

**Volume 1, Issue 1**

**Research Article**

**Date of Submission:** 08 Apr, 2026

**Date of Acceptance:** 08 May, 2026

**Date of Publication:** 19 May, 2026

## Principles of humanitarian actions: a comprehensive Examination

**Gabriel Odigbo Iji\***

National Research University Higher School of Economics, Russia

**\*Corresponding Author:** Gabriel Odigbo Iji, National Research University Higher School of Economics, Russia.

**Citation:** Iji, G. O. (2026). Principles of humanitarian actions: a comprehensive Examination. *J Clim Change Disaster Risk Resil Stud*, 1(1), 01-07.

### Abstract

The goal of humanitarian action, a complicated and multidimensional undertaking is to save lives and lessen suffering in times of crisis. The tenets of an ethical and successful humanitarian response are thoroughly examined in this essay along with their doctrinal interpretations, historical development, real-world applications and critical evaluations. Along with important operational imperatives like; do no harm, accountability, coordination and capacity building, we will examine the fundamental principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality and independence. In order to highlight the inherent conflicts and difficulties in putting these principles into practice in various and frequently hotly contested contexts, the discussion will include a range of viewpoints including those of affected populations, policymakers, critical scholars and humanitarian organizations. Particular case studies will highlight how these ideas are applied in practice (and where they may go wrong) while also addressing new issues like climate change, protracted conflicts and the growing politicization of humanitarian assistance. By highlighting the critical importance of ongoing learning, introspection and a dedication to accountability to impacted populations. The essay ends by arguing for a nuanced, flexible and morally sound approach to humanitarian action.

**Keywords:** Humanitarian Principles, Humanity, Impartiality, Neutrality, Independence, Conflict, Politicization of Aid, Vulnerability, Ethical Challenges

### Introduction

Even though humanitarian efforts have long been rooted in acts of kindness during natural disasters and famines, they did not take on their current form until the middle of the 20th century. Throughout history people have given material aid to those in need due to religious reasons (Christian charity and Zakat for example) and moral concerns about how to conduct oneself during a war (found in ancient Greek, Roman and Chinese writings like Sun Tzu's Art of War) (ibid). However, the methodical unbiased independent and neutral delivery of aid came into being later. Public health boards that were set up during the Black Death are early examples of disaster medicine at its most basic level. But a significant change occurred in the late 19th century. Weapons and communication technologies allowed for previously unheard-of levels of destruction but they also made it easier for information about crises to spread around the world opening the door to coordinated aid efforts. The Red Cross was established in 1863 marking a turning point for global humanitarian organizations as a result of Henry Dunant's "A Memory of Solferino" (1862) which described the atrocities of war and argued for an impartial aid organization. The Red Cross obligation to offer unbiased assistance to victims of conflict was formally mandated by the first Geneva Convention (1864). Due to circumstances such as the Northern Chinese Famine (1876-1879) international financial assistance also increased in the late 1800s (ibid). Therefore, although there have always been humanitarian impulses, it was not until the late 19th and early 20th centuries-when the horrors of war and technological advancement greatly influenced it- that the organized moral system of humanitarian aid that we know today really came into being. Despite having its roots in long-standing customs of kindness and generosity, humanitarianism has changed dramatically over time. The early humanitarian movements were mostly ad-hoc and dispersed and they were frequently motivated by religious beliefs. The Geneva Conventions and the creation of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) in the 19th century hence marked the formalization of humanitarian principles. The foundation for a more organized and globally coordinated strategy to alleviate human suffering during armed conflict was established by these historic developments. The recognition of human rights as fundamental principles, the emergence of complex emergencies and greater global interconnectedness have all contributed to the dramatic expansion of humanitarian action in the 20th and 21st centuries. New difficulties have been brought about

by this expansion though, such as; the difficulties of working in conflict areas, the growing politicization of aid and the requirement to address the underlying causes of vulnerability . As a result, in a world that is changing quickly, the tenets that underpin humanitarian actions must be continuously reassessed and modified in order to remain applicable and efficient [1-13]. This essay will examine the core principles looking at their theoretical underpinnings, real-world applications and continuing discussions about them.

