United Nations Security Council

Preventing the Militarization of Humanitarian Aid in Conflict Zones.

Backgrounder Guide

Table of Contents

Director's Letter

Dear Delegates,

Welcome to the United Nations Security Council Committee of SPAMUN 2025!

My name is Jayden Chan, and alongside my Chair, Marie, and Assistant Director, Kaveer, we are honoured to be able to serve as your DAIS team at the seventh iteration of Southpointe Academy Model United Nations. It is our absolute pleasure to welcome you to UNSC.

At this iteration of SPAMUN, UNSC, running as a specialized agency, will be addressing the topic of: *Preventing the Militarization of Humanitarian Aid in Conflict Zones*. As wars and conflicts continue to ravage our Earth, humanitarian aid is deployed to alleviate suffering and provide help to those who need it. Despite this, time and time again, we witness its diversion for military advantage and misuse in ways that can cause more harm than good. In a world where armed conflicts are increasingly complex and technological, ensuring that humanitarian aid reaches those who need it most is both urgent and absolutely vital. It is my hope that through debate and diplomacy, this topic will prove to be both engaging and rewarding.

As a senior at Steveston-London Secondary School, this will be my final year in Model United Nations. After all these years, my one piece of advice is this: push yourself. The love that I have for this endeavour, the perspectives that I gained, the friends I have made; none of these would have come to be if I did not step out of my comfort zone. No matter what stage you are in your Model UN career, from beginners to advanced delegates, push yourself. Challenge yourself with every speech and interaction. Step out of your comfort zone, and start talking to other people. Furthermore, I also highly encourage delegates to not only thoroughly review this backgrounder, but also conduct additional research in order to fully understand the issue at hand, allowing for more fruitful debate and a better understanding. Finally, have fun. I am confident that each and every one of you will find an opportunity to grow and leave with an even greater love for Model United Nations.

Last but not least, if you have any inquiries or concerns, please do not hesitate to reach out by emailing unscspamun@southpointe.ca . Please also submit your position papers to the same email address and position papers are due on October 7 for feedback and October 14 for the normal submission. With that being said, we look forward to meeting you on October 18th and we hope you have fun researching!

Sincerely,

Jayden Chan
Director, UNSC | SPAMUN 2025

Committee Description

The United Nations Security Council, commonly referred to as the UNSC, is one of the six principal bodies of the United Nations. Established in January 1946 as a specialised body of the United Nations[1], the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) set out with the principal aim of promoting and maintaining global stability. The UNSC focuses on four key aspects: Maintaining international peace and security, developing friendly relations among nations, ensuring cooperation to solve international problems and promote respect for human rights, and being a centre for the harmonisation of the actions of countries all around the globe. Under Article 25 of the UN Charter, all resolutions agreed upon by the UNSC are binding to all UN member states, meaning that the clauses you as delegates will formulate will truly matter.

The Security Council is composed of 15 member states, who each have one vote. However, five of these members are known as permanent (P5) members, who retain a permanent seat on the council while also being able to unilaterally veto any resolution presented to the council. The ten non-permanent seats are held by various member states of the UNGA, in rotating terms of 2 years. In order to ensure all regions of the world are fairly represented, the council has set specific geographical requirements to ensure that every continent has a voice at the council. In order to pass a resolution in the security council, a resolution must pass with 9 or more votes, with none of the P5 members vetoing the resolution.[2] When voting on resolutions, UNSC members can vote for, against, or abstain. As of September 2025, the UNSC is set in the period of the 80th United Nations General Assembly. The UNSC can convene emergency sessions, request reports from the Secretary General, and employ other unique procedures under its mandate. The matrix for this committee will reflect the modern day as it is. In contemporary times, the UNSC remains central to addressing urgent global crises such as peacekeeping in conflict zones and maintaining international order.

