



Southern China International MUN

Official Background Guide

*Security Council: On measures to resolve military and political
impediments to humanitarian aid in the Gaza Strip*

Agenda overseen by: Bryan Hew

1. Description of the Issue

1.1 History of the issue

For an extended period of time, both military operations and political restrictions continued to affect the attempts to deliver humanitarian aid in the Gaza Strip. According to the **United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)**, prevalent conflict and security conditions have restricted humanitarian personnel, supplies, and logistics from reaching those in need of humanitarian aid, vulnerable populations, throughout Gaza.¹

Inconsistent border points and constant restrictions on convoy movements hindered the first entry of assistance, let alone allowing it to be distributed in the Strip.² This issue reflects how the blockade and security limitations have been shaping the Gaza's humanitarian situation since 2023. For example, the closure of important crossings and stricter security procedures at **Rafah**, known to be a major lifeline for humanitarian aid and civilian movement because it is considered the most reliable route for aid, limited both the amount and frequency of humanitarian supplies entering Gaza.³

The combination of conflict-related damage to infrastructure, security risks to humanitarian convoys, and administrative restrictions linked to political concerns created an operating environment in which access challenges became a defining feature of the humanitarian response. Making political and military constraints the central limitation of the humanitarian response, it reveals that the issue is no longer just about how aid reaches Gaza, but whether it can reach civilians at all.

1.2 Recent developments

As of late 2025, OCHA have continued to report and heavily shaped by ongoing access restrictions. In Situation Report No. 44,⁴ OCHA documented how severe weather conditions compounded existing humanitarian needs while also challenging relief operations due to limitations in the entry and movement of supplies.⁴ This report noted that **flooding** affected hundreds of households during winter conditions, which increased the urgency of providing support while forced to face limitations.⁴ Even if humanitarian aid was passed at crossings, the timing and amount of deliveries would often be disrupted by logistical and

security constraints that delayed distribution to vulnerable populations in need.⁴ United Nations humanitarian coordinators emphasized that despite efforts to scale up food distribution, medical supply deliveries, and shelter support, these persistent barriers have limited the reliability and reach of humanitarian operations throughout Gaza.⁵

Overall, recent developments show that while concerted efforts have been made by UN agencies and partners to provide life-saving assistance, the continuation of crossing closures, variable corridor operations, and security-linked restrictions continue to impede the consistent flow of humanitarian aid into and within the Gaza Strip.^{4,5}

Key Terms:

Political Impediments: Barriers caused by political disputes, lack of cooperation, or diplomatic disagreements that delay or block humanitarian aid.

Military Impediments: Obstacles created by armed conflict, military operations, or unsafe conditions that restrict or endanger aid delivery.

Humanitarian Corridor: A protected route or zone agreed upon by conflict parties to allow safe passage for aid, workers, or civilians.

Humanitarian Pause: A short, temporary halt in fighting to enable urgent humanitarian operations without being a formal ceasefire.

Dual-Use Goods: Items that may serve both civilian and military purposes (commonly inspected or restricted), such as fuel or construction materials.

De-confliction Mechanism: A coordination system used by the UN/ICRC to communicate aid movements to military actors to avoid accidental harm to humanitarian convoys or personnel.

2. Emphasis of the Discourse

2.1 Right wing approach

Right-wing, with priorities on national security and military power, approaches to resolving military and political impediments to humanitarian aid in the Gaza Strip by **prioritizing security considerations** and **state control** over aid delivery. Proponents argue that because militant groups such as **Hamas** exert influence across Gaza, unregulated humanitarian aid has a risk of exploitation by armed groups. According to reports, Israeli authorities have repeatedly restricted the entry of aid groups and imposed requirements, including new security and transparency standards for NGOs, citing concerns that some organizations could indirectly aid militant operations or be infiltrated by hostile parties.⁷ These measures have led to the suspension of dozens of international organizations, including Doctors Without Borders and CARE, on the basis of alleged security risks.⁸

Another core right-wing position is the strict **control of dual-use goods** that could serve both civilian and military functions, such as fuel, generators, and medical equipment. Israel's dual-use blacklist, though, has been criticized because commercial traders can import many of the same goods that humanitarian organizations are banned from bringing in, highlighting a security-driven discrimination in the policy.⁸ Even Israeli policy sources acknowledge that they have strengthened the dual-use import screening and NGO checks, revealing that aid motives are still influenced by political and security reasons.¹⁴

Furthermore, advocates argue that humanitarian aid must be channeled through state-controlled entry points and subject to military oversight to prevent material support from reaching armed groups and to ensure national security. This is reflected in plans to funnel aid through tightly controlled crossings like Kerem Shalom with screening processes that some aid agencies contend jeopardize neutrality.¹⁵