### **The Core Principles Of Humanitarian Actions**

The fundamental ethical tenets or principles of humanitarian action- humanity, impartiality, neutrality and independence- form the framework around which the entire system is built [13]. Although these principles seem self-evident, they are frequently complicated and contradictory when interpreted and applied. Namely:

**Humanity:** This principle highlights the fundamental duty to alleviate suffering as well as the intrinsic dignity and worth of every human being. It acknowledges the universal right to life health and well-being regardless of one's nationality, ethnicity, religion, gender or political affiliation surpassing all other factors. Humanity forces those who provide humanitarian aid to act quickly and compassionately giving the needs of the most vulnerable people top priority. At the heart of all humanitarian endeavors is the humanity principle that maintains each person's inherent worth and dignity. Helping those in need is not merely an ideal; it is driven by a basic ethical obligation. This commitment stems from a deep appreciation for the inherent value of human life and the urgent need to eradicate suffering wherever it occurs. Therefore, a commitment to protecting human life and alleviating suffering underpins humanitarian interventions irrespective of the crisis origin- conflict, natural disaster or other forms of violence and adversity. In order to fulfill this commitment, a universal and impartial response is needed ensuring that those whose wellbeing is at risk and whose basic needs are not being met receive the assistance they need without bias or selection. Therefore, the human principle serves as the moral pillar upon which the entire framework of humanitarian action is built [13-17].

**Impartiality:** According to this principle humanitarian assistance must be given solely to those in need and without discrimination. It requires that everyone be treated equally regardless of their affiliation with any particular cause or group. Bias and favoritism must be avoided in order to maintain impartiality and guarantee that aid reaches those who need it the most regardless of their social political or religious background. This is particularly challenging in conflict situations because populations are often divided along factional lines. The principle of impartiality palpably states that assistance must only be given to those in need regardless of their race, political affiliation or religious convictions. Despite its apparent simplicity, this principle presents many difficulties in actual application. Access to the most vulnerable populations is frequently impeded by conflicting parties and humanitarian workers themselves may be in danger making it more difficult to provide aid in an unbiased manner (ibid). The use of humanitarian aid for political or security purposes also make it more difficult to apply this essential idea. The intricate realities of conflict areas and the political pressures influencing aid distribution make maintaining impartiality even more difficult. Navigating these complicated realities requires constant effort in order to apply impartiality in practice. It demands a dedication to putting the needs of the most vulnerable first even in situations where access is restricted or dangerous. Furthermore, it necessitates a critical examination of the possible impact of security or political interests on aid distribution, guaranteeing that humanitarian efforts are not influenced. Adherence to the impartiality principle itself is essential for its successful application but so is a thorough comprehension of the difficulties and roadblocks that come up when trying to achieve this goal. Fairness, accountability and transparency must be continuously pursued in order to guarantee that humanitarian aid genuinely and impartially reaches those who are most in need [18-22].

**Neutrality:** In order to be considered neutral humanitarian, actors must abstain from all actions that might be seen as partisan including picking a side in conflicts [13]. This principle seeks to preserve access to impacted populations while safeguarding aid workers. Neutrality does not however mean remaining silent in the face of flagrant abuses of human rights. Humanitarian groups can and frequently do denounce these abuses in public while remaining impartial in their operations. Finding the right balance between advocacy and side-picking is the difficult part [23]. A fundamental component of traditional humanitarianism as promoted by the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) neutrality denotes non-partisanship in times of conflict (ibid). It entails avoiding acts that might favor one party over another and making sure that assistance reaches those in need irrespective of their political affiliation or the circumstances at hand. This idea is essential for preserving the confidence of all stakeholders and enabling humanitarian organizations to function efficiently in disaster and conflict areas where affiliation with a particular group may endanger access to populations at risk and jeopardize the security of aid workers. Maintaining neutrality is crucial to the ICRC's reputation and capacity to offer objective aid the organization stresses. The idea of neutrality is complicated and frequently contested though. New humanitarianism contends that tackling the underlying causes of suffering frequently necessitates confronting political realities and possibly compromising strict neutrality in contrast to traditional humanitarianism which places a higher priority on this principle [24-26]. It is made more difficult by the difference between impartiality and neutrality impartiality calls for treating all parties equally while neutrality mainly concentrates on refraining from acts that benefit one side. There is usually the conflict between preserving access to those in need and possibly endangering the fundamental idea of impartial aid distribution. The continuous debate shows that although neutrality is still a crucial ideal its actual implementation in the intricate world of humanitarian intervention requires ongoing assessment and modification.