The United Nations Security Council can achieve its goals through multiple means, from relatively peaceful options such as investigations and the appointment of special envoys to more forceful options, such as issuing ceasefires, dispatching peacekeeping forces, economic sanctions, naval blockades, and the enactment of global military action.[3] Since its first session, the UNSC has been involved in several global conflicts, including notable examples such as the Korean War and the Suez Crisis. As the primary body responsible for maintaining international peace and security, the UNSC wields significant influence in global diplomacy and law.

---

[1] United Nations. "What Is the Security Council?" *United Nations Security Council,* www.un.org/securitycouncil/en/content/what-security-council.

[2] Haddock, Kaleah, Rhea Basarkar, Sara Ibrahim, Nathalie Bussemaker, and Zachary Rosenthal. "The UN Security Council." *Council on Foreign Relations*, 27 Aug. 2025, www.cfr.org/backgrounder/un-security-council

[3] United Nations. "Functions and Powers." *Security Council*, United Nations, https://main.un.org/securitycouncil/en/content/functions-and-powers.

Topic Overview

Humans are social creatures. Humanitarian aid has existed as long as humans, reflecting the common tendency to help those for whom we have sympathy. Humanitarian aid is especially prevalent in zones of conflict, and is intended to alleviate suffering, save lives, and uphold human dignity.[4] Unfortunately humanitarian aid can and has been exploited, militarized, and used as a political or military tool, undermining neutrality and goodwill, putting civilians and aid workers at risk, and eroding trust in humanitarian institutions. This blending of contradictory purposes blurs critical boundaries, making it harder to reach vulnerable populations safely. If people perceive aid as a form of destruction, communities may reject lifesaving assistance altogether.

The militarization of humanitarian aid takes many forms and is undertaken to achieve strategic goals, such as gaining territorial control, winning local support, and more. Examples include military escorts during aid deliveries, tying relief distribution to political campaigns and eroding neutrality, adopting security measures like armed convoys, stealing humanitarian aid to help fund a military's own endeavors, and full scale manipulation and propaganda. This militarization has many risks and consequences, most notably the politicization of aid, abandonment of core principles, reduced access and trust, an increased risk to aid workers, and a damaged perception of humanitarianism.[5]

This problem continues to grow as modern conflicts become increasingly complex and prolonged. States, now more than ever, rely on approaches that integrate defense, diplomacy, and development, making it difficult to separate humanitarian efforts from political agendas[6]. Non-state armed groups also manipulate aid flows, blocking supplies, taxing deliveries, or stealing it themselves. Global competition and the securitization of foreign aid funding further entrench the overlap between humanitarian and military objectives[7], leaving neutral humanitarian groups and NGOs pressured to adapt to financially backed political strategies.

---

[4] CARE Canada. "Six Things You Need to Know about Humanitarian Aid." *CARE Canada,* 19 Aug. 2024, www.care.ca/2024/08/19/six-things-you-need-to-know-about-humanitarian-aid/

[5] Beckwith, Sam. "The Militarisation of Aid in Afghanistan: Implications for Humanitarian Actors and the Way Ahead." *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 2012, https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2167857.

[6] Azim, N. "Separating Humanitarian Aid from Politics." *BMJ : British Medical Journal*, vol. 324, no. 7333, 9 Feb. 2002, p. 319, pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC1122263/.

[7] Friedman, Ara. "The Future of Foreign Aid: Evolving Funding Environment | School of Foreign Service | Georgetown." *SFS - School of Foreign Service - Georgetown University*, 6 Aug. 2025, sfs.georgetown.edu/news/the-future-of-foreign-aid-evolving-funding-environment/.

Additionally, IGOs and other International Institutions, including the UNSC, are under pressure to coordinate with military actors for efficiency while trying to uphold humanitarian principles[8], creating tension between mandates and political realities. From the Israel-Palestine conflict to the Russia-Ukraine War to the Sudan Civil War, the militarization of humanitarian aid, especially in current conflicts, reflect the severity and increasing concern of this.

This issue is urgent and has to be addressed effectively and quickly. Humanitarian space and aid is shrinking worldwide. When aid is seen as a weapon of war, aid workers are at a higher risk of being attacked, civilians denied assistance, and mistrust only splinters wider across communities. Neutrality is not only moral, but a necessity to ensure access and safety. Safeguarding the independence of humanitarian aid is essential to preserving the credibility of international relief systems.

