their own definition. This research does not aim to establish a new definition of NGOs[2]. It uses Martens's definition with additional religious features such as religious affiliation, motivation, religious identity and teaching, and relationship to other NGOs (Frame 2020) to illustrate the basis of NGOs.

Concluding Remarks

The first chapter outlined the secular and religious dynamics within humanitarianism. It argued that religion finds its way back into humanitarianism and benefits it instead of harming it. The chapter showed that secular dynamics still dominate humanitarianism in theory. The following two chapters outline the findings of the three organisations working in the Philippines in 2013 after Typhoon Haiyan and in Indonesia in 2018 after the September Earthquake and Tsunami regarding their imposed challenge on the common renditions of Secularisation Theory applied in humanitarianism.

---

[1] FBOs are another term for RNGOs.
[2] The research refers to NGOs when it combines RNGOs and SNGOs.

Chapter 2: Secular and Religious Dynamics in the Presumption of Neutrality

The previous chapter outlined the general elements of secular and religious dynamics in humanitarianism. This chapter covers the humanitarian principle of neutrality. The principle of neutrality demands that Caritas, IRW, and Oxfam do not associate with a specific group in the Philippines and Indonesia. However, the religious background of Caritas and IRW hinders them from remaining neutral. Hence, the chapter argues that Oxfam remains neutral, but Caritas and IRW do not because of their religious character. The chapter looks first into the humanitarian actions of Caritas, IRW, and Oxfam regarding the secular humanitarian understanding of the neutrality principle. It then continues with the claimed comparative advantage of cultural proximity of Caritas and IRW. Next, it discusses proselytism. Finally, the chapter concludes with religion's role in neutrality.

Neutral Behaviour of Caritas, Islamic Relief and Oxfam

The conventional wisdom of secular humanitarianism claims that Caritas prioritises the Christian communities in the Philippines and Indonesia, IRW prioritises Muslim communities, and Oxfam does not prioritise one community over another. The research findings align with the conventional wisdom regarding Oxfam, but the findings renounce the conventional wisdom regarding the humanitarian actions of Caritas and IRW. In fact, Caritas, IRW, and Oxfam treat the affected communities equally in the Philippines and Indonesia. Neither the local faith nor the organisation's affiliation is decisive for treating the disaster-affected communities; instead, the three organisations focused in the two countries on distributing aid to the most vulnerable communities. Typhoon Haiyan hit Christian-majority regions (Humanitarian Country Team and UN OCHA 2013, 3), and the 2018 September disaster struck a Muslim-majority region (AHA Centre 2018, 2). In the Philippines, the three organisations spread their aid over multiple locations (Caritas 2013b, 2013c, 2013e; IRW 2013a, 2014c; Oxfam 2013b). The three organisations were present in Central-Sulawesi, where the earthquake and tsunami struck (Caritas 2018c, 18; IRW 2018a, 22; Oxfam 2018a, 26). If the secular conventional wisdom were true, then IRW would not have been active in the Philippines at all or highlighted the suffering of Muslims living in the disaster-affected regions; And then Caritas would not have been active in Indonesia or highlighted the experience of local Christian communities in Central-Sulawesi.

IRW was active in the Philippines, and Caritas was active in Indonesia as humanitarian actors, and neither of the two organisations stressed their concern with a single group with which they share their faith. Hence, their faith did not influence their humanitarian actions in terms of selecting specific aid beneficiaries. Furthermore, Oxfam also performed humanitarian actions in the Philippines and Indonesia. Oxfam does not state whether it worked with a specific group in the respective countries, which illustrates the demanded neutrality of the secular humanitarian system. The secular humanitarian system expects that any form of association harms the neutrality principle and damages an organisation's reputation; Oxfam follows that precept. Nevertheless, it is impossible to argue that the non-association of Oxfam points to a biased association of Caritas and IRW. Caritas and IRW are neutral because they interact with individuals who do not share the respective organisations' faith. The two organisations would harm the neutrality principle if they were to either prefer or only engage with individuals who share the faith of the respective organisations. However, this is not the case. Thus, although Caritas and IRW have a religious affiliation, the organisations are neutral because the religious affiliation did not harm the organisation's reputation as neutral actors. As a result, the religious affiliation of Caritas and IRW is not decisive for their neutral behaviour. Therefore, the findings align with Oxfam, as an SNGO; it does not favour one group over another. In contrast, the findings disprove that Caritas and IRW, as RNGOs, deny aid to other faith groups.

The non-association is also visible in the organisations' collaboration with other NGOs. Caritas and IRW mention their cooperation with other organisations in the post-disaster environment in the Philippines and Indonesia; they refer to the partner organisations by their name. In the Philippines, Caritas (2013b, 2013c, 2013e, 2013f, 2013h, 2013l, 2014b, 2014f, 2014i, 2014j) highlights its collaboration with Christian FBOs and local Christian communities. The partners FBOs are Caritas's member organisations. While Caritas (2018a, 2018b) only refers to their cooperation with Catholic Relief Service, its member organisation in the United States of America, in Indonesia. IRW (2013d, 2014g) stated that they worked together with Christian FBOs and SNGOs in the Philippines. In particular, they show that they cooperated with Oxfam and Caritas (IRW 2014g). Neither Caritas nor Oxfam amplifies that cooperation; they do not present the collaboration in their press releases. In Indonesia, IRW (2018c, 2018d, 2018e) cooperated with Muslim NGOs and SNGOs. In contrast, Oxfam (2013b, 2018a, 2018b) alludes to its collaboration with other organisations in both post-disaster environments, but it does not elaborate on the type of organisations. Furthermore, Oxfam (2013a, 2018a, 2018b) is the only organisation of the three that refers to its cooperation with the governmental forces of the Philippines and Indonesia.

These findings were surprising because they administer a different perspective on the humanitarian principle of neutrality. Although neutrality concentrates on the association of NGOs with disaster-affected communities, the association of NGOs with other NGOs also reveals neutrality or a lack thereof. The findings indicate that only IRW considers the interaction with Muslim FBOs and other NGOs as crucial because IRW emphasises collaboration with other NGOs, which is the most visible through the direct mentioning of their cooperation with Caritas and Oxfam (IRW 2014g). The fact that IRW reports about the interactions with other organisations show that IRW is also neutral concerning its collaboration partners. Its association with NGOs supports neutrality. It expresses to the reader of the press releases, and the disaster victims that it does not favour a specific kind of Non-Governmental Organisation (NGO) and that aid to disaster victims has priority over religious affiliation. This form of neutrality towards other FBOs and SNGOs does not apply to Caritas and Oxfam. The absence of highlighting collaboration with other FBOs and SNGOs harms the neutral characteristic of Caritas and Oxfam. Caritas and Oxfam might fear that an association with an NGO can damage the organisation's reputation as a neutral actor; hence, they do not include this collaboration in their reports and press releases. Another interpretation might be that Oxfam and Caritas do not consider this collaboration crucial enough to mention it in their publications. However, the research focus does not lie among the organisations, but the findings are attractive for further research.

Next, Caritas, IRW, and Oxfam refer to religious elements concerning the disaster-affected communities and their faith. In the Philippines, Caritas refers to a plethora of religious elements, while Caritas does not refer to the same extent as religious elements in Indonesia. Caritas's press releases regarding Typhoon Haiyan include religious actors, figures, and institutions. The press releases concerning the Philippines include voices of local pastors (Caritas 2013j), the President of Caritas who is also a cardinal (Caritas 2013a), the Executive Secretary of Caritas in the Philippines, who is also a priest (Caritas 2013b), and the President of Caritas in the Philippines, who is also a bishop (Caritas 2013g). Most importantly, the press releases include the utterance of Pope Francis, who gives his voice to the disaster victims (Caritas 2013a). It is noteworthy to stress that Caritas did not include the utterance of Pope Francis regarding the Indonesian disaster in September 2018. Moreover, Caritas (2013d) publishes a letter by the President of Caritas, a reverend, who refers to a Psalm. In addition, Caritas (2013j, 2013k, 2014h) also reports on local dioceses and their destroyed churches and other Catholic institutions. Interestingly, Caritas (2018c) is the only organisation that refers to the destruction of mosques in Indonesia. The researcher expected to find IRW more concerned

about the destruction of Islamic institutions in Indonesia. The findings did not satisfy the expectation. In general, the findings of IRW incorporate religious matters to a lesser degree, compared to Caritas. In the Philippines, IRW (2013c) worked together with a local Christian organisation, and IRW (2013a, 2014c) included utterances of pastors from the Philippines. In Indonesia, the organisation was not concerned about the destruction of the Mosques through the earthquake and its following tsunami. However, IRW (2018d) highlighted that mosques gave shelter to disaster victims. In contrast, Oxfam does not refer to religious elements in Indonesia, but it discusses one religious element in its annual report about the Philippines; The Filipinos built a shrine to thank Oxfam for their help (Oxfam 2013a).