## Independence

For humanitarian organizations to be considered independent, they must be free from religious, political or economic influence. By guaranteeing that decisions are made exclusively in accordance with humanitarian needs and principles rather than in response to outside pressures or agendas this principle protects the integrity and legitimacy of humanitarian action [27-29]. It can be difficult to stay independent particularly when humanitarian operations depend on a variety of funding sources and are conducted in politically complex environments. Delivering aid must also be free from military factors according to the fundamental humanitarian principle of independence. As a result, humanitarian actors must function independently and base their decisions only on the needs of people impacted by crises not on the long-term objectives of any one government or organization. Regardless of their political affiliation, ethnicity or religious beliefs the principle guarantees that aid is dispersed equitably reaching the most vulnerable [13,30,31]. Human suffering is given priority as the only factor influencing the distribution and operation of aid in a truly independent humanitarian response guaranteeing that aid is unaffected by outside demands or goals. Nevertheless, it is difficult for big governmental actors like the European Union (EU) to maintain their independence. This intrinsic tension is exemplified by the EU's efforts to strike a balance between humanitarian aid and other external policies (trade, foreign policy, assistance for development). Even though the EU formally acknowledges and aspires to independence in its humanitarian assistance, political complexities and institutional barriers stand in the way of full autonomy. Navigating this conflict successfully necessitates maintaining the fundamental humanitarian principle of independence while making sure that the needs of marginalized groups are given top priority in all decision-making procedures [30,32].

## Operational Imperatives: Translating Principles Into Action

The guiding principles offer a solid ethical foundation but in order to apply them effectively a number of operational requirements must be met.

- **Do No Harm:** This principle emphasizes how important it is to prevent further harm to impacted populations. Careful needs analyses, risk assessments and culturally sensitive programming are required to avoid unforeseen negative effects. It is important to carefully assess and reduce the possibility that aid will unintentionally make already-existing issues worse or even lead to the development of new ones [33].

- **Accountability:** In order to preserve confidence and guarantee that humanitarian efforts are efficient and responsive to needs, it is imperative that affected populations be held accountable. This calls for open and honest operations systems for receiving feedback and addressing complaints and a dedication to growing from errors. From individual employees to multinational corporations, accountability is present at every level [34,35].

- **Coordination:** In any given situation, it is noteworthy that to prevent duplication of effort, guarantee complementarity and maximize resource allocation, effective coordination between humanitarian actors-including governments, international organizations, nongovernmental organizations and local communities- is essential. Cluster systems and other coordination tools are essential for quick and successful reactions especially during major emergencies [36].

**Capacity Building:** Long-term resilience and sustainability depend on funding local actor's capacity. By empowering local communities and organizations to spearhead response and recovery activities, humanitarian aid is not just a band-aid solution but a catalyst for long-term constructive change. This fosters self-reliance and ownership [36,37].

## Critical Assessments And Challenges To Humanitarian Principles

Humanitarian action principles are often contested in practice despite their moral appeal. Numerous critical viewpoints draw attention to the restrictions and inconsistencies present in their use:

- **Contextual Challenges:** Pragmatic adaptations are required due to the inherent conflict between maintaining impartiality and neutrality while working in environments that are marked by active conflict, poor governance and human rights violations. Aiding one party could be interpreted as taking sides endangering access to vulnerable populations and the safety of humanitarian workers. This makes maintaining neutrality especially challenging when dealing with competing political agendas [22,38]. Moreover, prioritizing needs frequently necessitates challenging trade-offs; resources are always scarce so choices must be made based on factors like urgency vulnerability; and potential impact which may result in charges of prejudice or ignoring particular groups. There is a continuous balancing act due to the intricate interaction between humanitarian access and security concerns. Excessively strict security measures can inadvertently deny access to those who are most in need undermining the fundamental tenets of humanitarian action even though thorough risk assessment and security procedures are necessary to safeguard personnel. Navigating these contextual challenges ultimately calls for a sophisticated awareness of the local environment, flexible tactics and a persistent dedication to ethical reflection and accountability. It also acknowledges that compromises may be required in the pursuit of minimizing harm and maximizing positive impact on impacted populations [39,40].

