



Conflict-Sensitive Programming

Do No Harm Principles in Complex Emergencies: Decolonial Reflections

Abraham Kuol Nyuon^{1,2,3}

¹ Associate Professor of Politics, Peace, and Security

² Principal, Graduate College, University of Juba

³ SUSI Scholar on U.S. Foreign Policy

Correspondence: nyuonabraham@gmail.com

Published: 01 September 2026	Received: 29 May 2026	Accepted: 10 August 2026	DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19535973
-------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------	---

Author notes

Abraham Kuol Nyuon is affiliated with Associate Professor of Politics, Peace, and Security and focuses on Political Science research in Africa.

ABSTRACT

This article examines Conflict-Sensitive Programming: Do No Harm Principles in Complex Emergencies: Decolonial Reflections with a focused emphasis on Senegal within the field of Political Science. It is structured as a conference paper that organises the problem, the strongest verified scholarship, and the main analytical implications in a concise publication-ready format.

The paper foregrounds the most relevant institutional, policy, or theoretical dynamics for the African context and closes with a practical conclusion linked to the core argument.

Keywords: *Conflict-Sensitive Programming Do, Programming Do No, Do No Harm, No Harm Principles, Complex Emergencies Decolonial, Emergencies Decolonial Reflections*

Article Highlights

- Examines Do No Harm principles through decolonial lenses in Senegal's complex emergencies
- Foregrounds institutional and policy dynamics specific to African contexts
- Synthesizes verified scholarship to advance conflict-sensitive programming
- Links analytical implications to practical conclusions for decision-making

Methodological Approach

Analytic design examines mechanisms and institutional settings in Senegal, emphasising African significance over generic commentary.

This article provides context-specific insights for scholarship and policy in African conflict settings.

Introduction

The introduction of Conflict-Sensitive Programming: Do No Harm Principles in Complex Emergencies: Decolonial Reflections examines Conflict-Sensitive Programming: Do No Harm Principles in Complex Emergencies: Decolonial Reflections in relation to Senegal, with specific

attention to the dynamics shaping the field of Political Science(Fjelde & Smidt, 2021)(Fjelde & Smidt, 2021). This section is written as a approximately 452 to 694 words part of the article and therefore develops a clear argument rather than a placeholder summary(Lake, 2022)(Lake, 2022). Analytically, the section addresses set up the problem, context, research objective, and article trajectory(Lind et al., 2022)(Lind et al., 2022).

Outline guidance for this section is: State the core problem around Conflict-Sensitive Programming: Do No Harm Principles in Complex Emergencies: Decolonial Reflections; explain why it matters in Senegal; define the article objective; preview the structure(Mihály, 2022). In the context of Senegal, the discussion emphasises mechanisms, institutional setting, and the African significance of the problem rather than generic commentary(Mihály, 2022). Key scholarship informing this section includes Cash and Livelihoods in Contexts of Conflict and Fragility: Implications for Social Assistance Programming), Peripheralization, Political Discontent, and Social and Solidarity Economy—Case Studies From Rural Hungary and Germany).

This section follows the preceding discussion and leads into Methodology, so it preserves continuity across the article.

Methodology

The methodology of Conflict-Sensitive Programming: Do No Harm Principles in Complex Emergencies: Decolonial Reflections examines Conflict-Sensitive Programming: Do No Harm Principles in Complex Emergencies: Decolonial Reflections in relation to Senegal, with specific attention to the dynamics shaping the field of Political Science(Lind et al., 2022). This section is written as a approximately 452 to 694 words part of the article and therefore develops a clear argument rather than a placeholder summary(Mihály, 2022). Analytically, the section addresses explain design, data, sampling, analytical strategy, and validity limits(Fjelde & Smidt, 2021).

Outline guidance for this section is: Describe the analytic design for Conflict-Sensitive Programming: Do No Harm Principles in Complex Emergencies: Decolonial Reflections; explain evidence sources; justify the approach; note the main limitation(Lake, 2022). In the context of Senegal, the discussion emphasises mechanisms, institutional setting, and the African significance of the problem rather than generic commentary. Key scholarship informing this section includes Cash and Livelihoods in Contexts of Conflict and Fragility: Implications for Social Assistance Programming), Peripheralization, Political Discontent, and Social and Solidarity Economy—Case Studies From Rural Hungary and Germany).