---

[8] O'Leary, Emma. The Impact of Counterterrorism Measures and Preventing/Countering Violent Extremism on Principled Humanitarian Action Principles under Pressure. *Norwegian Refugee Council*, 18 June 2018, www.nrc.no/globalassets/pdf/reports/principles-under-pressure/nrc-principles_under_pressure-report-2018-screen.pdf

Timeline of Events (~1 to 1.5 pages)

Pre-2000s:

- August 12, 1949 - The Geneva Conventions, still in place today, were adopted, establishing the legal framework regarding humanitarian aid in armed conflict, protecting civilians and relief workers. [9]
- June 08, 1977 - Additional protocols to the Geneva Conventions were added, reaffirming the right of civilians to receive humanitarian assistance and set limits on interference with aid as a weapon of war.[10]
- 1967-1970 - The Nigerian Civil War set a precedent for aid as a weapon of war, with both government and secessionist forces manipulating food aid with blockades and diversions.[11]
- 1980s - Numerous wars, notably in Afghanistan and Africa, featured aid that was highly politicized, with donor states channeling resources to aligned governments and militias.
- December 19, 1991 - UN GA Resolution 46/182 affirmed humanitarian principles of humanity, neutrality, and independence[12], as well as established the Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA).

---

[9] American Red Cross. "Summary of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and Their Additional Protocols." *American Red Cross*, Apr. 2011, https://www.redcross.org/content/dam/redcross/atg/PDF_s/International_Services/International_Humanitarian_Law/IHL_SummaryGenevaConv.pdf?srsltid=AfmBOooEfCHi0NhQ_g6UkQBkH2iOOIIimPh2CRBvayw8bpOL6wDY9yCo

[10] ICRC. "Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and Relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts (Protocol I), 8 June 1977." *Icrc.org*, 2022, ihl-databases.icrc.org/en/ihl-treaties/api-1977.

[11] Freymond, Jacques. "AID to the VICTIMS of the CIVIL WAR in NIGERIA." *International Review of the Red Cross*, 1 Feb. 1970, international-review.icrc.org/sites/default/files/S0020860400064032a.pdf.

[12] United Nations General Assembly. Resolution 46/182: Strengthening of the Coordination of Humanitarian Emergency Assistance of the United Nations. 19 Dec. 1991, *https://docs.un.org/en/A/RES/46/182*

- 1992-1994 - The UN intervention of the Somalia famine, which involved large-scale humanitarian operations under military operation, notably Operation Restore Hope[13], saw aid looted by armed factions and atrocities committed by both sides[14].

2000s-2010s:
- 2001 - NATO and U.S. forces launched Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs) combining aid, development, and counterinsurgency during the U.S. -led invasion of Afghanistan[15]. Humanitarian space narrowed as NGOs were seen as aligned with military forces.
- 2003 - Coalition forces in the Iraq War distributed aid to 'win hearts and minds'[16], leading to suspicion and attacks towards NGOs.
- 2005 - The UN and OCHA reaffirmed the need for civilian leadership in humanitarian response, stressing independence from political or military agendas.

2010s:
- 2011 - Assad regime restricted UN aid flows during the Syrian Civil War, channeling assistance to government-held areas. Rebel groups and extremists seized or taxed convoys, and aid became systematically weaponized.
- 2011 - Al-Shabaab banned many Western NGOs, while militias manipulated aid access, denying help to civilians in opposition areas during the Somalia famine[17].
- 2014 - Russian "humanitarian convoys" were accused of carrying military equipment in Ukraine, blurring the distinction between relief and logistics for war.
- December 12, 2014 - The UN General Assembly Resolution 69/135 reiterated the importance of humanitarian principles and independence from political or military influence, amid rising concerns about aid manipulation in conflict.