- **Power Dynamics and Inequality:** Power disparities still exist in the humanitarian system. Strong governments and international organizations have considerable sway over how funds are distributed and how humanitarian agendas are formulated. Disparities in aid distribution may result from this undermining the impartiality principle and excluding the

voices of impacted communities. Additionally, local ownership and participation may be impeded by the unequal power dynamics between donors and recipients [41,42].

- **The Politicization of Humanitarian Aid:** The independence principle is seriously threatened by the growing politicization of humanitarian assistance. The neutrality and impartiality of aid delivery may be compromised by attempts by governments and other actors to use humanitarian assistance for political ends. The safety of aid workers and the legitimacy of humanitarian organizations may be jeopardized by the instrumentalization of aid[43,44].

- **The "Humanitarian-Development Nexus":** Concerns regarding the roles and responsibilities of humanitarian actors have been raised by the increasingly hazy boundaries between development, assistance and humanitarian aid. Development work tackles structural problems and long-term needs, whereas humanitarian aid concentrates on providing relief right away. The principles of impartiality, neutrality and local ownership must be carefully considered in order to successfully integrate these efforts which present many challenges [45,46].

### **Case Studies: Illustrating Principles In Practice**

The real-world implementation and inherent difficulties of humanitarian principles can be better understood by examining particular case studies. Take for example:

#### **The Syrian Civil War (15 March 2011 - present)**

The difficulties in upholding neutrality and impartiality in humanitarian operations are glaringly illustrated by the Syrian Civil War; a protracted conflict marked by numerous armed actors and shifting power dynamics. Relief organization's capacity to reach vulnerable populations in need was severely hampered by the conflicts complicated and fragmented nature. Furthermore, the delivery of crucial aid was significantly impeded by the widespread security threats posed by warring factions such as kidnappings attacks on aid convoys and the targeting of humanitarian workers. These challenges were exacerbated by the clear politicization of aid as different players sought to control the allocation of humanitarian funds for their own political ends. The effectiveness of humanitarian efforts was ultimately undermined by this manipulation which combined with the frequent targeting of aid workers and facilities created a volatile and unpredictable environment that made providing neutral and unbiased assistance extremely risky and difficult [47-49].

#### **The 2010 Haiti Earthquake**

Strong capacity building and efficient coordination are vital for disaster response and long-term recovery as the devastating 2010 Haitian earthquake made clear. In Haiti, the 2010 earthquake destroyed Port-au-Prince killing over 250,000 people and leaving millions homeless. Even though the first international response was large and mostly effective in offering life-saving aid right away there were a lot of coordination issues because of the sheer number of participants which included government organizations foreign non-governmental organizations and numerous volunteer groups. The transition from emergency relief to sustainable recovery efforts was impeded by this lack of a unified strategy and effective resource allocation which also reduced the effectiveness of aid delivery. Haiti's long-term resilience and self-sufficiency in the face of future disasters were compromised as a result of a heavy reliance on outside actors brought on by a lack of investment in enhancing local capacity to manage and respond to the crisis. In order to ensure effective and significant responses to major crises the experience made clear the necessity of enhanced coordination mechanisms and a more proactive approach to capacity building in vulnerable areas. This will guarantee that aid is not only immediate but also sustainable for long-term recovery initiatives [50-53].

