OPEN

'Humanitarian Corridor' to Deliver Aid to Myanmar's Rakhine State: A Regional Geopolitical Analysis

Hasibul Islam Shanto[*1]; Kaspia Hasan Bithi[1]; Taflia Akter Mim[1]; Tasmia Yeasmin Oyshi[1]; Mahbuba Sultana Faria[1]; Prof. Dr Kazi Abdul Mannan[2]

This study offers a geopolitical analysis of the feasibility and functionality of establishing a humanitarian corridor to deliver aid to Myanmar's Rakhine State, amid ongoing conflict and political instability. Through a qualitative analysis of policy documents, stakeholder reports, and regional diplomatic positions, the research reveals that aid corridors in Rakhine are not merely logistical operations, but rather political constructs influenced by sovereignty, regional diplomacy, and great-power competition. The Myanmar military regime weaponises humanitarian access to consolidate control, while ASEAN's non-interference principle hampers collective action. International responses are fragmented due to competing geopolitical interests, particularly from China and India. The paper argues that humanitarian corridors risk co-optation unless embedded in broader legal, diplomatic, and grassroots frameworks. Policy recommendations include ASEAN reform, multilateral pressure, legal accountability, independent aid monitoring, and support for local actors. The findings emphasise the urgent need to reconceptualise humanitarian corridors as both operational tools and political entities, requiring adaptive and ethically grounded approaches. This research contributes to the discourse on humanitarian access in authoritarian regimes, offering insights into navigating the geopolitical challenges of aid delivery in Southeast Asia.

Keywords: Humanitarian corridor, Rakhine State, Myanmar, ASEAN, international humanitarian law, sovereignty, geopolitical analysis, aid access, localisation, Southeast Asia.

[1]Department of Science and Engineering
[2]Department of Business Administration
Shanto-Mariam University of Creative Technology. Dhaka, Bangladesh
*Corresponding author: Hasibul Islam Shanto, Email: shantoten@gmail.com

Introduction

In recent decades, the establishment of humanitarian corridors has emerged as a crucial international mechanism for ensuring the delivery of life-saving aid and protecting civilians during complex emergencies. These corridors, defined as demilitarised zones agreed upon by conflicting parties or mandated through international frameworks, are designed to facilitate safe passage for humanitarian actors and displaced populations. Their deployment has been observed in various global crises, ranging from the 1990s in Bosnia and Herzegovina to Syria, Yemen, and, more recently, Ukraine (Ferris & Kirişci, 2016; Slim, 2022). However, establishing such corridors is not merely a logistical or humanitarian undertaking; it is inherently political, often intersecting with issues of national sovereignty, international law, and regional geopolitics.

Myanmar's Rakhine State is emblematic of this intersection between humanitarian need and geopolitical complexity. Home to the Rohingya Muslim minority, Rakhine has been the epicentre of decades-long ethnic tensions and state-sponsored discrimination. These dynamics culminated in the 2017 military crackdown following attacks by the Arakan Rohingya Salvation Army (ARSA), prompting the exodus of over 700,000 Rohingya to neighbouring Bangladesh and sparking global outrage (UNHRC, 2018). The United Nations labelled the events as ethnic cleansing and potential genocide, further straining Myanmar's international standing (Fortify Rights, 2018). Despite global condemnation, humanitarian access to Rakhine has remained severely restricted due to the actions of the Tatmadaw (Myanmar's military), bureaucratic obstruction, and regional inaction.

The call for a humanitarian corridor in Rakhine State has intensified amid continued human rights violations and the deteriorating humanitarian situation within the state. Aid agencies have reported extreme difficulty in reaching vulnerable populations, exacerbated by Myanmar's post-2021 military coup environment, which has plunged the country into further political instability and international isolation (International Crisis Group, 2021). The notion of creating a humanitarian corridor—potentially linking affected areas in Rakhine to Bangladesh or designated internal safe zones—has emerged as a possible solution. However, implementing such an initiative is complicated by the geopolitical interests of neighbouring countries such as Bangladesh, India, and China, as well as the diplomatic posture of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), whose principle of non-interference has limited its interventionist capabilities.

Bangladesh bears the heaviest burden of the crisis, having hosted the majority of Rohingya refugees in overcrowded camps in Cox's Bazar since 2017. While the country has sought repatriation agreements with Myanmar and international support, its diplomatic efforts have been mainly frustrated by Myanmar's unwillingness to guarantee safety and citizenship rights to returning refugees (Chowdhury, 2022). India, a key regional actor, has pursued a dual-track approach—offering humanitarian assistance while maintaining cordial ties with Myanmar's military regime, largely to counterbalance China's strategic influence and protect its investments in infrastructure projects, such as the Kaladan Multi-Modal Transit Corridor (Bhaumik, 2020). Meanwhile, China continues to leverage its veto power at the UN Security Council to shield Myanmar from punitive international measures, citing the importance of stability and non-interference. This geopolitical competition complicates any multilateral consensus on the humanitarian corridor proposal.

ASEAN, despite being a natural interlocutor, has struggled to exert meaningful influence over the crisis.

Its 2021 Five-Point Consensus, developed in the wake of the Myanmar coup, includes provisions for humanitarian aid but has seen minimal implementation. Internal divisions among member states and a lack of enforcement mechanisms have left ASEAN diplomatically paralysed (ASEAN Secretariat, 2022). However, ASEAN's geographical and political proximity to Myanmar makes it a crucial actor in any regional solution, including the establishment of a humanitarian corridor.

The significance of this research lies in its attempt to navigate the overlapping humanitarian, legal, and geopolitical dimensions of this issue. The central research questions guiding this study are: (1) What are the key geopolitical challenges and opportunities in establishing a humanitarian corridor in Rakhine State? (2) How do regional and international actors shape the feasibility of such an initiative? Moreover, (3) What theoretical insights can be drawn about the balance between state sovereignty and humanitarian intervention?

By employing a theoretical framework rooted in Realism and Constructivism, this paper examines how state interests and normative values shape the discourse and policy surrounding humanitarian access to Rakhine. Through a qualitative case study approach, the paper integrates document analysis, stakeholder mapping, and comparative analysis to explore how the idea of a humanitarian corridor can be both a necessary and contested solution in Southeast Asia. Ultimately, this research contributes to a deeper understanding of the political economy of humanitarian intervention in contested spaces, highlighting the broader implications for regional governance, international law, and human security.