Lastly, right-wing perspectives often emphasize that humanitarian access depends on de-confliction mechanisms negotiated with military actors, and that aid is acceptable only as it does not undermine broader security objectives. That is, state sovereignty and security imperatives are not secondary to humanitarian need but essential prerequisites to ensuring aid does not lead to more insecurity nor empower militant organizations.¹³

2.2 Left wing approach

On the other hand, left-wing approaches emphasize that unimpeded humanitarian access is a fundamental human right and **should not be subjected to political or security preconditions**. This is considered a violation of international humanitarian law, which requires all parties in a conflict to allow humanitarian aid to reach civilians quickly and without obstruction, except in cases of verified and immediate security threats.^{11,13}

Humanitarian aid access in Gaza has been shaped not only by military oversight but also by **diplomatic delegitimization** of international aid bodies, complicating neutrality and aid coordination.⁶ International actors and humanitarian organisations have called for lifting restrictions on aid imports, particularly those labelled as dual-use, to ensure essential medical and shelter supplies reach civilians in need.⁸ A statement by multiple foreign ministers from Western and Nordic countries explicitly demanded the removal of unreasonable import restrictions that block life-saving assistance like medical equipment and emergency relief goods.¹²

UN officials and human rights advocates have repeatedly argued against policies that limit humanitarian access in Gaza as disproportionate and harmful to civilian populations. A senior UN coordinator urged an immediate cessation of hostilities and unblocking of aid entries, warning that life-saving supplies were being denied to millions of people reliant on external assistance.¹¹

Scholars and rights-based organizations also highlight that under the Fourth Geneva Convention, an occupying power must ensure the provision of essential food and medical supplies to its population, and cannot lawfully ban these consignments, official batches of supplies being delivered, without breaching international law.¹³

Thus, from the left-wing perspective, neutrality and multilateral oversight are key to ensuring aid is delivered directly to civilians, not politicized nor delayed by parties in power. They argue that humanitarian aid, far from being a strategic bargaining tool, is a **moral and legal** obligation that should be guaranteed above military or political objectives.

2.3 Stance of intergovernmental organizations

Intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) overwhelmingly argue that military operations, administrative restrictions, and crossing shutdowns are the primary barriers to humanitarian aid delivery in Gaza, and stress that access must be protected through neutral, internationally coordinated mechanisms rather than one dominant military clearance pipelines.^{6,11}

The United Nations and multilateral coalitions have issued diplomatic statements expressing the concerns over aid obstruction, dual-use import bans, and NGO suspensions, calling for the removal of unreasonable restrictions on life-saving supplies including medical equipment, fuel for hospitals, and emergency shelter materials.^{12,13,19}

UN officials have specifically condemned prolonged aid blockades as “**cruel collective punishment**”, reinforcing the IGO position that civilian suffering must never be used as a technique for political bargaining, and that humanitarian pauses should be implemented immediately during escalated hostilities to allow urgent aid entry.¹¹

To minimize accidental strikes on aid convoys, the UN and the ICRC constructed de-confliction mechanisms by sharing real-time aid movement data with military actors, demonstrating that IGOs do not reject security concerns but advocate for security frameworks that protect humanitarian operations rather than delay or block them.^{13,16}

Overall, the IGO consensus is that humanitarian access is a protected international obligation, must remain neutral, and requires multilateral coordination, legal compliance, and demilitarized corridors guaranteed by international actors.^{6,11,12,13}

2.4 Stance of developed countries

Developed countries typically frame humanitarian aid access in Gaza as a moral obligation that must be safeguarded alongside legitimate security screening, though many argue that the current level of

restrictions is **disproportionate**. The G7 nations and EU states have repeatedly urged that humanitarian operations be protected, stressing that crossings must remain functional, reasonable, predictable, and neutral for aid organizations.¹⁵ Also, temporary humanitarian pauses were also popular amongst developed countries, arguing that short, enforceable windows of de-escalation are essential to deliver urgent civilian aid without legitimizing non-state armed actors.²⁰ Nordic countries, often aligned with IHL norms, have also supported statements arguing that aid must be rapid and neutral, and that civilian welfare should not be used as diplomatic leverage.²¹

In 2025, G7 foreign ministers expressed “deep concern” over aid obstruction, calling for the protection of civilians, humanitarian staff, and medical facilities.¹⁷ The European Union has also condemned bureaucratic and political delays in aid distribution, urging accelerated humanitarian shipments and international coordination for crossings.¹⁸ Additionally, Germany, France, and the UK have supported UN-led monitoring for dual-use goods, arguing that restrictions should not block medical kits, hospital electricity fuel, and temporary shelter materials.¹⁹

Overall, developed-country consensus favors: protected NGO access, multilateral de-confliction coordination, predictable humanitarian pauses, and international legal compliance, while urging that security frameworks should facilitate aid rather than indefinitely delay it.