#### **The Rohingya Crisis (2017)**

A clear example of the tremendous challenges in maintaining impartiality and safeguarding vulnerable groups from persecution and systematic violence is the Rohingya crisis which was characterized by the mass exodus of the Rohingya population from Myanmar into Bangladesh. An enormous humanitarian challenge was created by the sheer volume of displacement and the unstable conditions in Bangladesh's refugee camps. The suffering was made worse by a lack of international assistance for the impacted populations both in raising awareness of their rights and providing necessary aid. The Rohingya case is a prime example of how difficult it is to apply humanitarian principles, especially impartiality. Humanitarian organizations must negotiate a challenging environment in which political and social factors such as violence and discrimination against the Rohingya frequently impact the delivery of aid. In order to guarantee that everyone impacted by the crisis receives support without prejudice, the impartiality principle requires that aid be given according to need rather than identity. Additionally, the efficacy of humanitarian responses was severely impeded by political tensions between Bangladesh and Myanmar as well as more general geopolitical factors. These factors made it difficult to deliver aid restricted access to vulnerable populations and prevented long-term solutions. The necessity of prompt strong and politically unbiased humanitarian interventions during mass displacement was highlighted by this crisis underscoring the significance of global collaboration and strong safeguards for marginalized communities [54-59].

### **Emerging Challenges And Future Directions**

In the continuous development of humanitarian principles, a number of new issues need to be carefully considered:

- **Climate Change:** A paradigm shift toward proactive Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and community resilience-building is required due to the growing frequency and severity of climate-related disasters which pose an increasingly

serious challenge to humanitarian efforts. Prioritizing proactive measures is essential for future directions which should go beyond emergency response and include long-term plans that increase communities' ability to endure and bounce back from climate shocks. This entails investing in climateresilient livelihoods and infrastructure encouraging community involvement in DRR planning and incorporating climate change projections into vulnerability assessments. Additionally, it is essential to improve local preparedness efforts and fortify early warning systems in order to enable prompt interventions and lessen the effects of disasters. In order to create resilient societies that can handle the growing threats posed by climate change this proactive approach necessitates a large investment in capacity building technology transfer and cooperative partnerships between governments humanitarian organizations and local communities. This calls for a change in emergency response tactics from reactive to more proactive and preventative [60-63].

● **Protracted Conflicts:** Long-term conflicts require a change in approach from emergency relief to development-focused long-term humanitarian interventions. Building local capacity, self-reliance and community resilience through livelihoods, support education and peace building initiatives must be the main goal of future efforts. Instead of only attending to immediate needs; this calls for cooperation with local actors and involvement with the underlying causes of conflict in order to achieve long-term peace and development. Addressing the underlying causes of conflict supporting regional peace building efforts and maintaining long-term engagement are crucial [64].

● **Technological Advancements:** The effectiveness and efficiency of humanitarian response could be greatly increased by technological advancements like big data analytics and remote sensing. To enhance needs, assessments, resource allocation and aid program monitoring and evaluation; future directions should place a high priority on integrating these technologies. This includes mapping impacted areas, forecasting the likelihood of disasters and tracking the effects of interventions using data from remote sensing. Big data analytics can be used to pinpoint vulnerable groups and allocate resources as efficiently as possible. But there are still issues with addressing data privacy concerns, guaranteeing fair access to these technologies and developing the ability to use the enormous volumes of data produced efficiently. But it is important to pay close attention to ethical issues regarding data privacy and possible bias [65,66].

● **Localization:** Humanitarian action must give localization top priority in order to guarantee long-term sustainability and efficacy. Future approaches must drastically change to encourage local ownership and leadership of humanitarian responses. In order to ensure that aid is in line with their unique needs and priorities, this entails giving local organizations and communities the authority to direct the planning, execution and oversight of aid programs. Addressing power disparities within humanitarian systems, developing local capacity and overcoming systemic biases that favor international actors are some of the challenges. Empowering local actors and guaranteeing their meaningful involvement in every phase of the humanitarian cycle is necessary and needful [67].

## Conclusion

Humanitarian principles offer a crucial ethical framework for addressing human suffering. Nevertheless, their real-world implementation is intricate and frequently difficult. Humanitarian actors, impacted populations and other stakeholders must constantly reflect, adapt and communicate in order to uphold the integrity of these principles. The growing complexity of humanitarian crises calls for a flexible and nuanced strategy that places equal emphasis on rigorous adherence to moral principles and the ability to effectively address the pressing needs of individuals impacted. Humanitarian actions future depends on our shared commitment to upholding these values while critically analyzing the inevitable ethical and practical conundrums. A strong responsible and inclusive humanitarian system is essential to effectively addressing the 21st century's expanding humanitarian crises. A constant dedication to learning, adapting and putting the needs of individuals impacted first is necessary for this.