---

[13] United Nations Peacekeeping. "United Nations Operation in Somalia II (UNOSOM II)." *United Nations*, https://peacekeeping.un.org/ar/mission/past/unosom2backgr2.html

[14] "Somalia Affair." *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, Historica Canada, https://thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/somalia-affair

[15] Institute for the Study of War. "Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs)." *Understanding War*, 15 Apr. 2009, https://understandingwar.org/research/middle-east/provincial-reconstruction-teams-prts/

[16] Williamson, Jamie A. "Using Humanitarian Aid to 'Win Hearts and Minds': A Costly Failure?" *International Review of the Red Cross*, vol. 93, no. 884, Dec. 2011, https://international-review.icrc.org/sites/default/files/irrc-884-williamson.pdf

[17] "Somalia S/2012/544." Security Council Report, *United Nations Security Council*, 2012, www.securitycouncilreport.org/atf/cf/{65BFCF9B-6D27-4E9C-8CD3-CF6E4FF96FF9}/Somalia%20S%202012%20544.pdf

2020s-present:

- 2023 - UN report[18] Ethiopia and Yemen reported documented aid blockades and diversion by governments and armed groups, framing denial and militarization of aid as violations of international humanitarian law.
- 2022-present - The Russia-Ukraine War saw both parties accusing each other of blocking and politicizing humanitarian assistance, with aid and humanitarian corridors being contested.
- 2023-present - Humanitarian aid deliveries into Gaza were severely restricted, with Israel controlling border crossings and inspections during the Israel-Palestine conflict. Reports also highlighted diversion of aid by armed groups.

Historical Analysis

The militarization of humanitarian aid is not a new phenomenon. Since the mid-20th century, states and armed groups have repeatedly manipulated humanitarian assistance for strategic ends. Over time, the issue has grown in scope and complexity, influenced by major wars and global political shifts. The historical record highlights both the persistence of the problem and the international community's struggle to uphold the principles of humanity, neutrality, impartiality, and independence.

The aftermath of World War II saw the establishment of humanitarian norms in the 1949 Geneva Conventions and 1977 Additional protocols, which explicitly prohibited interference with humanitarian aid. Despite this legal framework, reality often strayed from the law. During the Nigerian Civil War (1967–1970), the Nigerian government used blockades to starve secessionist regions, while rebel forces taxed aid. These acts revealed how humanitarian assistance could be weaponized, leading to the emergence of "humanitarian diplomacy,"[19] — the use of aid to influence political outcomes — where aid was used not merely to alleviate suffering but to advance political and military objectives.[20] Such practices set a precedent that would be repeated in later conflicts.

The establishment of the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) in 1991[21] marked a significant shift towards coordinated, neutral humanitarian responses. However, the 1990s also witnessed instances where humanitarian aid was used to further military objectives. In Bosnia and Herzegovina,

---

[18] "Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights." *OHCHR Report 2023*. United Nations, 2023, www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/documents/publications/ohchr-reports/ohchr-report-2023.pdf

[19] https://www.unocha.org/publications/report/world/ocha-message-humanitarian-diplomacy-august-2024
[20] https://retrospectjournal.com/2025/04/13/the-biafran-crisis-how-famine-redefined-humanitarianism/
[21] https://www.unocha.org/ocha

for example, aid convoys were sometimes escorted by military forces, raising concerns about the politicization of humanitarian assistance.[22] These instances highlighted the balance between ensuring aid delivery and maintaining the neutrality of humanitarian efforts.

The Somalia famine of the 1990s marked a turning point in the debate over the militarization of aid and the challenge of maintaining neutrality. Aid convoys were routinely looted by warlords, while U.S. and UN peacekeepers provided "humanitarian intervention" under heavy military escort. Although intended to protect aid, this military dominance blurred the line between relief and occupation. It created mistrust among local communities and made aid workers a target, foreshadowing challenges that persist today.

Current Situation

The militarization of humanitarian aid has become an increasingly urgent problem as aid operations are increasingly exposed to violence and politicization rather than being safeguarded as neutral, civilian activities. Recent data shows a record 383 aid workers killed in 2024 alone[23], alongside hundreds of kidnappings, detentions, and attacks on convoys. Across multiple conflict zones, notably Gaza, Syria, Yemen, and parts of the Sahel, humanitarian aid has transformed assistance into a tool of political leverage and even a method of coercion against vulnerable populations.