2.5 Stance of Developing Countries

Developing countries commonly emphasize that humanitarian aid access in Gaza must be treated as an international duty centered on civilian survival, not a concession dependent on **military or political** clearance.²³ Many states within the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) and the Group of 77 (G77) argue that excessive border inspections, prolonged crossing closures, and dual-use goods restrictions have created avoidable civilian harm and call for these decisions to be replaced with monitoring under neutral international actors, rather than unilateral military parties.²²

Several developing countries also frame the issue through a **post-colonial humanitarian lens**, warning that aid obstruction disproportionately impacts weaker regions.²⁴

Coalitions led by developing states, including the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) and African Union (AU) members, have issued statements demanding the opening of humanitarian corridors, immediate medical and food aid entry, and protection for NGOs delivering civilian relief, stressing that security frameworks must protect aid instead of delaying it.^{25,26}

3. Possible Solutions

3.1 In favor of developed countries

Developed countries generally support solutions that ensure humanitarian aid access while maintaining security accountability and international credibility. Many of these states, including G7 and EU members, argue that they hold structural influence in global politics, funding networks, and humanitarian institutions, giving them both the capacity and diplomatic legitimacy to enforce coordinated aid mechanisms.

A major priority for developed nations is that aid delivery remains neutral, traceable, and protected under international humanitarian law (IHL) rather than being delayed indefinitely by conflict clearance procedures.^{6,11,12,13}

Developed countries frequently back solutions such as accredited NGO access through monitored crossings, improved shipment screening using neutral international actors, and enforced humanitarian pauses to guarantee safe convoy movement without legitimizing armed groups.^{7,8,12,15}

Additionally, developed nations commonly argue that dual-use goods should be inspected proportionally rather than banned categorically, especially when they are essential for hospital fuel, electricity generators, medical equipment, and emergency shelter reconstruction.^{8,10,13}

3.2 In favor of developing countries

Developing countries generally support solutions that prioritize immediate, unimpeded humanitarian access and reduce the ability of any single military actor to delay aid through administrative clearance. Since OCHA has repeatedly documented that crossing closures, convoy movement restrictions, and unpredictable access conditions slow both aid entry and distribution inside Gaza, developing countries often argue that the most effective solution is to stabilize crossings and guarantee consistent humanitarian flow through internationally backed arrangements.¹⁵

A key proposal aligned with developing-country positions is the establishment of internationally guaranteed humanitarian corridors and expanded UN/ICRC-style coordination, paired with humanitarian pauses or ceasefire language sufficient to allow large-scale delivery of medical supplies, food, fuel, and shelter materials.^{4,5,11,16}

Developing countries also tend to push for minimizing dual-use restrictions when they block civilian necessities, arguing that restrictions should be narrowly applied and transparent, so hospitals and emergency relief operations are not deprived of essentials.^{8,13}

Finally, legal obligations under international humanitarian law must not be harmed through aid denial or collective punishment dynamics.^{11,13}

4. Keep in Mind the Following

This Background Assistive Report does not include the full political and military history that shaped present humanitarian access conditions in Gaza. Delegates are encouraged to conduct further research into the origins of the crisis and legal obligations surrounding aid delivery. Because each country and regional organization has different strategic and humanitarian motives, delegates must assess both security narratives and civilian rights frameworks when forming their stance. When preparing arguments and policies, delegates should consider the following guiding questions:

1. *What are the root causes and policy implications of military and political restrictions on humanitarian aid in Gaza?*
2. *Has/Is your country facing similar aid-access or corridor obstruction challenges in conflict zones?*
3. *If aid shipments are inspected, what accountability mechanisms exist to ensure inspections do not delay civilian necessities?*
4. *What are the motives and reasoning behind your country choosing to support or oppose military oversight on aid clearance?*
5. *If you are a developing country, will facilitating humanitarian corridors provide insight or precedent for your own region?*
6. *To what extent does your membership in supranational or intergovernmental organizations affect your stance on Gaza aid?*
7. *Can your country support both unblocking humanitarian aid and long-term civilian stability in Gaza simultaneously?*

5. Evaluation

Gaza's humanitarian aid crisis can be understood like an iceberg. The visible problem, blocked aid, closed crossings, and delayed convoys, sits above the surface. Beneath it lies a much larger structure of military operations, political distrust, infrastructure damage, and administrative clearance systems that ultimately trap civilians in long-term humanitarian vulnerability. What about the political disputes over which organizations are allowed to deliver aid? And what about the security procedures that may delay fuel for hospitals or shelter materials for displaced families? Thus, while the topic's main focus is on resolving military and political impediments, it is equally important for delegates to explore solutions that address both immediate access and the deeper systems that cause unpredictability in aid delivery. All in all, remember that nations are interdependent, meaning that one country's security framing or diplomatic motive may conflict with another's humanitarian priorities, making it crucial to connect reasoning, alliances, and negotiation incentives.