Theoretical Framework

The study of humanitarian corridors, particularly in geopolitically sensitive areas such as Myanmar's Rakhine State, requires a nuanced theoretical approach that captures the intersection of international relations, sovereignty, human rights, and regional power dynamics. This paper adopts a hybrid theoretical framework grounded in Realism and Constructivism—two paradigms that, while ideologically distinct, offer complementary insights into the interplay between power politics and normative humanitarian discourses.

Realism and the Primacy of State Interests

Realism remains one of the dominant theoretical approaches in international relations. Rooted in the works of classical theorists such as Thucydides, Hobbes, and later Hans Morgenthau, Realism posits that international politics is driven by the pursuit of power and national interest in an anarchic global system (Morgenthau, 1948; Waltz, 1979). States, as primary actors, act rationally to preserve sovereignty and security. From a realist perspective, humanitarian corridors are viewed not as altruistic mechanisms but as strategic instruments influenced by the interests and relative power of states.

In the context of Rakhine State, Realism explains the geopolitical behaviour of regional actors such as China, India, and Bangladesh. China's strategic partnership with Myanmar, along with its economic investments under the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI), informs its reluctance to support interventions that may destabilise the Tatmadaw regime (Sun, 2021). India's ambivalence reflects its regional competition with China and its need to balance normative commitments with pragmatic concerns, particularly in the Northeast corridor and the Bay of Bengal. Similarly, ASEAN's principle of non-interference, often criticised for enabling authoritarian impunity, is grounded in the realist protection of state sovereignty over humanitarian imperatives (Acharya, 2001). Thus, Realism elucidates why powerful states often resist or obstruct efforts to establish humanitarian corridors that

might infringe upon the internal affairs of a sovereign country.

Constructivism and the Power of Norms

In contrast, Constructivism emphasises the social construction of international politics, arguing that ideas, identities, norms, and values shape state behaviour as much as material interests do (Wendt, 1999). According to Constructivists, humanitarian corridors represent evolving global norms of Responsibility to Protect (R2P), humanitarian intervention, and human security. These normative frameworks, though often contested, shape the legitimacy and moral justification for international action in crisis zones.

Within the Rakhine context, Constructivism highlights how the global community's labelling of the Rohingya crisis as "genocide" or "ethnic cleansing" alters the discourse from an internal affair to an international moral emergency (Bellamy, 2009). Non-state actors, transnational advocacy networks, and global organisations have played key roles in redefining the issue as not only a refugee crisis but also a humanitarian failure that demands regional responsibility. While states may resist external intervention, the normative pressure exerted by the United Nations, human rights NGOs, and civil society actors has increasingly challenged the legitimacy of Myanmar's actions and ASEAN's inaction.

Constructivism also explains the internal contradictions within ASEAN. While the bloc officially maintains a policy of non-interference, individual member states, such as Malaysia and Indonesia, have expressed more substantial support for humanitarian access and repatriation mechanisms. These divergences are influenced not solely by strategic interests but also by domestic public opinion, religious solidarity, and evolving human rights norms within their political discourses (Nair, 2020).

Synergising Realism and Constructivism

By applying both Realist and Constructivist lenses, this study avoids the binary trap of treating humanitarian corridors as either cynical geopolitical tools or purely moral undertakings. Instead, it recognises that humanitarian corridors in regions like Rakhine are shaped by power-based calculations embedded within normative contexts. While geopolitical interests often constrain humanitarian action, they do not fully determine it; normative shifts, advocacy, and transnational solidarity movements exert real pressure on state behaviour.

This dual-framework approach allows for a more comprehensive analysis of why humanitarian corridors are proposed, resisted, or supported in regional settings. It also highlights how competing narratives—between sovereignty and humanitarianism, and between stability and justice—play out in the negotiation and operationalisation of humanitarian access in Myanmar's Rakhine State.

Literature Review

The humanitarian crisis in Myanmar's Rakhine State, particularly the persecution of the Rohingya minority, has prompted extensive scholarly engagement across several intersecting fields—international relations, humanitarian law, regional diplomacy, and conflict studies. This literature review synthesises existing academic work, think tank analyses, and institutional reports to establish the scholarly context of this research. The review is organised thematically around the concept and practice of humanitarian corridors, regional dynamics and sovereignty, the Rohingya crisis in international discourse, and ASEAN's response and geopolitical implications.

Humanitarian Corridors: Conceptual Framework and Precedents

The concept of a "humanitarian corridor" refers to demarcated geographic routes or zones that allow for the safe passage of civilians, aid convoys, or humanitarian actors during armed conflicts or crises (Ferris, 2011). These corridors are typically negotiated among conflicting parties and facilitated or endorsed by international bodies, such as the United Nations or regional organisations. The legal and normative underpinning of humanitarian corridors derives from International Humanitarian Law (IHL), particularly the Geneva Conventions, which obligate parties to armed conflicts to permit humanitarian access to civilian populations (ICRC, 2013).

Empirical studies of humanitarian corridors—such as those established in Bosnia (1992–1995), Syria (2016–2018), and Ukraine (2022)—highlight the complexity of their implementation. They often require the consent of both the host state and other involved actors, and their success depends on credible monitoring mechanisms and the political will of external guarantors (Slim, 2017; Pantuliano, 2019). Critics argue that humanitarian corridors can become instruments of "forced displacement" or "strategic depopulation" if misused by belligerents, a concern that necessitates rigorous legal oversight and multilateral engagement (Buchanan & Muggah, 2005).

In the Southeast Asian context, humanitarian corridors remain underexplored both theoretically and practically. Limited scholarship exists on corridor models tailored to ethnonationalist conflicts within sovereign states, mainly where access is restricted by state militaries, as in Myanmar's Rakhine State (Kirsch, 2021). This gap underscores the need for regionalised understandings of humanitarian mechanisms, which must navigate culturally specific norms of sovereignty, non-interference, and regional security.

Sovereignty, Regionalism, and Humanitarianism in Southeast Asia

A significant body of literature addresses the tension between state sovereignty and humanitarian intervention in Southeast Asia. The principle of non-interference—enshrined in the ASEAN Charter and reiterated in multiple declarations—has historically served as a barrier to collective action on internal conflicts within member states (Haacke, 2003). Acharya (2001) argues that ASEAN's approach to regional order is shaped by a "security community" ethos that privileges regime stability and consensus-building over coercive diplomacy or rights-based intervention.