One of the core prevention challenges today lies in the failure of deconfliction systems, where aid agencies share their coordinates with militaries to avoid being targeted. In Gaza, several aid convoys and warehouses were struck despite their locations being communicated in advance, eroding confidence in deconfliction and raising fears that the deconfliction system themselves are being exploited militarily[24]. At the same time, donor governments increasingly link humanitarian aid to the military, encouraging escorts and logistics. While intended for security, these practices blur the civilian–military divide, compromise neutrality, and risk aid being seen as part of a military campaign rather than an impartial relief effort. Both state and non-state actors also continue to seize, tax, or divert aid for strategic benefit, further undermining impartiality and trust.

Similarly, in Myanmar, the military has been accused of deliberately obstructing humanitarian aid to displaced civilians in the Kachin and Shan states.[25] Reports indicate that only a small fraction of aid applications were

---

[22] https://docs.un.org/en/S/RES/836(1993)

[23]

https://apnews.com/article/un-humanitarian-aid-workers-killed-gaza-sudan-40e205b90bf0b0e90e5090f79aade35a

[24] https://www.devex.com/news/devex-newswire-how-deconfliction-is-getting-aid-workers-killed-in-gaza-107319

[25] https://time.com/5381336/myanmar-kachin-fortify-rights/

approved, with the majority being denied or delayed. These actions have been condemned by international organizations as violations of international human rights laws, underscoring the potential for humanitarian aid to be weaponized in conflict settings.

UNSC has long condemned any humanitarian aid that does not promote the values of impartiality and neutrality, as is seen through UNSC Resolution 2286 [26] and numerous statements reinforcing humanitarian principles. However, enforcement has lagged. For example, despite the International Court of Justice ordering measures to ensure unimpacted humanitarian access, UNSC divisions have not been able to subject external forces to comply[27], undermining its credibility.

Recent developments highlight the urgency of UNSC action. In Gaza, new centralized "mega-sites" for aid distribution, established under the military, have concentrated control and restricted access for civilians, raising concerns about the weaponization of food assistance.[28] In Sudan, aid convoys continue to be looted and blocked by warring factions, while in Ukraine and Syria, militarized checkpoints slow or redirect assistance. These examples illustrate a global trend: humanitarian aid is increasingly treated as a bargaining chip or a military resource rather than a protected civilian lifeline. The UNSC has discussed these crises individually, but without a coherent strategy, the pattern persists across the world.

UN/International Involvement

International organizations have made repeated attempts to safeguard humanitarian aid, receiving inconsistent results. One notable example mentioned was when the UNSC adopted Resolution 2286 in 2016[29], which condemned violence against humanitarian and medical personnel. This also declared that attacks on aid workers, hospitals, and convoys are completely intolerable. The resolution stressed that states will bear the responsibility to protect their populations, as well as hold accountability for international humanitarian law violations. Please also refer back to the timeline and historical analysis for more information regarding UN/International involvement in the prevention of militarization of humanitarian aid.

Despite these strict laws, enforcement has been relatively ineffective. The United Nations, particularly through the Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), has worked to coordinate aid, delivery, monitor access, and strengthen compliance with humanitarian principles. Regional organisations such as the African

---

[26] https://press.un.org/en/2016/sc12347.doc.htm
[27] https://amnesty.ca/human-rights-news/israel-defying-icj-ruling-to-prevent-genocide-by-failing-to-allow-adequate-humanitarian-aid-to-reach-gaza
[28] https://www.hrw.org/news/2025/08/01/gaza-israeli-killings-of-palestinians-seeking-food-are-war-crimes?utm_source
[29] https://docs.un.org/en/S/RES/2286(2016)

Union and European Union have also taken steps to support humanitarian principles. NGOs such as the International Committee of the Red Cross, have been advocating for aid neutrality and directly delivering relief to vulnerable populations.