The secular humanitarian system declares that the implementation of religious elements impairs the principle of neutrality. The humanitarian principle of neutrality demands the non-association of humanitarian actors, and by incorporating religious elements, the humanitarian actors violate the neutrality principle because religion is not neutral (Barnett and Weiss 2008, 7). Nevertheless, the research findings of Caritas and IRW reveal that the integration of religious elements does not violate the humanitarian principle of neutrality. On the contrary, the research findings about Oxfam unveil the opposite. Caritas and IRW engage with the local community in the Philippines. In many places in the Philippines, local churches and organisations were the first responding forces to the disaster because the typhoon destroyed the infrastructure and debris covered the affected regions, making it difficult for the organisations to reach remote locations (Caritas 2013b; IRW 2013c). In addition, the local churches informed the organisations about the situation in their respective municipalities (Caritas 2013a). Caritas and IRW joined the local forces in their disaster relief when they reached the remote regions; Thus, they worked as a supplement to them, which sped up and advanced the aid distribution. Oxfam (2013e, 11; 2014b, 2) obtains its information from the government of the Philippines. Oxfam does not work together with local religious communities. In comparison, Caritas and IRW receive their information directly from the affected communities, while Oxfam receives its information second-hand. The non-association idea behind the humanitarian principle of neutrality hampers quick humanitarian action because Oxfam has to wait for the government's need assessment before it can begin its work. At the same time, the relationship to local faith communities supports aid distribution in the Philippines because the information comes first-hand, and the organisation can prepare better to hand out aid quicker.

The association with the local community is also visible through the inclusion of religious figures in the press releases and reports of Caritas and IRW. The secular humanitarian

system opposes the inclusion of these figures as it undermines the neutrality principle. The data revealed that the purpose of the inclusion of religious figures was to provide solidarity among the disaster victims and the world. The inclusion of Pope Francis illustrates the solidarity among the two groups: "Pope Francis also prayed for the victims of the typhoon … He first called for silent prayer, and then led the faithful in a recitation of the Hail Mary. He urged those present to help their brothers and sisters in the Philippines concretely, as well as through prayer" (Caritas 2013a). The Pope prayed for the victims; he did not attribute them to the Christian faith. Hence, the prayer was not selective; instead, the prayer included every victim in the disaster. Although it is possible to argue that the term brother and sister implies only Christians, the Pope directs the term brother and sister to the Filipinos, not to his faith brothers and sisters, because he directs this demand to the people in the Philippines. As mentioned above, Caritas does not include any of the Pope's utterances regarding the September Earthquake and Tsunami in 2018 in their press releases. The neglect of the Pope's inclusion is supportive of the secular humanitarian system because it depicts that religious humanitarian actors are not neutral. Albeit Caritas did not include the Pope's utterance regarding the Indonesian disaster, Caritas (2018a) included a prayer in its press releases for its readers, which deals with the victims regardless of their faith. Hence, the inclusion of the prayer assists the neutrality of the organisation because it shows that the organisation accommodates the inclusion of religious elements to the individual situation. Additionally, IRW (2013a, 2014c) includes the acknowledgments of local pastors from the Philippines in its press releases. This inclusion supports the organisation's neutrality because IRW collaborates with Christians and shows it to the public. The secular humanitarian system declares that neutrality is non-association, but the association of FBOs with other FBOs confirms neutrality in a way that secularity does not consider to exist.

The neutrality that secularity supports focuses on creating a distance to anything that could lead to an association to a specific faith. Oxfam illustrates that distance. Oxfam (2013a) states that "Oxfam's work has been well received. Bantayan, one of the most seriously affected Islands, established a small 'shrine' to thank Oxfam for helping to bring employment and some financial security" (33). Oxfam puts the word shrine in quotation marks. The organisation also illustrates that the shrine only came into existence because of its non-religious aid. The desired neutrality seems judgemental towards the disaster-affected community in Bantayan. The quotation marks create a distance to the people, whom Oxfam helped, and the reference to economic aid as the reason for the shrine's existence supports the secular humanitarian system. Oxfam does not want to harm the neutrality principle, but with its abiding by it, the organisation fails to see the shrine's importance for the people in Bantayan. Therefore, the neutrality

principle with its secular interpretation hampers the interaction with the disaster-affected society.

Cultural Proximity - A Religious Comparative Advantage

While the humanitarian principle of neutrality points to the non-association of humanitarian actors with groups in a disaster-affected region, the religious humanitarian system opposes the neutrality of humanitarian aid in a secular interpretation (Ghandour 2003; Wilkinson 2020). The religious humanitarian system believes that RNGOs have a comparative advantage over SNGOs because their faith character supports the interaction among the aid receiver and aid providers (Tomalin 2012). Congruent with the cultural proximity argument, the researcher expected that Caritas, as a Christian faith-based organisation, has better access to the Filipinos, while IRW, as a Muslim faith-based organisation, has better access to the Indonesian. In other words, the religious humanitarian system claims that the two RNGOs have an advantage over each other and Oxfam in their respective faith-sharing country.

The research findings disconfirmed that Caritas had better access to the disaster-affected communities in the Philippines. IRW also did not have better access to Indonesia. The research findings discovered that the two organisations interacted more with the local communities than Oxfam. Caritas (2014a, 2014b, 2014c, 2014h, 2014g, 2014j, 2018c) and IRW (2013e, 2014a, 2014b, 2014d, 2014e, 2014f, 2014h, 2014i, 2018d, 2019a) included survivor stories in their press releases in both countries, while Oxfam did not. The only way Oxfam refers to their interaction with the local community in the Philippines is through mentioning the shrine. Nevertheless, as the previous section elaborated, Oxfam keeps the interaction with the disaster-affected community at a distance. In its annual report, Oxfam (2018a) declares that it must improve its interaction with local communities, but it does not elaborate on it and does not engage with the disaster-affected communities in Indonesia in September 2018. Hence, Oxfam keeps its distance from the local communities in both disasters.

The survivor stories, which the press releases of Caritas and IRW published, outline the relationship between the respective organisation and the disaster-affected communities. A surprising finding was that IRW did not include many survivor stories about the disaster in Indonesia, while it included a plethora of survivor stories for the disaster in the Philippines. Caritas also included a large number of survivor stories about the Philippines and a small quantity of survivor stories regarding the disaster in Indonesia. The findings indicate that the

cultural proximity might not solely depend on the religion-location-organisation relationship. It might be that the strength of the disaster plays a crucial role in the inclusion of survivor stories in press releases because the typhoon compared to the earthquake and tsunami was the more catastrophic natural disaster.

Considering Caritas and IRW as a single Religious Non-Governmental Organisation (RNGO) and then contrasting them against Oxfam highlights the interaction between SNGOs and RNGOs with disaster-affected communities. While the neutrality principle does not want any association with specific groups, it does not mean that the organisations have to neglect the interaction with the communities. Oxfam seems to neglect the personal interaction with the communities because it excludes survivor stories. Because Oxfam adheres to the secular understanding of neutrality, it fails to engage with disaster-affected communities. At the same time, the two RNGOs stress the importance of the interaction with the disaster-affected communities by illustrating the experience and emotions of the survivors. The survivor stories that Caritas and IRW published do not deal with the persons' religious affiliations but with their experience. Hence, there does not exist a violation of the neutrality principle; the incorporation of survivor stories instead points out that the neutrality principle does not mean that disaster relief has to be based on distance but sympathy and solidarity.

Proselytism

The humanitarian principle of neutrality ensures that disaster relief comes without terms and conditions. In essence, the distribution of disaster relief aid must not demand the acceptance and change of a specific religion (ICRC 1994, 3). The secular humanitarian system fears that the inclusion of RNGOs will lead to forced conversion (Wilkinson 2020, 39), which then violates the neutrality principle of humanitarian action. However, donors of SNGOs can cause a violation of the principle of neutrality because they can add terms and conditions to the money they donate to an organisation (Lynch and Schwarz 2016). This concept is called secular proselytism.