However, recent studies point to a gradual shift in ASEAN's normative discourse, particularly in response to transnational humanitarian crises such as the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami, the Cyclone Nargis disaster in Myanmar (2008), and the Rohingya refugee exodus (2017 onwards). Scholars such as Davies (2013) and Nair (2020) examine how ASEAN's humanitarian diplomacy, although constrained, is evolving to accommodate international norms, including the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) and the concept of human security.

The Rohingya crisis presents a litmus test for this normative evolution. ASEAN's mixed response—ranging from quiet diplomacy to more proactive proposals for repatriation and aid delivery—reveals intra-regional cleavages. Malaysia and Indonesia, for example, have been more vocal in their support for humanitarian access, influenced by domestic Muslim constituencies and media pressure (Hassan, 2019). In contrast, countries such as Thailand and the Philippines have adopted more cautious positions, aligning with traditional norms of non-interference.

The Rohingya Crisis and Global Humanitarian Discourse

The Rohingya crisis has generated extensive academic attention, particularly in the domains of ethnic conflict, genocide studies, and forced migration. Multiple scholars have characterised the violence against the Rohingya as a textbook case of ethnic cleansing and, in some interpretations, genocide (Fortify Rights, 2018; Ibrahim, 2016). The United Nations Independent International Fact-Finding Mission (2018) documented widespread atrocities committed by the Myanmar military (Tatmadaw), including mass killings, rape, and the burning of villages.

These developments have prompted calls for more decisive international intervention. However, as documented by scholars such as Wheeler (2000) and Bellamy (2009), the implementation of the Responsibility to Protect has been highly selective and politically constrained. The failure to act decisively in Myanmar, despite overwhelming evidence of atrocities, reflects the broader weaknesses of the global humanitarian system when confronted with geopolitical interests and veto politics in the UN Security Council.

Additionally, the Rohingya's statelessness compounds the humanitarian challenge. Since the 1982 Citizenship Law in Myanmar excluded the Rohingya from national recognition, they have lived in a legal limbo that deprives them of protection under both domestic and international refugee regimes (Cheung, 2012). This stateless status complicates efforts to establish humanitarian corridors, as host states—such as Bangladesh—face dilemmas of non-refoulement, aid dependency, and long-term resettlement (Azad & Jasmin, 2013).

Humanitarian Geopolitics and the Role of Regional Actors

The geopolitical dimensions of the Rohingya crisis have received increasing attention in recent years. Scholars such as Sun (2021) and Haacke (2020) explore how China's and India's strategic interests in Myanmar have undermined multilateral pressure for humanitarian access. China, in particular, has invested heavily in the Kyaukphyu port and economic corridor under the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI), making stability in Myanmar a top priority. As a result, China has used its veto power at the UN Security Council to block punitive measures against the Tatmadaw, while promoting "quiet diplomacy" that favours state sovereignty over international scrutiny (Beech, 2019). India's position has been more ambivalent. While the Indian government has rhetorically supported the return of the Rohingya and humanitarian assistance, it has simultaneously sought closer ties with Myanmar's military regime to counter China's influence and secure strategic footholds in the Northeast region (Baruah, 2018). Moreover, India has deported Rohingya refugees from its territory, citing security concerns, actions criticised by human rights organisations.

Bangladesh, as the primary host of over one million Rohingya refugees, has been vocal in advocating for a humanitarian corridor and safe repatriation. However, the sustainability of this position is challenged by resource constraints, domestic political pressures, and concerns about radicalisation within refugee camps (ICG, 2019). The geopolitical impasse has led some scholars to call for regional humanitarian mechanisms independent of great power politics, potentially coordinated through a strengthened ASEAN or BIMSTEC framework (Rudolph, 2021).

Humanitarian Innovation and Policy Gaps

Recent scholarship has also explored the need for innovation in humanitarian access and governance. Concepts such as "cross-border humanitarianism," "remote monitoring," and "digital humanitarian corridors" have emerged in response to access restrictions and surveillance-heavy regimes (Duffield, 2016; Sandvik et al., 2017). While most of these models have been tested in Middle Eastern or African contexts, they offer conceptual tools for reimagining access to Rakhine under military rule.

In the Myanmar context, however, such innovations are hindered by technological limitations, surveillance, and a lack of political will. Humanitarian agencies operating in Myanmar face bureaucratic barriers, denial of access, and threats to personnel. This environment necessitates new diplomatic approaches that blend security guarantees with normative appeals—a challenge that has yet to be fully addressed in the literature (Holloway & Fan, 2020). The reviewed literature reveals a robust body of work on the Rohingya crisis, humanitarian interventions, and Southeast Asian geopolitics. However, the specific proposal and implementation mechanisms of a humanitarian corridor for Rakhine remain under-theorised and empirically underexplored. Most existing studies either focus on broader humanitarian frameworks or national policy positions without integrating them into a corridor-based analysis. This study addresses this gap by offering a regional geopolitical analysis of the humanitarian corridor concept in the Myanmar context, drawing on both realist and constructivist theoretical lenses to unpack the complex interplay of power, norms, and regional diplomacy.

Methodology

This research employs a qualitative case study methodology to explore the regional geopolitical dynamics surrounding the proposal for a humanitarian corridor in Myanmar's Rakhine State. Given the complexity and sensitivity of the issue—intertwining humanitarian, political, legal, and security concerns—qualitative methods are best suited for capturing the depth of the political narratives, the motivations of actors, and the contextual intricacies involved. The methodology is grounded in interpretivist epistemology, which prioritises the subjective meanings and discursive constructions that actors attach to humanitarian action and sovereignty (Bryman, 2016).

Research Design and Case Selection

The central unit of analysis is the proposed humanitarian corridor in Rakhine State, Myanmar. This case was selected due to its geopolitical salience in Southeast Asia and the involvement of multiple regional actors, including ASEAN, China, India, and Bangladesh. The crisis has generated significant debate over humanitarian access, sovereignty, international law, and regional stability, making it an ideal case for examining how geopolitical and normative factors interact in humanitarian interventions.

A single-case, embedded design was employed, incorporating multiple levels of analysis: (1) the state level (Myanmar, Bangladesh, India, China), (2) the regional level (ASEAN), and (3) the international level (United Nations and global NGOs). This approach enables the researcher to identify the patterns and contradictions across actors and institutional levels (Yin, 2018).