Possible Solutions

Delegates are reminded that there exists a plethora of solutions regarding this issue not mentioned. **Delegates are encouraged to make variations of these solutions or come up with ones not mentioned here.** Please remember what the United Nations Security Council can entail, and to please act within its power.

Legal and Accountability Mechanisms:
Legal and accountability mechanisms are rooted in frameworks such as the Geneva Conventions, Additional Protocols, and past UNSC and GA resolutions. Their purpose is to reaffirm that the militarization of humanitarian aid is a violation of international law. These mechanisms include referrals to the International Criminal Court (ICC)[30] which can prosecute internationally as well as imposing sanctions on states that obstruct humanitarian aid.

However, these mechanisms regularly face gridlock in the Security Council, where permanent members often protect allies or themselves from accountability. For example, attempts to sanction Syria for obstructing aid delivery were vetoed by Russia[31]. Similarly, Western powers have been hesitant to expose their own actions to scrutiny, such as in Afghanistan or Iraq. As a result, while the legal tools exist, their enforcement is selective and politically charged. Furthermore, they may cause harm to civilians.

Expanding UN Civil-Military Coordination (CMCoord):

The UN Civil-Military Coordination (CMCoord)[32] aims to keep humanitarian and military roles clearly distinct, ensuring aid operations remain impartial and not perceived as an extension of military campaigns. This would reduce reliance on armed escorts, military convoys, or bases for logistics and security. Instead, aid agencies would maintain independence, making it less likely that humanitarian efforts become politicized or targeted due to neutrality being preserved as well as increasing trust in local communities. Despite these benefits, it is logistically challenging and expensive without military infrastructure, and increases the risks of aid worker casualties.

---

[30] https://www.icc-cpi.int/sites/default/files/Publications/understanding-the-icc.pdf
[31] https://press.un.org/en/2023/ga12517.doc.htm
[32] https://www.unocha.org/publications/report/world/un-cmcoord-handbook-version-21-2025

Local/Regional Capacity Building:

Investing in local NGOs, civil society organizations, and community-based aid networks strengthens resilience and reduces dependence on foreign or militarized aid delivery channels. Local actors often have better cultural awareness, community trust, and access in conflict zones than international agencies. This can make aid delivery more effective and less likely to be perceived as politically biased.

However, local actors face serious risks. Armed groups may target and accuse them of working with rivals or international powers. In highly polarized environments, even local NGOs may be perceived as politically biased. Furthermore, community-led distribution can be controlled by local elites or warlords, leading to the potential diversion of aid, and some NGOs may not receive enough or the proper funding.

Bloc Positions

Pro-Restriction Nations

The Pro-Restriction bloc consists of France, the United Kingdom, Denmark, Greece, Slovenia, and the Republic of Korea. These countries consistently advocate for strict measures to prevent the militarization of humanitarian aid. They view humanitarian assistance as a neutral, impartial, and lifesaving activity that should remain separate from military or political objectives. In conflict zones, they emphasize that using aid as a tool to gain a strategic advantage not only endangers civilians but undermines the credibility and safety of aid workers. Historically, these countries have spoken against violations in contexts such as Afghanistan, Iraq, and parts of Africa, pushing for clear distinctions between military operations and humanitarian interventions. In terms of practical measures, the Pro-Restriction nations are strong supporters of legal and accountability mechanisms, advocating for the enforcement of international humanitarian law, ICC referrals, and UNSC resolutions against violators. They believe that the best world is an interconnected one, and would be slightly less favourableb toward funding local and regional capacity building. They would also be wary about implementing sanctions, as they can indirectly hurt the civilians they are trying to protect.