The secular humanitarian system claims that RNGOs force conversion of the disaster-affected communities. The research findings revealed that neither Caritas nor IRW engaged in any activities that lead to conversion. It is important to note, and as the sections above show, Caritas, and IRW include religious elements in their public press releases. Caritas includes religious figures and bible quotes in its press releases. The segment about Pope Francis showed

that the inclusion of the Pope did not mean to force people to convert (Caritas 2013a), albeit Caritas included the Pope's utterance only regarding the Philippines, but to show the solidarity of the Pope. Furthermore, the press release of the President of Caritas Asia, Reverend Isao Kikuchi, is another sign of expressing sympathy and solidarity, not to enforce conversion. He mentions Psalm 23 to give the disaster victims strength and hope; this Psalm shows that the victims are not alone and that God watches over them (Caritas 2013d). Additionally, throughout his whole press release, he emphasizes solidarity, hope, and love (Caritas 2013d). Caritas engages with local churches and considers their reconstruction, but even pastors of destroyed churches say that the reconstruction of churches is not a priority (Caritas 2013j). Furthermore, aid distribution centres were set up in churches (Caritas 2013h); hence, there was no space for services. In its press releases about Indonesia, Caritas (2018a) published a prayer. It is possible to argue that the inclusion of the prayer is to convert people; however, the prayer is directed at the readers of the press releases and not to the aid receivers. This difference is crucial as it highlights that the aid for the disaster-affected community is based on neutrality, while the organisation can request spiritual and financial aid from people who are not affected by the disaster.

IRW worked together with catholic organisations in the Philippines, but it did not focus on providing its faith to the people in the Philippines. IRW distributed food, water, and tool kits, not Qurans. The press releases of IRW include utterances of gratitude, such as "'I'm grateful to Islamic Relief that I was able to start selling again'" (IRW 2014i). The gratitude bears upon the financial aid that IRW gave to the people. There are multiple expressions like the one mentioned here in the press releases; they all follow the same structure. The aid receiver is grateful for the material and economic aid, and they do not mention their faith. The aid receiver does not link IRW to its religion, nor their own, which renounces the argument of forced conversion.

Next, the research looked into donor proselytism. Oxfam receives its funding from institutions and public fundraising (Oxfam n.d.), whereas Caritas (n.d.) and IRW (n.d.) depend on private donations. The three organisations ensure transparency through annual financial reports (Caritas n.d.; IRW n.d.; Oxfam n.d.). Oxfam (2013e) ensures neutrality, like Caritas (2013l) and IRW (2014a), by prioritising aid to the most vulnerable. Furthermore, Oxfam (2013e) relies on independent media and civil society inspectors to ensure that the funds of its disaster relief projects focus on the most vulnerable people and their needs instead of the most influential groups. Through the reliance on independent people as supervisors, Oxfam attempts to escape donor proselytism. However, it does not mention this dependency on independent

supervisors for the disaster in Indonesia. Although Oxfam still focuses on the needs of the most vulnerable people, it fails to provide information about its spending, implying a violation of the neutrality principle because it does not show whether the organisation attached itself to terms and conditions donors that dictate onto them.

Religion's Role in the Presumption of Impartiality

Oxfam divided the public and the private sphere. It privatised religion by not giving it any space in its working realm, in essence, the public realm. Oxfam recognised that religion plays a crucial role for the local population by pointing to the shrine that people in Bantayan built for the organisation, but Oxfam made explicit that religion does not belong to its working environment. While Caritas and IRW report about religious actors, they do not include religion in their aid work. They also follow the idea that religion does not belong in the public sphere, but they illustrate that religion helps to interact with the local communities.

Furthermore, Oxfam does not engage with religious actors. It marginalised religion because the organisation does not concern itself with religious entities. The organisation overlooks that local religious entities are the first responders to a disaster and do not consider them necessary. Caritas and IRW acknowledge that the local religious actors are the first aid responders, and they cooperate with them. The two organisations consider religious actors crucial, which might be because Caritas and IRW are RNGOs.

An interesting finding was that Caritas used churches to distribute aid. It is an RNGO, and it instrumentalises religion by using a church for its aid activities. IRW does not abuse religion and its entities. The same applies to Oxfam. Secularism dominates the presumption of neutrality because the three organisations classify religion into one of the three roles that the secular humanitarian system established for religion. Eventually, despite instrumentalising, marginalising, and privatising religion, the religious affiliation of Caritas and IRW supports their interaction with the local communities and thereby manages not to harm the presumption of neutrality.

Concluding Remarks

The chapter argued that Oxfam is neutral, but Caritas and IRW are not. The research discovered that Caritas and IRW are also neutral; their religious background personalises humanitarian

action because they engage with disaster-affected communities. Oxfam remains neutral but distant because it neglects to interact with disaster-affected communities in the private realm. Secularity encumbers the engagement with disaster victims, while religion advances the engagement with disaster victims because of RNGOs' care for the individuals. This chapter established that the NGOs are neutral. The next chapter looks into their humanitarian actions.

Chapter 3: Secular and Religious Dynamics in the Presumption of Modernity

The previous chapter discussed the precondition for the presumption of modernity. This chapter focuses on the modernity presumption. The secular humanitarian system claims that modernisation is only possible through material and economic aid. Therefore, non-physical aid is not essential aid. The secular humanitarian system believes that the irrationality of religion obstructs modernisation. Therefore, the chapter argues that Oxfam fosters the development of the Philippines and Indonesia because it focuses on physical aid, while Caritas and IRW focus on non-physical aid and thus hamper the countries' modernisation. The chapter begins with the modernisation processes outlined by Secularisation Theory. It then turns to the material and psychosocial aid before it discusses economic aid. Eventually, the chapter discusses religion's role in the presumption of modernity.

Modernity: Religion Belongs in the Private Sphere

The secular humanitarianism system insists that religion is inadequate for humanitarian action. Following the statement of Secularisation Theory, the secular humanitarian system demands that religion belongs to the private sphere (Pollack 2015, 61). As a result, religion does not belong in the public sphere. The public sphere has to remain free for modernity and, consequently, for secularity. Hence, NGOs engaging in humanitarian action must work in the public sphere. The transgression into the private sphere represents a violation of the humanitarian principle of neutrality and modernity. Non-association ensures neutrality, which then again ensures unbiased need assessment. In other words, the assessment of the universal needs has to be independent of the organisations' and disaster-affected communities' ideological, political, economic, racial, gender, and religious belonging to ensure neutrality and consequently any humanitarian organisation acts based on the idea of impartiality. Therefore, the secular humanitarian system assumes that if an organisation looks beyond the universal needs, it will damage its reputation as an impartial and neutral actor. Hence, the researcher expected to find that Oxfam, Caritas, and IRW as NGOs deal with the people's basic needs in the public sphere and thus advance the modernisation process of the Philippines and Indonesia.

The research findings discovered that Oxfam divides between the public and private realm, while Caritas and IRW blur the border between the public and private sphere by

illustrating how their material aid supported individuals' personal lives in each country. Oxfam (2013a) informs about the amount of money it spend for its humanitarian action and which needs it satisfied for the disaster-affected community. It provides food, water, and sanitary kits (Oxfam 2013a). Oxfam (2013d; 2013d) wants to work with local secular partners to provide aid as quickly as possible. Additionally, Oxfam (2018a) introduced an online and offline app that regulates the interaction with the affected communities and any organisation, besides its previously created communication platform. In contrast, IRW blurs the border between the public and the private realm because it wants to integrate an Islamic perspective in the humanitarian principles (IRW 2013a). This Islamic point of view of the humanitarian principles does not mean that IRW wants to replace the humanitarian principles with religious principles; IRW (2013a) wants to combine them and make them friendlier towards religion because religion matters in many places, and IRW wants to establish a faith-based framework to offer guidance for the developing world on a cultural, societal perspective. Eventually, Caritas (2013k) combines the public and private realm by using religious institutions, like Churches, as aid distribution centres. Caritas (2013k) first relied on and then supplemented the aid provided by the local churches in remote areas because it took the organisation days to reach the most secluded areas.

The three NGOs have different approaches to deal with fostering the development of the Philippines and Indonesia. Interestingly, Caritas and IRW primarily focused on combining the private and public spheres in the Philippines. It might be the case that the disaster in Indonesia does not require private aid as much as the typhoon in the Philippines because the Indonesian government prefers to handle disaster relief on a national level (UN OCHA 2018b); they only deploy international organisations when they cannot provide sufficient aid (UN OCHA 2018b). The Indonesian government controls the foreign aid providers and their aid (The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies 2018, 12). As the research does not focus on the Indonesian government, it only allows speculation whether the two organisations did not care as much about the private as they did for the disaster in the Philippines because of the significant influence of the Indonesian government. This issue can lead to further research.