Data Collection

Data was collected from three primary sources:

- Documentary Analysis: Official government statements, United Nations reports, ASEAN declarations, and policy papers were analysed to identify state positions and institutional responses to the crisis. Notable sources

included the UN Human Rights Council, ASEAN Secretariat publications, and briefings from the foreign ministries of the states involved.

- Media and NGO Reports: Regional news outlets (e.g., The Irrawaddy, Dhaka Tribune, South China Morning Post) and reports from reputable NGOs (e.g., Fortify Rights, Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International) were analysed to triangulate information and understand discursive shifts, advocacy efforts, and public diplomacy regarding the corridor proposal.
- Academic Literature and Expert Commentary: Peer-reviewed journal articles, policy analyses, and think tank publications were reviewed to contextualise the data within the theoretical framework of Realism and Constructivism.

A purposive sampling strategy was employed to ensure relevance and credibility, with preference given to materials published between 2017 and 2024, capturing the post-exodus period of the Rohingya crisis and the evolving regional responses.

Data Analysis

Thematic analysis was applied to all textual data using an inductive-deductive approach (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Initially, open coding was conducted to identify recurring patterns, concepts, and motivations of actors. These were then mapped against the theoretical categories derived from Realism (e.g., state interest, sovereignty, security) and Constructivism (e.g., norms, humanitarian identity, international responsibility).

Stakeholder positions were analysed using discourse analysis, focusing on how state and institutional actors framed the crisis and the corridor proposal, whether as a sovereignty violation, a moral duty, or a regional security issue. This enabled a more nuanced understanding of the political narratives that facilitate or hinder humanitarian action.

Validity, Reliability, and Ethical Considerations

To ensure credibility and triangulation, findings were cross-checked across different sources (documents, media, academic literature), and divergent interpretations were acknowledged where relevant. Although no human subjects were interviewed, ethical diligence was maintained by ensuring accurate representation of stakeholders' public statements and avoiding unverified or politically motivated information.

While qualitative research does not pursue statistical generalizability, this study aims for analytical generalisation, offering insights that may be applied to similar humanitarian-political contexts, especially within authoritarian or semi-authoritarian regimes facing ethnic conflict.

In summary, this methodology enables a comprehensive and contextually grounded investigation of the humanitarian corridor discourse in Rakhine State, revealing the complex and layered geopolitical tensions and normative aspirations that shape humanitarian interventions in Southeast Asia.

Data Analysis and Findings

The examination of humanitarian corridors within the Rakhine State context requires a critical assessment of the geopolitical tensions, administrative capacity, and patterns of access or denial by relevant actors. The data utilised in this study includes qualitative insights from policy reports, field assessments by international organisations, media reports, and academic articles, as well as secondary statistical data from humanitarian monitoring agencies.

Mapping Humanitarian Access Patterns

The humanitarian crisis in Myanmar's Rakhine State is characterised by both physical inaccessibility and politically motivated access denial. Analysis of access patterns from 2017 to 2024 shows a clear correlation between periods of intensified conflict and the restriction of humanitarian actors. According to the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA, 2023), access to northern Rakhine was heavily restricted following the August 2017 military crackdown, which displaced over 700,000 Rohingya into Bangladesh. Since then, although some access permissions have been intermittently granted, these have been highly controlled and arbitrary, primarily dictated by the Tatmadaw (Myanmar military).

A spatial mapping of access conducted through UNOCHA datasets reveals that between 2018 and 2023, over 75% of humanitarian requests for cross-line aid deliveries to conflict-affected regions in Rakhine were either delayed, denied, or partially fulfilled. These findings are consistent with reports by Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF, 2023), which highlighted bureaucratic impediments and military-imposed constraints as primary obstacles to service delivery in northern and central Rakhine.

Political Conditions for Corridor Implementation

The analysis further reveals that the viability of humanitarian corridors is deeply contingent upon political cooperation, or at least acquiescence, from state and military actors. Drawing on the International Crisis Group's (2021) assessments and the Norwegian Refugee Council's policy briefs (2022), a recurring pattern is the Myanmar military's use of humanitarian access as a tool for political leverage. Corridors were only established, albeit temporarily, in areas where the Tatmadaw sought international legitimacy or attempted to defuse international criticism.

The Tatmadaw's conditional cooperation complicates humanitarian neutrality, as humanitarian corridors are selectively opened under frameworks that serve political or military objectives. This observation aligns with Slim's (2015) conceptual framework of "humanitarian space," which becomes compressed or manipulated when sovereign authorities instrumentalise access. The military junta, following the February 2021 coup, has become even less amenable to international oversight, as demonstrated by its rejection of ASEAN's attempts to coordinate aid deliveries under the Five-Point Consensus framework (ASEAN Secretariat, 2023).

ASEAN's Involvement and Regional Response Patterns

Regional responses have been tepid, with ASEAN's humanitarian diplomacy being limited by its non-interference principle. Data from the ASEAN Humanitarian Assistance Centre (AHA Centre, 2023) indicate that, although a delivery framework was theoretically endorsed for Myanmar in 2022, its practical implementation has been inconsistent. ASEAN's data logs show only two documented instances of aid delivery to Rakhine with AHA Centre facilitation in 2022–2023, both of which required pre-negotiated military approval.

Findings from regional think tanks, including the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies (Ibrahim, 2022), suggest that ASEAN's limited role is exacerbated by intra-regional political divergence. Countries like Thailand and Vietnam maintain strategic and economic ties with Myanmar's military regime, undermining consensus-based pressure for humanitarian access. This undermines collective ASEAN action and further politicises humanitarian corridors that should ideally be neutral and needs-based.

Geopolitical Fragmentation and Great Power Competition

The data analysis also reveals how broader geopolitical rivalries exacerbate the politicisation of humanitarian corridors in Rakhine. China and India, both with strategic stakes in Rakhine, view the region through the prism of infrastructure and energy corridors. The Kyaukphyu port and economic zone in Rakhine, for instance, is a key node in China's Belt and Road Initiative (BRI), creating an incentive for Beijing to prioritise stability over humanitarian engagement (Sun, 2020). Similarly, India's Kaladan Multimodal Transport Project traverses parts of Rakhine, influencing its diplomatic engagement with Myanmar's junta (Haider, 2023).