Mixed Nations

The Mixed bloc includes The United States, China, Pakistan, Panama, and Guyana, and their approach is more pragmatic and flexible. While they generally support the principle that humanitarian aid should remain neutral and not be used for military purposes, they weigh this against considerations of state sovereignty, political alliances, and operational feasibility. For example, China often emphasizes that humanitarian aid should respect

the consent and authority of the host state and may resist measures perceived as imposing Western norms.[33] Pakistan and Panama may prioritize security or regional stability, tolerating some military involvement in aid delivery if they see it as necessary to reach civilians safely. These countries favour CMCoord safeguards conditionally, as well as local and regional capacity building. In general, they are moderately in favor of preventing militarization, supporting measures that are compatible with state interests, but less likely to push aggressively for enforcement.

Sovereign-favouring Nations

The Sovereignty-Favouring bloc, composed of Russia, Algeria, Somalia, and Sierra Leone, places the highest priority on state control and non-interference. These countries are often skeptical of international mechanisms that could restrict their autonomy or override domestic decision-making. They tend to oppose measures aimed at preventing the militarization of humanitarian aid if they perceive them as infringing on sovereignty or restricting a government's ability to manage aid in conflict zones. For example, Russia has historically resisted ICC referrals or sanctions in conflicts.[34] In practice, this bloc may tolerate or even rely on military involvement in aid delivery to maintain security or control, particularly in unstable regions like Somalia or parts of Africa. They are cautious about legal and accountability mechanisms, fearing they could be used against them or their allies. Similarly, sanctions and punitive measures are generally opposed, with concerns that they could exacerbate humanitarian crises or serve geopolitical agendas rather than protect civilians. While they may support local and regional capacity building, it is usually under strict supervision to ensure alignment with state priorities and avoid empowering groups perceived as politically hostile. Overall, this bloc is the most resistant to aggressive measures preventing militarization, favoring flexibility, national control, and pragmatic responses over international norms.

Discussion Questions

1. What factors blur the lines between *militarizing* and *weaponizing* humanitarian aid?

2. What role should the UNSC play in mediating aid efforts in conflict zones?

3. Should sovereign nations deserve to be given the right to maintain their own country, even if international laws are being broken?

4. Why have previous international actions failed to prevent the militarization of humanitarian aid?

---

[33] Huang, Ying et al. "China and the WHO pandemic treaty: a dive into stance, underpinnings, and implications." *Frontiers in public health* vol. 12 1335751. 30 Jan. 2024, doi:10.3389/fpubh.2024.1335751
[34] https://www.asil.org/insights/volume/26/issue/4

5. What other solutions could be implemented to prevent the militarization of humanitarian aid?

6. What role may the ICC play in addressing the militarization of humanitarian aid?

7. How do we prevent other groups from militarizing their aid?

8. How will we ensure that aid workers will be safe?

Additional Sources/Works Cited

Inwood, Joe. "Gaza Air Drops "a Grotesque Distraction", Aid Agencies Warn." *BBC*, 26 July 2025,

    www.bbc.com/news/articles/cy08n8x6788o.

Lazzarini, Philippe. "We Must Prevent Humanitarian Aid from Being Used as an Instrument of War."

    UNRWA, United Nations, 9 Dec. 2023,

    www.unrwa.org/newsroom/notes/we-must-prevent-humanitarian-aid-being-used-instrument-war.

    Accessed Aug. 2025.

Lockyear, Christopher. "The Plan to Militarize Aid in Gaza Is Dehumanizing and Ineffective." *Doctors without*

    Borders - USA, 2025,

    www.doctorswithoutborders.org/latest/plan-militarize-aid-gaza-dehumanizing-and-ineffective.

    Accessed Aug. 2025.

Nations, United. "Improving UN Responses to Humanitarian Crises." *United Nations*, Dec. 2011,

    www.un.org/en/chronicle/article/improving-un-responses-humanitarian-crises. Accessed Aug. 2025.

"Pingree Unveils Bill to Protect Aid Workers in Global Conflict Zones." *U.S. Representative Chellie Pingree*, 7

    July 2025, pingree.house.gov/news/documentsingle.aspx?DocumentID=6608&utm. Accessed Aug.

    2025.

"Save the Children Canada." *Save the Children Canada*, 2025,

    www.savethechildren.ca/article/militarization-of-aid-in-gaza-save-the-children-response/. Accessed 19

    Aug. 2025.