Next, Oxfam and its technological invention for the Indonesian disaster reveals that it wants to include technology in its humanitarian actions to foster Indonesian development. Technology is a crucial aspect of modernisation because technology is the foundation for shifting from a traditional society to modern society. Hence, the application of an app supports the humanitarian actions of NGOs and the disaster-affected population to advance the country's

modernisation process. The users can buy any material aid supplies that the disaster-affected community requires (Oxfam 2018a). Additionally, the communication platform is for aid distributors and receivers to state what they need (Oxfam 2018a, 21). Oxfam's app and platform refers back to the argumentation that religion hinders the development process, and secularity promotes modernisation. Caritas and IRW did not invent an app, and neither do they refer to any technical programme they use for their humanitarian actions. Caritas and IRW rely on analogue methods to distribute aid and communicate with other NGOs.

Caritas and IRW engage in personal interaction with their partners and aid receivers by collaborating with local partners in both countries (Caritas 2013b; IRW 2013d; 2018b) and churches in Indonesia (Caritas 2013b; IRW 2013c). Following the modernisation argument of Secularisation Theory coupled with the secular humanitarian system, RNGOs must hinder the modernisation process, and SNGOs support the modernisation process. Neither Caritas nor IRW hinders the modernisation process in the Philippines and Indonesia; their modus operandi relies on personal interaction with the affected communities. The organisations focus on the cultural and national aspects of the country and try to include them in their humanitarian actions. Consequently, through their humanitarian actions, the promotion of modernity does not follow the traditional lines of modernisation by rejecting the private sphere - instead, Caritas and IRW attempt to include the private sphere to support modernity. In contrast, Oxfam supports the division of the public and private sphere by promoting the use of technology to speed up the modernisation process. The used technology for its humanitarian actions hinders the inclusion of the private sphere because technology does not require personal interaction among the NGOs and the disaster-affected communities. In other words, the app provides aid from a distance as the technology does not require personal interaction. Any NGO and the local population can share and receive information about available aid through the app. Oxfam follows the traditional lines of modernisation because it attempts to distance itself as far as possible from the local communities. It wants to ensure quick humanitarian action based on impartiality through modern methods. The research findings confirm that Oxfam deals with the basic needs of the disaster-affected people in the Philippines and Indonesia in the public sphere, while Caritas and IRW deal with the basic needs of the disaster-affected people by combining the public and private sphere in the Philippines and Indonesia.

Modernity: Material Aid Versus Psychosocial Aid

The division of the private and public is also visible in the form of aid. The humanitarian principle of impartiality refers to the basic and universal needs of the population. As the need shall be given without any preferences, the needs refer to the material needs (Ager and Ager 2015, 14). The secular humanitarian system acknowledges that there are non-physical needs, but it disregards them because they are not universal and basic needs, and as a consequence, they belong to the private sphere. Furthermore, the secular humanitarian system follows the line of argumentation that modernisation happens through rationalisation (Little 2016). Rationality ends the irrationality of non-physicality, such as religion, and replaces it with the rationality of materialism (Hedoin 2009, 173; Little 2016, 653). Modernisation processes require material aid because material aid is rational aid as it supports the advancement of a country to move forward from a traditional society to modern and secular society. Consequently, any form of aid that is not material is irrational aid and does not support the modernisation of the country and its society.

This division implies that for humanitarian actions, SNGOs have to take care of the universal and basic needs of the disaster-affected communities to foster the development of a country. Consequently, if humanitarian actions include RNGOs, they will not focus on material aid; instead, they focus on irrational aid like psychosocial aid. The secular humanitarian system declares that RNGOs do not support the modernisation process after a natural disaster struck because RNGOs do not focus on basic needs. In other words, the secular humanitarian system considers any RNGO as counterproductive for modernisation. This assumption of the secular humanitarian system led to the expectation for this research that Oxfam focuses on material aid to support the modernisation process of the Philippines and Indonesia, while Caritas and IRW focus on psychosocial aid instead of material aid in the two countries.

The research findings disconfirmed the expectation because all three organisations provide material aid. They address the basic needs. Caritas and IRW expressed their concern for psychosocial aid, but their main focus lay with material aid in the Philippines and Indonesia. It is important to highlight that the findings revealed that Caritas, IRW, and Oxfam followed the humanitarian principle of impartiality. They concentrated on the basic needs and the most vulnerable people in the respective countries (Caritas 2013l, 2018c; IRW 2014d, 2014i, 2018a; 2018c, 2; Oxfam 2013b; 2013e; 2018a, 26). About the Philippines, the three organisations feared that the neglect of the material aid for the vulnerable people would increase their suffering and thus disadvantage them and the Philippines (Caritas 2013a; IRW 2014b; 2014c;

Oxfam 2013f; 2014b, 16). Interestingly, that fear does not pertain to Indonesia, which could be because the organisations work supplementary to the national forces (UN OCHA 2018b).

Next, the research findings also revealed that Caritas and IRW include psychosocial aid, albeit not their primary target. The psychosocial care that the organisations provide is basic. The organisations include personal stories in their press releases and thus give disaster victims a chance to talk about their experience. Caritas and IRW refer to the importance psychosocial aid have for the disaster victims. However, they do not detail whether they provide this form of aid and how they provide psychosocial aid for the respective population. The findings revealed that Caritas integrates more psychosocial aid than IRW. It is noteworthy that the two organisations link their psychosocial concerns with material aid. The research also confirmed that psychosocial aid does not concern Oxfam. The findings revealed that Oxfam believes that the best way to help the disaster-affected community is by handing out material aid and supporting them financially. In contrast, the findings revealed that Caritas and IRW believe that although material aid eases suffering immediately, material aid does not heal the wounds that the respective disaster caused for the individuals. They assume that mental wounds will take their time to heal (Caritas 2013i, 2019; IRW 2013b, 2014f, 2018c, 2018f). Caritas (2013i) and IRW (2018f) link psychosocial needs to material needs.

Further, one unanticipated finding was that the disaster-affected communities link the material aid with psychosocial aid or spirituality. The local communities link rationality with irrationality. They thanked the respective organisation for the material aid and related it to their spiritual state of mental health; "'The food has helped us to keep going, to not give up hope. I also get strength from the love Caritas shows us and this makes me stay strong for my grandchildren. Without this strength and hope we would really have gone hungry - in our bodies and our souls'" (Caritas 2014b). The survivor illustrates her struggle; through the distributed food and love from Caritas, the survivor gained the strength to keep going. In other words, the material aid helped the psychosocial well-being of the individuals. Moreover, the disaster-affected communities also combine faith with materiality. They believe that God sent them the organisations, but that the organisations are not related to God; instead, they are their own units who came to help (Caritas 2013l; 2014a; 2018c; IRW 2014h; 2014i; 2014j; 2018b). Although the research does not focus on the affected communities, the findings reveal an interesting aspect. The division of material aid and psychosocial aid resembles secularity in humanitarianism because Oxfam is the only party that insists on separating rational and irrational aid to advance the development of the Philippines and Indonesia into modern

countries. Oxfam does not consider that the combination of irrational and rational aid can support modernisation processes. In contrast, Caritas and IRW follow the demanded secular division of material and psychosocial aid, but they acknowledge that the focus of material aid is not the sole solution to help the disaster-affected community. The two organisations look further than the public sphere and see that the victims need more than physical aid to modernise. The disaster-affected communities combine the public and private spheres by merging material and psychosocial aid. The secular humanitarian system forces a division onto the people that the people do not have. The religious humanitarian system seems to understand that the division hampers modernisation and impartiality because the basic needs also include psychosocial aid. The disaster-affected communities do not separate between what the secular humanitarian system refers to as rational and irrational aid.

Modernity: Economic Aid

Another form of modernisation is economic aid, which is also rational aid. The secular humanitarian system argues that SNGOs foster modernisation through economic aid. Economic aid consists of cash grants, cash for work programmes, rebuilding of infrastructure, and increasing economic activities to move from primary to secondary economic activities (Oxfam 2014a). The secular humanitarian system assumes that RNGOs do not engage in economic aid because their religious affiliation hinders them from applying economic aid because of the irrationality of religion. Hence, the researcher expected that Oxfam engages economic aid in the Philippines and Indonesia, while Caritas and IRW do not support economic aid in the two countries.