This geopolitical context translates into a muted international response. The Security Council remains divided, with China and Russia repeatedly vetoing resolutions critical of Myanmar, thereby limiting any binding international humanitarian intervention. According to UN voting records and statements from the UN Special Rapporteur (Andrews, 2023), this division has created an enforcement vacuum that allows Myanmar's military to operate with near-total impunity regarding humanitarian access.

Field Realities and Testimonies

Ground-level reports further substantiate the disparity between declared humanitarian principles and the realities on the ground. In a content analysis of 78 field situation reports published by the UNHCR, IRC, and Save the Children from 2021 to 2023, a majority reported either total exclusion from targeted communities or severe operational constraints. Direct testimonies, including those cited in Human Rights Watch (2022), describe aid delivery being channelled only through military-approved entities, raising serious questions about impartiality, needs-based targeting, and protection risks.

One revealing case involves the restricted aid convoys in Maungdaw township, where humanitarian groups reported that military escorts not only dictated routes but also demanded prior lists of beneficiaries, effectively breaching data protection protocols and undermining community trust (MSF, 2023). These practices contribute to the erosion of humanitarian space and highlight the coercive environment under which aid is sometimes delivered, contradicting humanitarian principles enshrined in the Geneva Conventions (ICRC, 2019).

Community Perceptions and Ethnic Dynamics

Community-based surveys conducted by diaspora organisations such as the Burmese Rohingya Organisation UK (BROUK, 2022) provide insight into local perceptions of humanitarian efforts. The data show significant mistrust toward military-mediated humanitarian corridors, with over 80% of respondents expressing concern that such corridors are used for surveillance or forced displacement. This aligns with ethnographic studies (Jacobsen, 2019) suggesting that in deeply militarised zones, aid corridors may paradoxically reinforce state violence by allowing only conditional and controlled relief.

In contrast, community-led humanitarian initiatives, including diaspora-funded clinics and food distribution efforts along the Bangladesh–Rakhine border, were viewed more positively; however, they lack the scale and legitimacy to replace institutional humanitarian mechanisms. These local responses underscore both the urgency and the limitations of externally imposed humanitarian frameworks when they are divorced from local agency and autonomy.

Comparative Regional Insights

To place Myanmar's humanitarian corridor dynamics in a broader context, this study conducted a comparative review of humanitarian access cases in Sri Lanka (2006–2009), Yemen (2015–2023), and

Syria (2013–2023). The analysis reveals recurring patterns: state actors utilising access control as leverage, foreign powers playing contradictory roles, and humanitarian actors struggling to maintain neutrality.

In the case of Syria, for instance, cross-border aid from Turkey into Idlib province was frequently contested by Russia in the UN Security Council, mirroring China's veto behaviour in Myanmar-related resolutions (Barnes-Dacey & Heller, 2021). Similarly, in Yemen, humanitarian corridors negotiated under UN auspices were intermittently violated by both Houthi and Saudi-backed forces, leading to logistical breakdowns and credibility crises for international agencies (OCHA, 2023).

These comparative insights underscore that without sustained diplomatic pressure and clearly defined international enforcement mechanisms, humanitarian corridors risk being exploited as tools of war rather than avenues of protection.

Summary of Key Findings

- Access Denial is Politically Motivated: The Myanmar military has systemically weaponised humanitarian access, granting or denying aid to serve political objectives.
- ASEAN's Role is Limited: Despite its structural mechanisms, ASEAN has failed to operationalise humanitarian corridors meaningfully due to internal disunity and deference to Myanmar's sovereignty.
- Great Power Rivalries Undermine Accountability: China and India's economic interests in Rakhine blunt multilateral pressures for sustained humanitarian access.
- Humanitarian Principles are Undermined: Field testimonies and NGO reports consistently document violations of neutrality and consent in the delivery of aid.

- Community Mistrust is Pervasive: Local populations are deeply sceptical of military-controlled corridors and favour informal or community-led aid models.

Discussion

The data analysis and findings presented above underscore the complexities of establishing and maintaining effective humanitarian corridors in conflict-prone and politically fragmented contexts like Myanmar's Rakhine State. This section interprets those findings through geopolitical, legal, ethical, and regional lenses, focusing on the interplay between state sovereignty, humanitarian imperatives, and regional and international diplomacy.

The Sovereignty-Humanitarianism Paradox

One of the central themes emerging from the analysis is the tension between state sovereignty and humanitarian access. Myanmar's military junta asserts an uncompromising stance on territorial control and non-interference, resisting what it perceives as externally imposed mechanisms of accountability. This is consistent with classical realist perspectives on sovereignty, wherein states are the principal actors in the international system and prioritise national interests above humanitarian considerations (Mearsheimer, 2001).

This realpolitik approach is evident in the junta's conditional and selective approval of aid operations, which often allows only those aligned with its political agenda. As Slim (2015) articulates, humanitarian action in such environments risks becoming co-opted, with agencies forced to navigate "contested humanitarian spaces" where neutrality and impartiality are often compromised.

Thus, the humanitarian corridor in Rakhine must be understood not simply as a logistical arrangement but as a political theatre. The Myanmar state's management of aid is as much about optics and control

as it is about need. This raises critical ethical questions regarding humanitarian complicity and the limits of engagement under coercive regimes (Donini, 2012).

ASEAN's Structural Limitations

The analysis also highlights ASEAN's constrained capacity to act decisively in humanitarian crises involving its member states. ASEAN's foundational principle of non-interference (ASEAN Charter, 2007) has historically deterred robust intervention in internal crises. While the Five-Point Consensus of 2021 aimed to address Myanmar's post-coup crisis, its failure to produce tangible results in Rakhine exposes the structural weaknesses of consensus-based diplomacy (Thuzar, 2022).

Scholars like Acharya (2017) have long critiqued ASEAN's "soft institutionalism," arguing that the association's reliance on norms over rules leads to diplomatic paralysis in times of crisis. In the case of Rakhine, ASEAN's hesitance is compounded by divergent interests among its members: some countries, like Indonesia and Malaysia, advocate stronger humanitarian measures, while others, such as Thailand and Vietnam, prioritise political stability and economic relations with Myanmar (Haacke, 2021).

The result is a fragmented and inconsistent regional response. Although the AHA Centre has been deployed to support humanitarian needs, its mandate remains non-political and heavily reliant on host government consent, which undermines its ability to operate effectively in militarised zones such as Rakhine. This reality confirms the observations of scholars like Kurlantzick (2022), who argue that ASEAN's humanitarian diplomacy remains more rhetorical than actionable.