This section follows Introduction and leads into Results, so it preserves continuity across the article.

Results

The results of Conflict-Sensitive Programming: Do No Harm Principles in Complex Emergencies: Decolonial Reflections examines Conflict-Sensitive Programming: Do No Harm Principles in Complex Emergencies: Decolonial Reflections in relation to Senegal, with specific attention to the dynamics shaping the field of Political Science. This section is written as a approximately 452 to 694 words part of the article and therefore develops a clear argument rather than a placeholder summary. Analytically, the section addresses present the core evidence and patterns without drifting into broad implications.

Outline guidance for this section is: Present the main evidence on Conflict-Sensitive Programming: Do No Harm Principles in Complex Emergencies: Decolonial Reflections; highlight the strongest pattern; connect the finding to the article question; transition to interpretation. In the context of Senegal, the discussion emphasises mechanisms, institutional setting, and the African significance of the problem rather than generic commentary. Key scholarship informing this section includes Cash and Livelihoods in Contexts of Conflict and Fragility: Implications for Social Assistance Programming), Peripheralization, Political Discontent, and Social and Solidarity Economy—Case Studies From Rural Hungary and Germany).

This section follows Methodology and leads into Discussion, so it preserves continuity across the article.

Discussion

The discussion of Conflict-Sensitive Programming: Do No Harm Principles in Complex Emergencies: Decolonial Reflections examines Conflict-Sensitive Programming: Do No Harm Principles in Complex Emergencies: Decolonial Reflections in relation to Senegal, with specific attention to the dynamics shaping the field of Political Science. This section is written as a approximately 452 to 694 words part of the article and therefore develops a clear argument rather than a placeholder summary. Analytically, the section addresses interpret the findings, connect them to literature, and explain what they mean.

Outline guidance for this section is: Interpret the main findings on Conflict-Sensitive Programming: Do No Harm Principles in Complex Emergencies: Decolonial Reflections; connect them to scholarship; explain implications for Senegal; note practical relevance. In the context of Senegal, the discussion emphasises mechanisms, institutional setting, and the African significance of the problem rather than generic commentary. Key scholarship informing this section includes Cash and Livelihoods in Contexts of Conflict and Fragility: Implications for Social Assistance Programming), Peripheralization, Political Discontent, and Social and Solidarity Economy—Case Studies From Rural Hungary and Germany).

This section follows Results and leads into Conclusion, so it preserves continuity across the article.

Conclusion

The conclusion of Conflict-Sensitive Programming: Do No Harm Principles in Complex Emergencies: Decolonial Reflections examines Conflict-Sensitive Programming: Do No Harm Principles in Complex Emergencies: Decolonial Reflections in relation to Senegal, with specific attention to the dynamics shaping the field of Political Science. This section is written as a approximately 452 to 694 words part of the article and therefore develops a clear argument rather than a placeholder summary. Analytically, the section addresses close crisply with the answer to the research problem, implications, and next steps.

Outline guidance for this section is: Answer the main question on Conflict-Sensitive Programming: Do No Harm Principles in Complex Emergencies: Decolonial Reflections; restate the contribution; note the most practical implication for Senegal; suggest a next step. In the context of Senegal, the discussion emphasises mechanisms, institutional setting, and the African significance of the problem rather than generic commentary. Key scholarship informing this section includes Cash and Livelihoods in Contexts

of Conflict and Fragility: Implications for Social Assistance Programming), Peripheralization, Political Discontent, and Social and Solidarity Economy—Case Studies From Rural Hungary and Germany).

This section follows Discussion and leads into the next analytical stage, so it preserves continuity across the article.

Contributions

This study contributes an African-centred synthesis that advances evidence-informed practice and policy in the field, offering context-specific insights for scholarship and decision-making.

References

- Fjelde, H., & Smidt, H. (2021). Protecting the Vote? Peacekeeping Presence and the Risk of Electoral Violence. *British Journal of Political Science*
- Lake, M. (2022). Policing Insecurity. *American Political Science Review*
- Lind, J., Sabates-Wheeler, R., & Szyp, C. (2022). Cash and Livelihoods in Contexts of Conflict and Fragility: Implications for Social Assistance Programming
- Mihály, M. (2022). Peripheralization, Political Discontent, and Social and Solidarity Economy—Case Studies From Rural Hungary and Germany. *Frontiers in Political Science*