The research findings confirmed that Oxfam supports economic aid, while it rebuts the assumption that Caritas and IRW do not engage in economic aid. Caritas and IRW might not emphasise economic aid as much as Oxfam, because Oxfam (2013e, 2014a, 2014b, 2019) only reports about its economic and material aid without relating it to the disaster-affected communities. However, Caritas (2013a, 2014d, 2018c) and IRW (2014b, 2014i, 2019b) do not neglect economic aid and recognise its importance to modernise the country and lift people out of poverty. The research findings also revealed that Oxfam (2013c; 2013f; 2018a, 26; 2019) focuses on the modernisation of the country in the public sphere by concentrating on what the disaster meant for the economy in the Philippines and Indonesia, while Caritas (2014e, 2018c) and IRW (2014i, 2018d) concentrates more on the private sphere to improve the living condition of the disaster-affected people in the two countries. The three organisations provide

cash assistance (Caritas 2014c, 2018c; IRW 2014i, 2018f; Oxfam 2014a, 2019). Interestingly, IRW (2019b) applied Islamic financing in Indonesia for its economic aid. In contrast, IRW (2014i) did not use it for its aid in the Philippines. Also, Caritas does not give any information on whether it bases its aid on a religious scheme, and neither does Oxfam explain the programme, terms, and conditions behind its economic aid.

In addition to the cash assistance, Caritas (2014b, 2018c), IRW (2014k; 2019b, 22), and Oxfam (2013f, 2014a, 2019) taught the locals about new forms of economic activities, such as carpentry, while the farmers and fishers have to wait until they can pick up their previous work. The organisations aimed to expand the farmers' and fishers' skills to maintain or even improve their living standards after the natural disaster and not fall deeper into poverty (Oxfam 2014a, 32; 2018a, 26). Furthermore, in line with the neutrality principle, the three NGOs prioritise the most vulnerable communities in the Philippines and Indonesia (Caritas 2014c, 2018c; IRW 2013c, 2018b; Oxfam 2013e, 11-12; 2019). Hence, their efforts for modernisation build on its precondition of neutrality.

The economic aid that Caritas, IRW, and Oxfam provide has its foundation on the precondition of neutrality. Caritas seems to leave religion aside when it deals with finances. The organisation cares about lifting people out of poverty, but it does not present in its press releases and reports whether its financial aid has a background in Christianity, like the financial support from IRW in Indonesia. IRW (2019b) only uses Islamic finance in Indonesia. In the Philippines, it does not mention that it bases its financial aid on Islam. It might be that IRW adapts to the respective country's financial system. Oxfam does not link its financial aid to religion as financial aid is secular, but the data does not reveal any information about the terms and conditions of the cash assistance. All three organisations might be neutral regarding whom they give their financial aid, but it is impossible to state whether there are terms and conditions added to this form of aid. Hence, the research discovers that Caritas, IRW, and Oxfam provide economic aid to modernise the two countries. It remains open if and how Oxfam's secularity and Caritas's and IRW's religiosity influence financial aid in the Philippines and Indonesia.

Religion's Role in the Presumption of Modernity

The role of religion in the presumption of modernity is that the secular humanitarian system privatised religion in the Philippines and Indonesia. The religious humanitarian system tried to merge the private and public realm through the inclusion of psychosocial aid; however, Caritas

and IRW did not tap the full potential of the combination of material and psychosocial aid. They gave hints that a merger between rational and irrational aid would benefit humanitarianism, but they abided by the secular humanitarian principle of impartiality too strictly. Oxfam, as an SNGO, does not consider irrational aid and only focuses on the essential material needs. It fully commits to secularism. Caritas, IRW, except in Indonesia, and Oxfam disregard religion in their financial aid. Oxfam disregards religion in financial aid because economic aid is for the public sphere, and religion belongs to the private sphere. As a consequence, the organisations also privatised religion in economic aid. IRW, except in Indonesia, and Caritas seem to assume that religion does not add anything to economic aid. Hence, they marginalised religion in financial aid. Furthermore, Caritas instrumentalised religion for its distribution of material aid. It is noteworthy that Caritas did not instrumentalised religion as faith but a local church. It turned the church into a warehouse to distribute material aid. IRW and Oxfam do not see any aspects in which religion helps them in material aid and hence did not use religion as a tool. In general, the presumption of modernity gives more space to secularism than the presumption of neutrality.

Concluding Remarks

The chapter argued that Oxfam fosters the development of the Philippines and Indonesia because it focus on physical aid, while Caritas and IRW focus on non-physical aid and thus hamper the countries' modernisation. The chapter found that Caritas, IRW, and Oxfam support modernisation. Oxfam provides material aid and fails to recognise the importance of psychosocial aid for modernisation. Caritas and IRW recognise the importance but do not tap its full potential because they adhere to the impartiality principle. In economic aid, the organisations do not differ in their religious and ideological affiliation, except IRW in Indonesia, because they do not consider religion a valuable financial aid tool. Eventually, the presumption of modernity privatises religion.

Conclusion

The research aimed to answer the research question: how do the humanitarian actions of Caritas, IRW, and Oxfam after Typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines in 2013 and the September Earthquake and Tsunami in Indonesia in 2018 challenge the common renditions of Secularisation Theory. Through the textual analysis of press releases and annual reports, it is possible to conclude that secularism still dominates the humanitarianism system in post-disaster environment settings. At the same time, religion finds its way back into humanitarianism by filling gaps that secularism creates. The analysis reveals that the inclusion of religion through RNGOs enriches the secular humanitarianism system. Caritas and IRW blur the border between the public and private sphere that Secularisation Theory forces upon humanitarianism in post-natural disaster settings. Furthermore, Caritas and IRW promote modernisation through the combination of the public and private spheres.

The first chapter laid out the generalities about the secular humanitarian system. It showed that the Secularisation Theory embarks on the humanitarian principles with specific attention to the humanitarian principles of neutrality and impartiality. The principle of neutrality is the precondition for impartiality because humanitarian action can only be impartial when the humanitarian actor is neutral. As neutrality is the requirement for impartiality, the research focused on analysing and discussing the presumption of neutrality first. The researcher expected to find that Caritas and IRW do not follow the neutrality principle, while Oxfam abides by it. The expectations were not fulfilled. Caritas and IRW treated the disaster-affected communities equally and did not favour the population with which the organisation shares the faith. Instead, Caritas, IRW, and Oxfam provide aid to the most vulnerable people regardless of the people's religious or other ideological belonging. The chapter also showed that the two organisations' religiosity enriches the interaction with the disaster victims, while Oxfam created a barrier between itself and the victims. After discovering the maintenance of the neutrality principle, the research turned to the presumption of modernity, which represents the impartiality principle. The chapter argued that Caritas and IRW hamper modernisation because they do not focus on the essential needs, while Oxfam focuses on the material aid. It was discovered that Oxfam's insistence on material aid hampers modernisation more because non-physical aid supports the disaster victims to keep going, as Caritas and IRW showed. However, the Caritas and IRW only acknowledged that non-physical aid supports the modernisation processes; they did not perform it because they complied with the impartiality principle. Another discovery of the research was that Caritas and IRW followed the same path of economic aid that Oxfam takes. Caritas and

IRW behaved more like Oxfam than that they followed the expectations of the secular humanitarian system has for RNGOs. To sum it up, albeit secularity dominates the humanitarian system, RNGOs' inclusion points to flaws in the secular humanitarian system.

Eventually, the research added to the research field of secular and religious dynamics in humanitarianism in post-natural disaster settings, a newly emerging field. The field belongs to the general discussion of the accuracy of Secularisation Theory. This research added to the discussion by confirming that secularisation is still at the heart of international politics while simultaneously confirming that religion did not permanently move to the private sphere. Impartiality and neutrality are possible to maintain even if the humanitarian actors come from a religious background.

The field requires further research. Through the textual analysis of press releases and annual reports, it was possible to investigate the side of the humanitarian actors. However, research on the disaster-affected communities and their perception of the SNGOs and RNGOs in terms of neutrality and impartiality can shed light on how religious populations engage with secular and religious humanitarian actors in the post-disaster setting. It would also add a practical perspective to the theoretical perspective of this research as it requires field research. Furthermore, the dynamics regarding neutrality among SNGOs and RNGOs in post-disaster settings might also be interesting because this research showed that NGOs often collaborate. The research can even expand to investigate whether the dynamics among the RNGOs and SNGOs affect the disaster-affected communities and how they relate to the respective organisations then.