6. Bibliography

1. United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. Gaza Strip: Humanitarian access constraints | May 15, 2024, www.ochaopt.org/content/gaza-strip-humanitarian-access-constraints-may-2024
2. United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. Humanitarian Access Snapshot – Gaza Strip | 1-31 May, 2024, www.ochaopt.org/content/humanitarian-access-snapshot-gaza-strip-1-31-may-2024
3. United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. Gaza Humanitarian Response Update | 13-19 May 2024, www.ochaopt.org/content/gaza-humanitarian-response-update-13-19-may-2024
4. United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. Gaza Humanitarian Response — Situation Report No. 44, UN OCHA oPt, 11 Dec. 2025, www.ochaopt.org/content/gaza-humanitarian-response-situation-report-no-44
5. United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. OCHA oPt Updates, www.ochaopt.org/update
6. Alareer, Refaat. “Navigating the Politics of Humanitarian Aid in Gaza.” The Cairo Review, 2024.
7. AP News. “Israel Says It Will Bar Dozens of Aid Groups from Operating in Gaza.” 31 Dec. 2025.
8. Borger, Julian, and Bethan McKernan. “Israel Allowing Traders to Bring Dual-Use Items into Gaza While Aid Organizations Remain Barred.” The Guardian, 1 Jan. 2026.
9. Federman, Josef, and Aaron Magid. “Israel Says It Will Halt Operations of Several Humanitarian Organizations in Gaza.” AP News, 30 Dec. 2025.
10. Haider, Huma. “The Dangerous Rise of Dual-Use Objects in War.” Yale Law Journal, 2025.
11. Nebehay, Stephanie. “UN Official Condemns Gaza Aid Blockade as Cruel Collective Punishment.” Reuters, 1 May 2025.
12. Nichols, Michelle. “Gaza Humanitarian Deterioration a Serious Concern, Say UK, Canada, France and Others.” Reuters, 30 Dec. 2025.
13. Physicians for Human Rights. “FAQs: Access to Health-Care Supplies, Dual-Use Items, and Restrictions in Gaza.” 2024.
14. The Times of Israel. “Israel Enforces New NGO Security Vetting and Dual-Use Import Policies.” 2025.
15. Washington Post. “Israel Suspends Gaza Aid Groups, Citing Security and Transparency Standards.” 31 Dec. 2025.
16. United Nations. “The Gaza Humanitarian Response: Joint Statement of the Foreign Ministers of Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Iceland, Japan, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom.” 2024.
17. European Union External Action Service. “G7 Foreign Ministers’ Statement on Gaza.” EEAS Press Release, 2025.
18. European Union. “EU Calls for Unimpeded Humanitarian Access at Gaza Crossings.” EU Council Conclusions, 2025.

19. Auswärtiges Amt (Federal Foreign Office of Germany), et al. “Developed States Support UN-Led Monitoring for Dual-Use Goods in Gaza.” 2025.
20. Government of Canada Global Affairs. “Developed Country Policy on Humanitarian Pauses in Gaza.” GAC Policy Briefing, 2025.
21. Third World Network. *Humanitarian Access in Gaza: Winter Restrictions and Civilian Leverage*. Third World Network, 2025, www.twn.my.
22. United Nations. “Joint Statement of the Non-Aligned Movement on Humanitarian Access in Gaza.” UN Meetings Coverage and Press Releases, 2025.
23. Group of 77. *Ministerial Communiqué on Humanitarian Aid and Crossing Protection in Gaza*. United Nations Meetings Coverage, 2025, www.un.org/press.
24. Third World Network. “Humanitarian Access in Gaza: A Global South Policy Analysis.” TWN Policy Brief, 2025.
25. Organization of Islamic Cooperation. “OIC Resolution on Humanitarian Corridors and Medical Aid Protection in Gaza.” OIC Resolutions, 2025.
26. African Union Commission. *Statement on the Humanitarian Situation in Gaza*. African Union, 2024, www.au.int/en/pressreleases.
27. International Committee of the Red Cross. “2024 ICRC Report on IHL and the Challenges of Contemporary Armed Conflicts.” International Committee of the Red Cross, 26 Sept. 2024, www.icrc.org/en/report/2024-icrc-report-ihl-challenges.