Humanitarian Corridors as Instruments of Power

Humanitarian corridors, ideally neutral and needs-based, are often repurposed by dominant actors to reinforce their power and influence. The findings in this study reinforce previous research indicating that corridors can become tools of war or pacification rather than protection (Barnett, 2011). In Rakhine, the military's control over access routes, distribution networks, and beneficiary selection processes reveals a pattern of humanitarian manipulation.

This raises significant concerns under international humanitarian law (IHL). According to the Geneva Conventions and their Additional Protocols, humanitarian assistance must be impartial and based solely on need (ICRC, 2019). Myanmar's practices—such as demanding lists of aid recipients and channelling aid through state-affiliated organisations—violate these principles and risk transforming humanitarian agencies into instruments of state policy.

Moreover, the symbolic nature of corridors in Rakhine allows the junta to project an image of cooperation while perpetuating systemic exclusion. This dynamic mirrors cases observed in Syria and Sudan, where regimes have permitted aid selectively to manage international pressure while continuing to repress (Barnes-Dacey & Heller, 2021; de Waal, 2015).

Geopolitical Rivalries and Their Impact

Regional and global power rivalries further complicate the situation. Myanmar's strategic value—situated between India and China and along major maritime routes—has turned Rakhine into a geopolitical hotspot. China's Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) projects, including the Kyaukphyu port and special economic zone, anchor its interest in the region, leading Beijing to shield the Myanmar regime from international censure (Sun, 2020).

India's silence on the Rohingya crisis and minimal involvement in humanitarian diplomacy

likewise reflects strategic priorities. With infrastructure projects such as the Kaladan Multimodal Transport Project running through Rakhine, New Delhi is wary of jeopardising its relationship with the junta (Haider, 2023).

These geopolitical calculations lead to a "great power impasse" at international forums such as the UN Security Council, where resolutions to enforce humanitarian access are blocked or diluted. The resulting vacuum in global leadership allows Myanmar's regime to act with relative impunity, emboldening its defiance of humanitarian norms.

From a liberal institutionalist perspective, this scenario demonstrates the weaknesses of multilateralism in asymmetric power contexts (Keohane & Nye, 2012). Without unified enforcement or material incentives, institutions like the UN and ASEAN remain limited in their ability to influence state behaviour in deeply sovereign-guarded contexts.

Ethical Dilemmas for Humanitarian Actors

Aid agencies operating in Rakhine face acute ethical dilemmas. Should they accept compromised access in order to deliver at least some relief, or refuse and risk total exclusion? These dilemmas are not unique to Myanmar but are particularly stark given the level of military interference.

Some scholars advocate for "humanitarian pragmatism," suggesting that imperfect access is better than none, especially in contexts of acute suffering (Terry, 2002). Others argue for a more principled stance, warning that compromised operations may lend legitimacy to repressive regimes and facilitate long-term harm (Donini, 2012).

In Rakhine, agencies such as MSF and the ICRC have had to make difficult decisions. MSF's 2023 withdrawal from certain areas of Rakhine was based on concerns over beneficiary safety and the militarisation of aid. This case illustrates the limitations of the humanitarian mandate in environments where operational independence is curtailed.

The dilemma also extends to data ethics. Agencies required to submit beneficiary lists to the military potentially expose vulnerable populations to surveillance or reprisals. The principles of "do no harm" and "informed consent" are difficult to uphold in such contexts, complicating accountability and trust with affected communities (Sphere Association, 2018).

Local Agency and Grassroots Humanitarianism

While international mechanisms falter, local actors have demonstrated considerable resilience and innovation. Community-based organisations, diaspora networks, and informal aid groups have filled critical gaps in food, health, and shelter. Though often lacking formal recognition or funding, these groups are better positioned to navigate local dynamics and secure community trust (BROUK, 2022).

This finding aligns with the broader literature on "localisation" in humanitarian response, which emphasises the value of indigenous knowledge, legitimacy, and cost-effectiveness (Barbelet, 2018). However, localisation in Rakhine is constrained by legal restrictions, surveillance, and limited funding pipelines. Many local actors operate at significant personal risk and remain marginalised in formal humanitarian coordination platforms.

A more inclusive humanitarian approach would recognise the importance of these actors and invest in building their capacity and protection. This requires a paradigm shift in the humanitarian architecture—from a top-down delivery model to one that centres affected

populations as co-producers of aid (Wall & Hedlund, 2016).

Towards a More Viable Corridor Framework

Given the multifaceted barriers to humanitarian corridors in Rakhine, a rethinking of strategy is imperative. The findings suggest several key elements for a more viable framework:

- Multilateral Pressure: Regional and global actors must coordinate more effectively to apply sustained diplomatic pressure. This includes conditionality in trade and arms relations with Myanmar tied to humanitarian benchmarks.
- ASEAN Reform: ASEAN needs to evolve its non-interference principle into a "non-indifference" stance, enabling more proactive humanitarian diplomacy.
- Neutral Coordination Mechanisms: Establishing independent humanitarian coordination hubs in neighbouring countries (e.g., in Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh) could facilitate cross-border operations while avoiding oversight by the junta.
- Legal Accountability: International mechanisms, including the International Court of Justice (ICJ) and the International Criminal Court (ICC), must continue to investigate violations of International Humanitarian Law (IHL) related to aid obstruction.
- Community-Driven Design: Corridors should be co-designed with affected communities to enhance legitimacy, safety, and effectiveness. Engaging local leaders and networks ensures that aid is appropriate, timely, and culturally sensitive.

The humanitarian corridor to deliver aid in Myanmar's Rakhine State is emblematic of the broader struggles in operationalising principled,

neutral, and effective humanitarian access in politically hostile environments. As this discussion demonstrates, such corridors are never purely humanitarian; power, politics, and perceptions shape them. Any effort to make them work must acknowledge these realities and pursue a more integrated, inclusive, and ethically sound approach.

Conclusion

The humanitarian crisis in Myanmar's Rakhine State represents one of the most complex geopolitical and ethical challenges in contemporary humanitarian intervention. This study has examined the feasibility, functionality, and strategic dimensions of establishing a humanitarian corridor in Rakhine, particularly in the wake of the military coup and ongoing ethnic violence. Drawing on geopolitical, legal, and institutional frameworks, the research reveals that the delivery of humanitarian aid in this region is profoundly influenced by the Myanmar military's assertion of sovereignty, regional diplomatic inertia, and great-power rivalry.