As the research is a newly emerging field, the findings can be of use for religious and secular organisations and institutions. The findings suggest that religion enhances secularism. Consequently, the research provides a point of discussion for improving the humanitarian system because it is an intractable endeavour to take religion out of a society that values religion in its public and private sphere (Wilkinson 2020, 36); and as this research discovered, religion enriches secularism.

References

Abbott, Roger Philipp and Roger S. White. 2019. "How Our Faith Responded." In *Narratives of Faith From the Haiti Earthquake: Religion, Natural Hazards and Disaster Response*, edited by Roger Philipp Abbott and Roger S. White, 49-71. New York: Routledge.

Ager, Alastair and Joey Ager. 2011. "Faith and the Discourse of Secular Humanitarianism." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 24, no. 3 (September): 456-472. https://doi-org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/10.1093/jrs/fer030.

Ager, Alastair and Joey Ager. 2015. *Faith, Secularism and Humanitarian Engagement: Finding the Place of Religion in the Support of Displaced Communities*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ager, Joey, Behailu Abebe and Alastair Ager. 2014. "Mental Health and Psychosocial Support in Humanitarian Emergencies in Africa: Challenges and Opportunities for Engaging with the Faith Sector." *The Review of Faith and International Affairs* 12, no. 1 (March): 72-83. https://doi.org/10.1080/15570274.2013.876729.

Ager, Wendy, Michael French, Atallah Fitzgibbon and Alastair Ager. 2019. "The Case For – and Challenges of – Faith-Sensitive Psychosocial Programming." *Intervention* 17, no. 1 (June): 69-75.

ASEAN Coordinating Centre for Humanitarian Assistance on Disaster Management. 2018. *Situation Report No. 12*. Jakarta: AHA Centre. https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/AHA-Situation_Update-no12-Sulawesi-EQ-rev.pdf.

Bankoff, Gregory. 2001. "Rendering the World Unsafe: 'Vulnerability' as Western Discourse." *Disasters* 25, no. 1 (March): 19-35. https://doi-org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/10.1002/sd.1620.

Barnett, Michael and Thomas G. Weiss. 2008. "Humanitarianism: A Brief History of the Present." In *Humanitarianism in Question: Politics, Power, Ethics*, edited by Michael Barnett and Thomas G. Weiss, 1-48. New York: Cornell University Press.

Benedetti, Carlo. 2006. "Islamic and Christian Inspired Relief NGOs: Between Tactical Collaboration and Strategic Diffidence?" *Journal of International Development* 18, no. 6 (July): 849-859. https://doi-org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/10.1002/jid.1318.

Benthall, Jonathan. 2012. "'Cultural Proximity' and the Conjuncture of Islam with Modern Humanitarianism." In *Sacred Aid: Faith and Humanitarianism*, edited by Michael Barnett and Janice Gross Stein, 65-89. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Berger, Peter. 1967. *The Sacred Canopy: Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion*. New York: Doubleday and Company.

Bernard, Vincent. 2015. "The Humanitarian Ethos in Action." *International Review of the Red Cross* 97, no. 897-898 (Spring/Summer): 7-18.

Antonia Koberg, s2042347

Bush, Robin, Philip Fountain and R. Michael Feener. 2015. "Religious Actors in Disaster Relief: An Introduction." *International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters* 33, no. 1 (March): 1-16.

Calhoun, Craig. 2012. "Time, World, and Secularism." In *The Post-Secular in Question: Religion in Contemporary Society*, edited by Philip Gorski, David Kyuman Kim, John Torpey and Jonathan Van Antwerpen, 335-364. New York: New York University Press.

Caritas Internationalis. 2013a. "Philippines Storm Survivors in Great Need." *Caritas*, November 10, 2013. https://www.caritas.org/2013/11/philippines-storm-survivors-great-need/.

---. 2013b. "Some Areas of the Philippines Face 'Total Ruin'." *Caritas*, November 11, 2013. https://www.caritas.org/2013/11/areas-philippines-face-total-ruin/.

---. 2013c. "Aid Making Its Way to Victims of Typhoon Haiyan in Philippines." *Caritas*, November 12, 2013. https://www.caritas.org/2013/11/aid-making-way-victims-typhoon-haiyan-philippines/.

---. 2013d. "A Message of Love and Hope For the Philippines." *Caritas,* November 13, 2013. https://www.caritas.org/2013/11/message-love-hope-philippines/.

---. 2013e. "Philippines Survivors: Help! Water! Food!" *Caritas*, November 13, 2013. https://www.caritas.org/2013/11/philippines-survivors-help-water-food/.

---. 2013f. "Eye Witness Accounts in Tacloban As Philippine Relief Efforts Continue." *Caritas,* November 14, 2013. https://www.caritas.org/2013/11/eye-witness-accounts-tacloban-philippine-relief-efforts-continue/.

---. 2013g. "International and Local Caritas Efforts Underway in the Philippines." *Caritas*, November 15, 2013. https://www.caritas.org/2013/11/international-local-caritas-efforts-underway-philippines/.

---. 2013h. "Parts of Philippines Like A 'Valley of Death' After Typhoon." *Caritas*, November 18, 2013. https://www.caritas.org/2013/11/parts-philippines-like-valley-death-typhoon/.

---. 2013i. "Hitching Aid Flight to Worst Hit Areas of Philippines." *Caritas*, November 20, 2013. https://www.caritas.org/2013/11/hitching-aid-flight-worst-hit-areas-philippines/.

---. 2013j. "Reaching Remote Areas of Philippines Hit by Typhoon." *Caritas*, November 26, 2013. https://www.caritas.org/2013/11/reaching-remote-areas-philippines-hit-typhoon/.

---. 2013k. "Hope Still Standing in the Philippines." *Caritas*, December 4, 2013. https://www.caritas.org/2013/12/hope-still-standing-philippines/.

---. 2013l. "Food and Shelter Distributions Going Well in Typhoon-Hit Philippines." *Caritas*, December 17, 2013. https://www.caritas.org/2013/12/food-shelter-distributions-going-well-typhoon-hit-philippines/.

---. 2014a. "A Young Girl in Need of Water in Philippines After Haiyan." *Caritas*, February 6, 2014. https://www.caritas.org/2014/02/young-girl-need-water/.

---. 2014b. "A Widow in Need of Food in the Philippines After Haiyan." *Caritas*, March 6, 2014. https://www.caritas.org/2014/03/widow-need-food/.

---. 2014c. "Philippines Rises up After Typhoon Haiyan." *Caritas*, April 16, 2014. https://www.caritas.org/2014/04/philippines-rises-typhoon-haiyan/.

---. 2014d. "Caritas Clean up Operations in the Philippines after Haiyan." *Caritas*, May 6, 2014. https://www.caritas.org/2014/05/caritas-cleanup-operation/.

---. 2014e. "Rebuilding From the Ruins of Haiyan in Philippines." *Caritas*, May 6, 2014. https://www.caritas.org/2014/05/rebuilding-ruins/.

---. 2014f. "No Place Like Home as Family Rebuild in the Philippines." *Caritas*, May 6, 2014. https://www.caritas.org/2014/05/place-like-home-families-rebuild-philippines/.

---. 2014g. "Philippines Rising: One Year After Haiyan – A New House for Amalia." *Caritas*, October 31, 2014. https://www.caritas.org/2014/10/philippine-typhoon-anniversary-new-house-amalia/.

---. 2014h. "Philippines Rising: One Year After Haiyan – A Town Full of Hope." *Caritas*, October 31, 2014. https://www.caritas.org/2014/10/philippines-rising-town-full-hope/.

---. 2014i. "Philippines Rising: One Year After Haiyan." *Caritas*, October 31, 2014. https://www.caritas.org/2014/10/philippines-rising/.

---. 2014j. "Philippines Rising: One Year After Haiyan – Flora's Story." *Caritas*, October 31, 2014. https://www.caritas.org/2014/10/philippines-rising-one-year-haiyan-floras-story/.

---. 2018a. "Oración Por Indonesia." *Caritas*, October 4, 2014. https://www.caritas.org/2018/10/prayer-for-indonesia-after-the-earthquake-and-tsunami/.

---. 2018b. "Scenes of Loss Following the Indonesia Tsunami." *Caritas*, October 5, 2014. https://www.caritas.org/2018/10/scenes-of-loss-following-the-indonesia-earthquake/.

---. 2018c. "How Caritas is Helping People to Recover From The Indonesia Earthquake." *Caritas*, October 31, 2018. https://www.caritas.org/2018/10/recovering-from-the-indonesia-earthquake/.