## References

1. Rysaback-Smith, H. (2015). History and principles of humanitarian action. *Turkish journal of emergency medicine*, 15, 5-7.
2. Eberwein, W. D., & Reinalda, B. (2015). A brief history of humanitarian actors and principles. In *The New Humanitarians in International Practice* (pp. 25-42). Routledge.
3. Taithe, B. (2015). Humanitarian history?. In *The Routledge Companion to Humanitarian Action* (pp. 62-73). Routledge.
4. Barnett, M., & Weiss, T. G. (2008). A brief history of the present. *Humanitarianism in question: Politics, power, and ethics*, 1-48.
5. Bugnion, F. (2004). The International Committee of the Red Cross and the development of international humanitarian law. *Chi. J. Int'l L.*, 5, 191.
6. Forsythe, D. P. (2005). *The humanitarians: The international committee of the Red Cross*. Cambridge University Press.
7. Forsythe, D. P., & Rieffer-Flanagan, B. A. (2016). *The International Committee of the Red Cross: A neutral humanitarian actor*. Routledge.
8. Mahoney, K. E., & Mahoney, P. (Eds.). (2023). *Human Rights in the 21st Century: A Global Challenge*. Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
9. Mingst, K. A., Karns, M. P., & Lyon, A. J. (2022). *The United Nations in the 21st century*. Routledge.
10. McGoldrick, C. (2015). The state of conflicts today: Can humanitarian action adapt?. *International Review of the*