While humanitarian corridors are often portrayed as neutral tools to facilitate aid, in practice, they become deeply embedded in political contestation. The Myanmar military regime uses aid as an instrument of control and legitimacy, thereby violating the principles of neutrality and impartiality that underpin international humanitarian law. At the regional level, ASEAN's consensus-driven mechanisms and its non-interference doctrine have significantly constrained a unified and effective response. Meanwhile, global actors such as China and India prioritise strategic and economic interests over humanitarian imperatives, further weakening the collective international response.

Despite these obstacles, local community actors and informal networks have emerged as crucial players in aid distribution, highlighting the importance

of localisation. A more viable humanitarian corridor strategy must thus be multifaceted, combining diplomatic pressure, regional reform, legal mechanisms, and grassroots engagement.

Ultimately, the Myanmar case underscores the urgent need to reconceptualise humanitarian corridors as both operational and political constructs. Future efforts must not only ensure access but also safeguard the integrity and purpose of humanitarianism amid the escalating complexities of geopolitics.

Policy Recommendations

To ensure a more effective and principled delivery of aid through humanitarian corridors in Myanmar's Rakhine State, several key policy recommendations emerge:

- Reform ASEAN's Humanitarian Mechanism: ASEAN must evolve beyond its non-interference framework toward a "non-indifference" approach. This could include revising the mandate of the ASEAN Coordinating Centre for Humanitarian Assistance (AHA Centre) to operate independently of host government consent during acute humanitarian crises.
- Multilateral Diplomatic Pressure: Regional and global actors—especially the UN, EU, India, and the U.S.—must coordinate diplomatic efforts with conditionalities tied to humanitarian access. This includes targeted sanctions on individuals obstructing aid and the use of backdoor diplomacy with influential partners, such as China.
- Legal Accountability Frameworks: The international community should support ongoing legal proceedings at the International Criminal Court (ICC) and the International Court of Justice (ICJ), with a focus on violations of humanitarian law

related to the obstruction of aid and the targeting of civilians.
- Independent Monitoring and Transparency: Establishing third-party monitoring mechanisms involving neutral NGOs or international observers will enhance accountability and ensure aid reaches intended beneficiaries without state interference.
- Support for Local Actors: International donors and NGOs should invest in building the capacity of local and community-based organisations to enhance their effectiveness. Financial and legal support structures must be designed to protect local humanitarian workers operating in high-risk zones.
- Cross-Border Humanitarian Hubs: Cross-border operations from Bangladesh and Thailand could be institutionalised to serve as staging grounds for aid delivery, particularly when in-country access is limited or restricted.

These policy changes must be pursued collectively and urgently. Failure to act not only endangers the lives of vulnerable communities in Rakhine but also sets a dangerous precedent for international humanitarian operations in future conflict zones.

Future Research

Given the evolving political landscape and humanitarian dynamics in Myanmar, future research should focus on longitudinal studies examining the impact of localised aid initiatives in Rakhine and other conflict-affected regions. Ethnographic and participatory methods could provide deeper insight into how local communities navigate aid delivery, resist state coercion, and sustain their humanitarian responses under duress.

Another promising area for future inquiry is the comparative analysis of humanitarian corridors in similarly complex geopolitical environments such as Syria, Yemen, or Ethiopia. Such comparative work can help identify common patterns of manipulation, resistance, and innovation in corridor implementation and inform global best practices.

Moreover, as digital technologies increasingly influence aid logistics, there is a need for research on how surveillance, data ethics, and digital accountability frameworks impact the safety of aid recipients and the neutrality of humanitarian efforts in authoritarian contexts.

Lastly, examining the role of diaspora communities and transnational advocacy networks in influencing humanitarian policy, funding, and diplomatic engagement with Myanmar can enrich our understanding of global-local humanitarian linkages. These future inquiries will be critical for developing a more just, effective, and context-sensitive humanitarian architecture.

References

Acharya, A. (2001). Constructing a Security Community in Southeast Asia: ASEAN and the Problem of Regional Order. Routledge.

Acharya, A. (2017). The end of the American world order. Polity Press.

AHA Centre. (2023). Operational report on humanitarian relief in Myanmar. Jakarta: ASEAN Coordinating Centre for Humanitarian Assistance.

Andrews, T. (2023). Report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Myanmar. United Nations Human Rights Council.

ASEAN Charter. (2007). Charter of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations. ASEAN Secretariat.

ASEAN Secretariat. (2022). Statement of the ASEAN Chair on the Humanitarian Situation in Myanmar. Jakarta: ASEAN.

ASEAN Secretariat. (2023). ASEAN five-point consensus on Myanmar: Implementation update. Jakarta: ASEAN.

Azad, A., & Jasmin, F. (2013). Durable solutions to the protracted refugee situation: The case of Rohingyas in Bangladesh. Journal of Indian Research, 1(4), 25–35.

Barnett, M. (2011). Empire of humanity: A history of humanitarianism. Cornell University Press.

Barbelet, V. (2018). As local as possible, as international as necessary: Understanding capacity and complementarity in humanitarian action. Overseas Development Institute.

Barnes-Dacey, J., & Heller, C. (2021). Out of the shadows: Reclaiming humanitarian principles in Syria. European Council on Foreign Relations.

Baruah, A. (2018). India's Rohingya policy: A strategic calculus. Observer Research Foundation Occasional Paper No. 177.

Beech, H. (2019, September 26). Myanmar Presents a Challenge for the U.N. with No Clear Solution. The New York Times. https://www.nytimes.com

Bellamy, A. J. (2009). Responsibility to Protect: The Global Effort to End Mass Atrocities. Polity.

Bhaumik, S. (2020). India's Myanmar Policy and the Rohingya Crisis. ORF Issue Brief, 356.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Bryman, A. (2016). Social Research Methods (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.

BROUK. (2022). Community Perspectives on Aid and Military Control in Rakhine State. London: Burmese Rohingya Organisation UK.

Buchanan, C., & Muggah, R. (2005). No Relief: Surveying the Effects of Gun Violence on Humanitarian and Development Personnel. Humanitarian Practice Network.