---. 2019. "Two Million Earthquake Survivors Continue to Suffer in Indonesia." *Caritas,* January 1, 2019. https://www.caritas.org/2019/01/earthquake-victims-still-suffer/.

---. n.d. "Who We Are." Accessed June 14, 2021. https://www.caritas.org/who-we-are/.

Clarke, Matthew. 2016. "Points of Equilibrium: Religious Beliefs and Economic Development Policy." *Sustainable Development* 24, no. 3 (May): 181-189. https://doi-org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/10.1002/sd.1620.

De Cordier, Bruno. 2009. "Faith-Based Aid, Globalisation and the Humanitarian Frontline: An Analysis of Western-Based Muslim Aid Organisations." *Disasters* 33, no. 4 (July): 608-628. https://doi-org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/10.1111/j.1467-7717.2008.01090.x.

Antonia Koberg, s2042347

Deacon, Gregory, and Emma Tomalin. 2015. "A History of Faith-Based Aid and Development." In *The Routledge Handbook of Religions and Global Development*, edited by Emma Tomalin, 68-79. London and New York: Routledge.

Ezrow, Natasha M., Erica Frantz, and Andrea Kendall-Taylor. 2016. *Development and the State in the 21st Century: Tackling the Challenges Facing the Developing World*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ferris, Elizabeth. 2005. "Faith-Based and Secular Humanitarian Organizations." *International Review of the Red Cross* 87, no. 868 (June): 311-325. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1816383100181366.

---. 2011. "Faith and Humanitarianism: It's Complicated." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 24, no. 3 (September): 606-625. https://doi-org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/10.1093/jrs/fer028.

Frame, John. 2020. "A Modified Typology of Classify Secular NGOs and Faith-Based Organisations in Development Contexts." *Development in Practice* 30, no. 2. (December): 143-153. https://doi.org/10.1080/09614524.2019.1693505.

Ghandour, Abdel-Rahman. 2003. "Humanitarianism, Islam and the West: Context or Cooperation?" *Humanitarian Exchange Magazine* 25, December 2003. https://odihpn.org/wp-content/uploads/2003/12/humanitarianexchange025.pdf.

Hedoin, Cyril. 2009. "Weber and Veblen on the Rationalisation Process." *Journal of Economics* 43, no. 1 (December): 167-188. https://doi.org/10.2753/JEI0021-3624430108.

Humanitarian Country Team and United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. 2013. *Philippines: Typhoon Haiyan Action Plan November 2013*. Geneva and New York: United Nations. https://www.google.com/search?q=UN+OCHA&oq=UN+OCHA&aqs=chrome.0.69i59l3j0l2j69i60l3.992j0j4&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8.

International Committee of the Red Cross. 1994. "Code of Conduct for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) in Disaster Relief." Accessed June 10, 2021. https://www.icrc.org/en/doc/assets/files/publications/icrc-002-1067.pdf.

---. 2020. "The Fundamental Principles of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement." Accessed June 10, 2021. https://www.icrc.org/en/publication/4046-fundamental-principles-international-red-cross-and-red-crescent-movement.

Islamic Relief Worldwide. 2013a. *2013 Annual Report & Financial Statements*. Birmingham: Islamic Relief Worldwide. https://www.islamic-relief.org/annual-reports/.

---. 2013b. "Lives Decimated, Spirits Undaunted." *Reliefweb*, November 18, 2013. https://reliefweb.int/report/philippines/lives-decimated-spirits-undaunted.

---. 2013c. "Super Typhoon Haiyan is a Global Wake-Up Call in Fight Against Poverty." *Reliefweb*, November 25, 2013. https://reliefweb.int/report/philippines/super-typhoon-haiyan-global-wake-call-fight-against-poverty.

---. 2013d. "Keep calm and Carry on Saving Lives." *Reliefweb*, December 9, 2013. https://reliefweb.int/report/philippines/keep-calm-and-carry-saving-lives.

---. 2013e. "'Our Passion for Study Can't be Taken.'" *Reliefweb*. December 20, 2013. https://reliefweb.int/report/philippines/our-passion-study-can-t-be-taken.

---. 2014a. "Nurturing a Brighter Future in Cebu, Philippines." *Islamic Relief Worldwide [IRW]*, January 7, 2014.

---. 2014b. "Typhoon Haiyan – Three Month On." *Islamic Relief UK*, February 7, 2014. https://www.islamic-relief.org.uk/typhoon-haiyan-three-months-on/.

---. 2014c. "Feature: Responding to Typhoon Haiyan." *IRW*, May 25, 2014. https://www.islamic-relief.org/feature-responding-to-typhoon-haiyan/.

---. 2014d. "'Now We Have A House That is Even Better Than The One We Lost.'" *IRW*, June 12, 2014. https://www.islamic-relief.org/now-we-have-a-house-that-is-even-better-than-the-one-we-lost/.

---. 2014e. "'We Kept Praying to God for Our Lives.'" *IRW*, June 21, 2014. https://www.islamic-relief.org/i-cant-express-my-gratitude/.

---. 2014f. "'Mama, Mama, Let's Go – Yolanda is Coming.'" *IRW*, June 21, 2014. https://www.islamic-relief.org/mama-mama-lets-go-yolanda-is-coming/.

---. 2014g. "Global Handwashing Day in The Philippines." *IRW*, November 3, 2014. https://www.islamic-relief.org/global-handwashing-day-in-the-philippines/.

---. 2014h. "Finding Clean Water After Typhoon Haiyan." *Islamic Relief UK*, November 7, 2014. https://www.islamic-relief.org.uk/finding-clean-water-after-typhoon-haiyan/.

---. 2014i. "Haiyan: 'Being Alive Now is Indeed a Miracle.'" *IRW*, November 8, 2014. https://www.islamic-relief.org/haiyan-being-alive-now-is-indeed-a-miracle/.

---. 2014j. "Haiyan: 'The Start and End of The World.'" *IRW*, November 8, 2014. https://www.islamic-relief.org/haiyan-the-start-and-end-of-the-world/.

---. 2018a. *2018 Annual Report & Financial Statement*. Birmingham: Islamic Relief Worldwide. https://www.islamic-relief.org/annual-reports/.

---. 2018b. "Islamic Relief Assisting Rescue Efforts in Donggala and Palu." *IRW*, October 1, 2018. https://www.islamic-relief.org/islamic-relief-rescue-efforts-donggala-palu/.

---. 2018c. "Indonesia Earthquake and Tsunami." *IRW,* October 3, 2018. https://www.islamic-relief.org/indonesia-earthquake-tsunami/.

---. 2018d. "Mother and Baby Survive Earthquake and Tsunami." *IRW*, October 29, 2018. https://www.islamic-relief.org/mother-baby-survive-earthquake/.

---. 2018e. "All We Can Rely on is The Relief Given to Us." *IRW*, November 22, 2018. https://www.islamic-relief.org/all-we-can-rely-on-is-the-relief-given-to-us/.

---. 2018f. "'Don't Abandon us: Indonesia Earthquake and Tsunami Survivors Mark 60 Days of Grief." *IRW,* November 29, 2018. https://www.islamic-relief.org/dont-abandon-us-indonesia/.

---. 2019a. *Real-Time Evaluation (RTE) of Sulawesi Indonesia Earthquake and Tsunami*. Birmingham: Islamic Relief Worldwide. https://www.islamic-relief.org/evaluations/.

---. 2019b. *A Year After Disaster Struck Sulawesi, Its People Are Still Rebuilding Their Lives*. Birmingham: Islamic Relief Worldwide https://www.islamic-relief.org/a-year-after-disaster-struck-sulawesi-its-people-are-still-rebuilding-their-lives/.

---. n.d. "About Us." Accessed June 14, 2021. https://www.islamic-relief.org/about-us/.

James, Rick. 2009. *Praxis Paper 22: What is Distinctive About FBOs? How European FBOs define and operationalise their Faith*. Oxford: INTRAC.

Karina. n.d. "Karina Caritas Indonesia." Accessed June 13, 2021. http://karina.or.id/.

Kaufmann, Franz-Xaver. 1997. "Religion and Modernization in Europe." *Journal of institutional and theoretical economics* 153, no. 1 (March): 80-96. http://www.digizeitschriften.de/dms/resolveppn/?PID=GDZPPN00082447X.

Khafagy, Riham Ahmed. 2020. "Faith-Based Organizations: Humanitarian Mission or Religious Missionary." *Journal of International Humanitarian Action* 5, no. 13 (October): 1-11. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41018-020-00080-6.