- Red Cross, 97(900), 1179-1208.
11. Kent, R. C. (2024). *Humanitarian Futures: Challenges and Opportunities*. Routledge.
  12. Clarke, Matthew, and Brett W. Parrisa.(2022). "Do Humanitarian Principles Still Fit Their Purpose? Suggested Values for a New Global Environment.
  13. Weiss, T. G. (1999). Principles, politics, and humanitarian action. *Ethics & International Affairs*, 13, 1-22.
  14. Bernard, V. (2015). The humanitarian ethos in action. *International Review of the Red Cross*, 97(897-898), 7-18.
  15. Fast, L. (2015). Unpacking the principle of humanity: Tensions and implications. *International Review of the Red Cross*, 97(897-898), 111-131.
  16. Rapatsa, M. (2016). Ubuntu and capabilities approach: Basic doctrines for calibrating humanitarian action. *European Review of Applied Sociology*, 9(12), 12-19.
  17. Pringle, John, and Matthew Hunt. "Humanitarian action." *Encyclopedia of Global Bioethics* (2015): 1-10
  18. Kennedy, D. (2019). Humanitarianism governed: rules, identity, and exclusion in relief work. *Humanity: An International Journal of Human Rights, Humanitarianism, and Development*, 10(2), 207-237.
  19. Glasman, J. (2019). Standards: The Sphere Project and the universalization of the vital minimum after Goma. In *Humanitarianism and the Quantification of Human Needs*. Taylor & Francis.
  20. van Mierop, E. S. (2019). Local humanitarian actors and the principle of impartiality. *Based on need alone?*, 62.
  21. Mačák, K. (2015). A matter of principle (s): The legal effect of impartiality and neutrality on States as humanitarian actors. *International Review of the Red Cross*, 97(897-898), 157-181.
  22. Slim, H. (2015). *Humanitarian ethics: A guide to the morality of aid in war and disaster*. Oxford University Press.
  23. Bordoloi, A. (2020). How important is neutrality in providing humanitarian assistance. *E-International Relations*, 2.
  24. Allen, Macdonald, A., & Radice, H. (2018). *Humanitarianism: A Dictionary of Concepts*. Routledge.
  25. Hoffman, P. J., & Weiss, T. G. (2017). *Humanitarianism, war, and politics: Solferino to Syria and beyond*. Bloomsbury Publishing PLC.
  26. Anderson, K. (2004). Humanitarian inviolability in crisis: The meaning of impartiality and neutrality for UN and NGO agencies following the 2003-2004 Afghanistan and Iraq conflicts. *Harv. Hum. Rts. J.*, 17, 41.
  27. Zewde, S. M. (2023). Information Management in Disaster and Humanitarian Response: A case in United Nations Office for the coordination of humanitarian affairs. *Intelligent Information Management*, 15(2), 47-65.
  28. Canton, H. (2021). Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs—OCHA. In *The Europa Directory of International Organizations 2021* (pp. 153-155). Routledge.
  29. Broberg, M. (2017). The Humanitarian Law Principle of Independence Versus the European Union's Missionary Principle. *Yearbook of European Law*, 36, 810-828.
  30. Orbie, J., Van Elsuwege, P., & Bossuyt, F. (2014). Humanitarian Aid as an Integral Part of the European Union's External Action: The Challenge of Reconciling Coherence and Independence. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 22(3), 158-165.
  31. Gibbons, P., Roughneen, D., McDermott, R., & Maitra, S. (2020). Putting affected people at the Centre of humanitarian action: an argument for the principle of humanitarian subsidiarity. *Disasters*, 44(3), 499-517.
  32. Chilaka, O. (2023). The crucial role of international humanitarian action. Available at SSRN 4643565.
  33. Christoplos, I., Dillon, N., & Bonino, F. (2018). *Evaluation of Protection in Humanitarian Action*. London, UK: ALNAP.
  34. Megersa, K. (2020). Accountability to Affected Populations and Cost-Effectiveness in Humanitarian Outcomes.
  35. Brouder, A. (2017). Accountability to affected populations in urban crises: who cares.
  36. Canton, H. (2021). United nations development programme—UNDP. In *The Europa Directory of International Organizations 2021* (pp. 179-184). Routledge.
  37. Bester, A. (2016). Capacity development. Report prepared for the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs.
  38. Lie, J. H. S. (2020). The humanitarian-development nexus: humanitarian principles, practice, and pragmatics. *Journal of International Humanitarian Action*, 5(1), 18.
  39. Bieńczyk-Missala, A., & Grzebyk, P. (2015). Safety and Protection of Humanitarian Workers. In *The Humanitarian Challenge: 20 Years European Network on Humanitarian Action (NOHA)* (pp. 221-252). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
  40. Clegg, L. (2021). The International Committee of the Red Cross and the protection of world war dead. *Forensic science international*, 319, 110648.
  41. Konyndyk, J., & Worden, R. (2019). People-driven response: power and participation in humanitarian action. Center for Global Development. <https://www.cgdev.org/people-driven-response> Accessed, 6.
  42. Sabates-Wheeler, R., & Barker, J. P. (2024). The place of religious inequalities within international development and humanitarian response frameworks: Lessons from Iraq. *World Development*, 173, 106417.
  43. Abdieva, Yrys. "Humanitarian Intervention." In the *Palgrave Encyclopedia of Global Security Studies*, pp. 754-758. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2023.
  44. Jackson, P., & Beswick, D. (2018). *Conflict, security and development: An introduction*. Routledge.
  45. Weishaupt, S. (2020). The humanitarian-development-peace nexus: towards differentiated configurations (No. 2020-8). UNRISD Working Paper.
  46. Roberts, R. (2020). Responding to protracted displacement using the Humanitarian-Development-Peace nexus approach: Scoping study (No. 2020-12). UNRISD Working Paper.
  47. Bahnasy, A. (2024). The consequences of civil-military relations on civil wars in the Middle East (Master's thesis, The American University in Cairo (Egypt)).