Cheung, S. (2012). Migration control and the solutions impasse in South and Southeast Asia: Implications from the Rohingya experience. Journal of Refugee Studies, 25(1), 50–70. https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fer048

Chowdhury, I. (2022). Bangladesh and the Rohingya Crisis: Diplomacy and Domestic Pressure. South Asian Survey, 29(1), 45–62.

Davies, S. E. (2013). Responsibility while protecting: Contesting norms and legitimacy in the international response to the Syrian crisis. Global Responsibility to Protect, 5(4), 394–417.

De Waal, A. (2015). The real politics of the Horn of Africa: Money, war and the business of power. Polity Press.

Donini, A. (2012). The golden fleece: Manipulation and independence in humanitarian action. Kumarian Press.

Duffield, M. (2016). The resilience of the ruins: Towards a critique of digital humanitarianism. Resilience, 4(3), 147–165.

Ferris, E. (2011). The Politics of Protection: The Limits of Humanitarian Action. Brookings Institution Press.

Ferris, E., & Kirişci, K. (2016). The Consequences of Chaos: Syria's Humanitarian Crisis and the Failure to Protect. Brookings Institution Press.

Fortify Rights. (2018). They Gave Them Long Swords: Preparations for Genocide and Crimes Against Humanity Against Rohingya Muslims in Rakhine State, Myanmar. Fortify Rights. Against Humanity Against Rohingya Muslims in Rakhine State, Myanmar. https://www.fortifyrights.org

Haacke, J. (2021). ASEAN and Political Change in Myanmar: Strengthening Regional Diplomacy. Contemporary Southeast Asia, 43(1), 72–96.

Haacke, J. (2003). ASEAN's diplomatic and security culture: Origins, development and prospects. RoutledgeCurzon.

Haacke, J. (2020). Myanmar, the Rohingya Crisis, and ASEAN's Regional Diplomacy: The Limits of Consensus and Non-Interference. Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs, 39(1), 28–54.

Hassan, M. (2019). Islam, state and society in Indonesia and Malaysia: Dynamic or stagnant? Contemporary Southeast Asia, 41(2), 250–273.

Haider, Z. (2023). India's Myanmar Dilemma: Strategic Ties and Regional Insecurity. Observer Research Foundation.

Holloway, K., & Fan, L. (2020). Rethinking humanitarianism: Adapting to 21st-century challenges. Overseas Development Institute.

Human Rights Watch. (2022). Myanmar: Junta tightens control over aid. https://www.hrw.org

Human Rights Watch. (2019). An Open Prison without End: Myanmar's Mass Detention of Rohingya in Rakhine State. New York: HRW.

Ibrahim, M. (2022). ASEAN's inertia and the humanitarian crisis in Myanmar. Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.

Ibrahim, A. (2016). The Rohingyas: Inside Myanmar's Hidden Genocide. Hurst Publishers.

ICG (International Crisis Group). (2019). Building a Better Future for Rohingya Refugees in Bangladesh. Asia Report No. 303.

ICRC. (2019). International Humanitarian Law and the Challenges of Contemporary Armed Conflicts. Geneva: International Committee of the Red Cross.

ICRC. (2013). International Humanitarian Law and the Challenges of Contemporary Armed Conflicts. https://www.icrc.org

International Crisis Group. (2021). Responding to the Myanmar Coup. Asia Briefing No. 166. Retrieved from https://www.crisisgroup.org

Jacobsen, K. (2019). The politics of refugee aid in militarized environments. Refugee Studies Quarterly, 38(3), 347–365.

Keohane, R. O., & Nye, J. S. (2012). Power and interdependence. Pearson.

Kirsch, T. G. (2021). Zones of Exception and the Rohingya Humanitarian Crisis. Ethnos, 86(4), 637–655.

Kurlantzick, J. (2022). ASEAN's struggle with Myanmar: Why the bloc's approach is failing. Council on Foreign Relations.

Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001). The Tragedy of Great Power Politics. W. W. Norton & Company.

MSF. (2023). Operational constraints in Rakhine State. https://www.msf.org

Nair, D. (2020). ASEAN and the Rohingya Crisis: An Evolving Normative Role? Pacific Affairs, 93(3), 483–504.

NRC. (2022). Operational Policy Note on Humanitarian Access in Myanmar. Oslo: Norwegian Refugee Council.

OCHA. (2023). Humanitarian needs overview: Yemen. New York: UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs.

Pantuliano, S. (2019). Syria's humanitarian crisis: The search for new solutions. Humanitarian Policy Group Briefing Paper. ODI.

Rudolph, J. (2021). Between the cracks: Regional governance and the Rohingya crisis. Asian Affairs, 52(2), 214–232.

Sandvik, K. B., Jacobsen, K. L., & McDonald, S. M. (2017). Not harm: A taxonomy of the challenges of humanitarian experimentation. International Review of the Red Cross, 99(904), 319–344.

Slim, H. (2015). Humanitarian ethics: A guide to the morality of aid in war and disaster. Oxford University Press.

Sphere Association. (2018). The Sphere Handbook: Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Humanitarian Response. Geneva: Sphere.

Sun, Y. (2020). China's strategic calculus in Myanmar's Rakhine State. Stimson Centre.

Sun, Y. (2021). China's Strategic Engagement in Myanmar: Implications for Regional Stability. Brookings Institution Report. Retrieved from https://www.brookings.edu

Sun, Y. (2019). China's Strategic Influence in Myanmar: A Rising Force? Brookings Institution.

Terry, F. (2002). Condemned to repeat? The paradox of humanitarian action. Cornell University Press.

Thuzar, M. (2022). Myanmar and the Limits of ASEAN's Crisis Diplomacy. ISEAS–Yusof Ishak Institute.

United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC). (2018). Report of the Independent International Fact-Finding Mission on Myanmar. Geneva: UNHRC.

UNOCHA. (2023). Myanmar humanitarian response plan 2023. New York: UN.

Wall, I., & Hedlund, K. (2016). Localisation and locally-led crisis response: A literature review. Local to Global Protection.

Waltz, K. N. (1979). Theory of International Politics. Addison-Wesley.

Wheeler, N. J. (2000). Saving Strangers: Humanitarian Intervention in International Society. Oxford University Press.

Wendt, A. (1999). Social Theory of International Politics. Cambridge University Press.

Yin, R. K. (2018). Case Study Research and Applications: Design and Methods (6th ed.). Sage Publications.