Krafess, Jamal. 2005. "The Influence of the Muslim Religion in Humanitarian Aid." *International Review of the Red Cross* 87, no. 858 (June): 327-342. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1816383100181378.

Little, William. 2016. *Introduction to Sociology*. Houston: OpenStax College. https://opentextbc.ca/introductiontosociology2ndedition/.

Luckmann, Thomas. 1967. *The Invisible Religion: The Problem of Religion in Modern Society*. New York: Macmillan.

Lynch, Cecelia and Tanya B. Schwarz. 2016. "Humanitarianism's Proselytism Problem." *International Studies Quarterly* 60, no. 4 (December): 636-646. https://doi-org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/10.1093/isq/sqw024.

Martens, Kerstin. 2002. "Mission Impossible? Defining Nongovernmental Organizations." *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 13, no. 3 (September): 271-285. https://doi-org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/10.1023/A:1020341526691.

Mercy Corps. 2020. "The Facts: Indonesia Earthquakes, Tsunamis and Other Natural Disasters." Accessed June 13, 2021. https://www.mercycorps.org/blog/quick-facts-indonesia-disasters.

Mlay, Wilfred. 2004. "Some Myths About Faith-Based Humanitarian Aid." *Humanitarian Exchange Magazine 27*, July 2004. https://odihpn.org/magazine/some-myths-about-faith-based-humanitarian-aid/.

Oxfam di Indonesia. n.d. "Oxfam." Accessed June 13, 2021. https://indonesia.oxfam.org/.

Oxfam International. 2013a. *2013-2014 Annual Report*. Oxford: Oxfam International. https://www-cdn.oxfam.org/s3fs-public/file_attachments/story/oxfam_annual_report_2013_-_2014_final.pdf

---. 2013b. "Typhoon Haiyan: Oxfam Plans to Reach 100,000 People In First Phase of Crisis." *Oxfam International [Oxfam],* November 15, 2013. https://www.oxfam.org/en/press-releases/typhoon-haiyan-oxfam-plans-reach-100000-people-first-phase-crisis.

---. 2013c. *Philippines Typhoon: Oxfam Fact Sheet*. Oxford: Oxfam International. https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/typhoon-haiyan-philippines-factsheet-12_04_13.pdf.

---. 2013d. "Philippines Typhoon Response: A Week of Obstacles, A month of Delivery, Years of Support." *Oxfam*, December 6, 2013. https://www.oxfam.org/en/press-releases/philippines-typhoon-response-week-obstacles-month-delivery-years-support.

---. 2013e. *Oxfam Briefing Paper: In the Shadow of the Storm*. Oxford: Oxfam International. https://oi-files-d8-prod.s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/file_attachments/bp-shadow-storm-haiyan-recovery-philippines-061114-en.pdf.

---. 2013f. "Christmas, A period of Reflection for Filipinos After Haiyan." *Oxfam*, December 24, 2013. https://www.oxfam.org/en/press-releases/philippines-typhoon-response-week-obstacles-month-delivery-years-support.

---. 2014a. "Thousands of Haiyan-Affected Fishing And Coconut Farmer Families Face Income Crisis." *Oxfam*, May 7, 2014. https://www.oxfam.org/en/press-releases/thousands-haiyan-affected-fishing-and-coconut-farmer-families-face-income-crisis.

---. 2014b. *Typhoon Haiyan: The Response of For and Vital Lessons for the Philippines Recovery*. Oxford: Oxfam International https://oi-files-d8-prod.s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/file_attachments/bn-typhoon-haiyan-philippines-response-071213-en_3.pdf.

---. 2018a. *2018-2019 Annual Report*. Oxford: Oxfam International. https://oi-files-d8-prod.s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/2019-12/191219_Oxfam_Annual_Report_2018-19.pdf.

---. 2018b. "Oxfam Scales Up Response to Deadly Indonesia Earthquake and Tsunami." *Oxfam*, October 1, 2018. https://www.oxfam.org/en/press-releases/oxfam-scales-response-deadly-indonesia-earthquake-and-tsunami.

---. 2019. "From Chaos to Recovery: How Oxfam is Supporting Earthquake and Tsunami Survivors in Indonesia." *Reliefweb*, March 31, 2019. https://reliefweb.int/report/indonesia/chaos-recovery-how-oxfam-supporting-earthquake-and-tsunami-survivors-indonesia.

---. n.d. "Abous Us." Accessed June 14, 2021. https://www.oxfam.org/en/what-we-do/about.

Pabst, Adrian. 2011. "The Paradox of Faith: Religion beyond Secularization and Desecularization." In *The Deepening Crisis: Governance Challenges After Neoliberalism*, edicted by Craig Calhoun and Georgi Derluguian, 157-182. New York: New York University Press.

Pew Research Center. 2019. "The Countries with the 10 Largest Christian Propulations and the 10 Largest Muslim Populations." Accessed June 13, 2021.

Antonia Koberg, s2042347

https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/04/01/the-countries-with-the-10-largest-christian-populations-and-the-10-largest-muslim-populations/.

Podbregar Nadja. 2015. "Hurrikans, Taifune und Co – Tropische Wirbelstürme." In *Im Fokus: Naturkatastrophen: Zerstörerische Gewalt und tickende Zeitbomben*, edited by Nadja Podbregar and Dieter Lohmann, 145-158. Heidelberg: Springer Spektrum.

Pollack, Detlef. 2015. "Varieties of Secularization Theories and Their Indispensable Core." *The Germanic Review: Literature, Culture, Theory* 90, no. 1 (April): 60-79. https://doi.org/10.1080/00168890.2015.1002361.

Reliefweb. 2013. "Typhoon Haiyan – Nov 2013." Accessed June 13, 2021. https://reliefweb.int/disaster/tc-2013-000139-phl.

Rudnyckyj, Daromir. 2015. "Religion and Economic Development." In *The Routledge Handbook of Religions and Global Development*, edited by Emma Tomalin, 405-417. London and New York: Routledge

Sahliyeh, Emile F. 1990. "Religious Resurgence and Political Modernization." In *Religious Resurgence and Politics in the Contemporary World*, 3-16. Albany: State University of New York Press.

The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. 2018. *Real-Time Evaluation Indonesia: Earthquakes and Tsunami (Lombok, Sulawesi) 2018*. Geneva: The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. https://media.ifrc.org/ifrc/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Indonesia-RTE_final-publish.pdf.

The World Bank. 2020. "The Philippines: Transferring the Cost of Sever Natural Disasters to Capital Markets." Accessed June 13, 2021. https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2020/04/09/the-philippines-transferring-the-cost-of-severe-natural-disasters-to-capital-markets.

Tomalin, Emma. 2012. "Thinking About Faith-Based Organisations In Development: Where Have We Got to and What Next?" *Development in Practice* 22, no. 5-6 (July): 689-703. https://doi.org/10.1080/09614524.2012.686600.

United Nations General Assembly. 2004. Resolution 58/114, Strengthening of the Coordination of Emergency Humanitarian Assistance of the United Nations, A/RES/58/114. New York: United Nations, February 5. https://undocs.org/en/A/RES/58/114.

United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. 2018a. "UN-CMCoord Field Handbook." Accessed April 1, 2020. https://www.unocha.org/sites/unocha/files/%5BE-Version%5D%20UNCMCoord%20Field%20Handbook%202.0%20%282018%29.pdf.

---. 2018b. "Asia and the Pacific: Weekly Regional Humanitarian Snapshot (25 Sep – 01 Oct 2018)." Accessed June 13, 2020. https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/ROAP_Snapshot_181001.pdf.

Wilkinson, Olivia J. 2018a. "Secular Humanitarians and the Postsecular: Reflections on Habermas and the Typhoon Haiyan Disaster Response." *Journal of Contemporary Religion* 33, no. 2 (May): 193-208. https://doi-org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/10.1080/13537903.2018.1469260.

---. 2018b. "'Faith can come in, but not religion': Secularity and Its Effects on the Disaster Response to Typhoon Haiyan." *Disaster* 42, no. 3 (June): 459-474. https://doi-org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/10.1111/disa.12258.

---. 2020. *Secular and Religious Dynamics in Humanitarian Response*. London and New York: Routledge Focus.

Wilson, Bryan. 1966. *Religion in Secular Society*. London: Pelican Books.

Wilson, Erin K. 2018. "Secularization and Secularism." *The International Encyclopedia of Anthropology*, 1-8. https://doi-org.ezproxy.leidenuniv.nl/10.1002/9781118924396.wbiea2085.