48. Bultrini, A. (2019). Reappraising the Approach of International Law to Civil Wars: Aid to Legitimate Governments or Insurgents and Conflict Minimization. *Canadian Yearbook of International Law/Annuaire canadien de droit international*, 56, 144-219.
49. Rahmani, H. (2023). *The Problem of Military Humanitarian Intervention Selectivity Reinterpreted: A Contrast of Active vis-à-vis Bystander Typical Intervener Actor Complicity* (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Irvine).
50. Comfort, L. K., Siciliano, M. D., & Okada, A. (2011). Resilience, entropy, and efficiency in crisis management: the January 12, 2010, Haiti earthquake. *Risk, Hazards & Crisis in Public Policy*, 2(3), 1-25.
51. Green, R., & Miles, S. (2011). Social impacts of the 12 January 2010 Haiti earthquake. *Earthquake Spectra*, 27(1\_suppl1), 447-462.
52. Gooding, K., Bertone, M. P., Loffreda, G., & Witter, S. (2022). How can we strengthen partnership and coordination for health system emergency preparedness and response? Findings from a synthesis of experience across countries facing shocks. *BMC health services research*, 22(1), 1441.
53. Grünwald, F., & Renaudin, B. (2010). Real-time evaluation of the response to the Haiti earthquake of 12 January 2010. Groupe URD.
54. Islam, M. S., Muhibbullah, M., & Ahmed, Z. (2024). Challenges in protecting Rohingya refugees: Pathways for international intervention. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Education Research*, 10(1), 12-21.
55. Khan, Nahid-Uz-Zaman.(2022). "Rohingya crisis: Security implications on Bangladesh and ways ahead.
56. Hoang, M. T. (2020). Crimes against humanity and the responsibility to protect: The case of the Rohingya crisis in Myanmar.
57. Avis, W. R. (2019). Challenges religious minorities face in accessing humanitarian assistance.
58. Islam, N. (2024). Understanding Bangladesh's Historical Perspectives Through the 2017 Rohingya Crisis.
59. Mahfuz, T. (2023). *The Rohingya Refugee Crisis: A Comparative Study of Liberalism, Realism, and Constructivism in Bangladesh and Myanmar's Foreign Policies*.
60. Gupta, A. K., Jafar, E., Bhardwaj, S., Tyagi, N., Mahajan, V., Sethia, R., ... & Bindal, M. K. (2022). Climate proofing disaster relief and recovery. National Institute of Disaster Management, Delhi, India, 153.
61. Naheed, S. (2021). Understanding disaster risk reduction and resilience: A conceptual framework. In *Handbook of disaster risk reduction for resilience: New frameworks for building resilience to disasters* (pp. 1-25). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
62. Gupta, A. K., Mani, N., Sarkar, B. B., Singh, S., & Katyal, S. (2019). Developing disaster risk resilient cities. Gorakhpur Environmental Action Group (GEAG), Gorakhpur (UP), National Institute of Disaster Management, New Delhi, India and United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), India, 72.
63. Willison, Z. D., de la Cruz, L. B., & Luneta, M. D. (2022). Community-based disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation. In *Handbook on climate change and disasters* (pp. 330-352). Edward Elgar Publishing.
64. Mabiso, A., Maystadt, J. F., Vandecastelen, J., & Hirvonen, K. (2014). Refugees, food security, and resilience in host communities: Transitioning from humanitarian assistance to development in protracted refugee situations (Vol. 2). Intl Food Policy Res Inst.
65. Nagendra, N. P., Narayanamurthy, G., & Moser, R. (2022). Management of humanitarian relief operations using satellite big data analytics: The case of Kerala floods. *Annals of operations research*, 319(1), 885-910.
66. Quinn, J. A., Nyhan, M. M., Navarro, C., Coluccia, D., Bromley, L., & Luengo-Oroz, M. (2018). Humanitarian applications of machine learning with remote-sensing data: review and case study in refugee settlement mapping. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 376(2128), 20170363.
67. Gibbons, P., & Otioku-Boadu, C. (2021). The question is not "if to localise?" but rather "how to localise?": Perspectives from Irish humanitarian INGOs. *Frontiers in Political Science*, 3, 744559.

#### Online Sources:

<https://edition.cnn.com/2013/08/27/middleeast/syria-civil-war-fast-facts>

<https://asiadisasterguide.unocha.org/II-guidance-frameworks.html>

[https://www.huffpost.com/entry/rohingya-crisis-photos\\_n\\_5a3bc302e4b025f99e150f1d](https://www.huffpost.com/entry/rohingya-crisis-photos_n_5a3bc302e4b025f99e150f1d)

<https://www.northcountrypublicradio.org/news/npr/794939899/haiti-in-ruins-a-look-back-atthe-2010-earthquake>