

Navigating Humanitarian Neutrality:

The challenges facing U.S. volunteers in conflict zones shaped by American foreign policy

Nicolina Gallo

May 18, 2026

How do humanitarian actors navigate legitimacy, trust, neutrality, safety, and moral complexity when aid environments are directly shaped by geopolitical power? Humanitarian volunteers working within various international conflict environments operate in increasingly politically charged contexts with international aid structures shaped by the power dynamics of foreign policy decisions and military alliances. For U.S. volunteers in regions heavily affected by American military or diplomatic involvement, navigating trust, safety, neutrality, and community perception can present uniquely difficult operational and ethical challenges.

From 2004–2011, I volunteered with several humanitarian aid NGOs across multiple countries spanning four continents. In these settings, the immediate security risks, movement restrictions, medical shortages, infrastructure instability, and civilian suffering—often dominate the day-to-day on the ground operations. It would be impossible to detail the level of trauma and accountability that many aid workers carry. Suffice it to say, that Sam Duerden, a senior aid worker with nearly a decade of experience, does an excellent job of defining the extent of PTSD and related challenges carried by most NGO volunteers.

Yet the broader geopolitical realities shaping those crises are never entirely absent. To have an honest discussion of humanitarian neutrality, examining the tension between humanitarian principles and geopolitical perception, including the difficulty of separating individual volunteers from the policies of their home governments, is essential. In environments such as Gaza, where U.S. military aid and diplomatic support are deeply intertwined with local realities, American volunteers encounter heightened skepticism, distrust, or assumptions of political alignment. Regardless of personal beliefs or humanitarian intent, it's difficult, in my experience, to escape the idea of culpability— even within one's own subconscious.

This dynamic creates significant reputational and operational challenges for both volunteers and NGOs. Humanitarian organizations rely heavily on community trust to maintain access, ensure staff safety, and effectively deliver services. However, local populations experiencing prolonged conflict or displacement may understandably view foreign humanitarian actors through the lens of broader international power structures. In some cases, U.S. volunteers indirectly or directly face assumptions of complicity, associated with policies of military escalation, occupation, or civilian harm. Even when humanitarian organizations operate independently and impartially, those distinctions are not always clear to those living under acute stress, surveillance, or insecurity.

Such perceptions can affect humanitarian access in practical ways. Increased skepticism toward foreign personnel may limit relationship-building opportunities, complicate coordination with local stakeholders, or heighten security concerns for both volunteers and partner organizations. Humanitarian workers may also face restrictions tied to border crossings, permit systems, telecommunications disruptions, or rapidly shifting military conditions. According to the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), humanitarian access constraints in conflict zones increasingly include bureaucratic restrictions, security threats, infrastructure destruction, and interference with civilian movement—all of which can severely limit aid delivery capacity.

Alongside operational pressures, humanitarian volunteers frequently carry substantial emotional and ethical burdens. Witnessing large-scale civilian suffering, displacement, and infrastructure collapse can produce profound moral injury and secondary trauma, particularly when volunteers feel constrained in their ability to respond effectively. For U.S. nationals, this burden may be compounded by internal conflict surrounding national identity, perceived responsibility, and the challenge of balancing humanitarian neutrality with personal ethical convictions. Maintaining professionalism while operating within highly polarized information environments can be psychologically exhausting, especially as social media increasingly amplifies misinformation, digital harassment, ideological scrutiny, and pressure for public positioning.

The broader structural challenges facing NGOs are similarly complex. Humanitarian operations are often shaped by donor priorities, political conditions attached to funding, international diplomatic pressures, and expanding compliance requirements. Critics of the international aid sector have increasingly highlighted the risks of over-centralized decision-making, unequal power dynamics between international NGOs and local organizations, and the unintended consequences of externally driven humanitarian frameworks. As a result, discussions surrounding localization, ethical partnership models, and community-led assistance have become central to contemporary humanitarian policy discourse.

Structurally, the related challenges facing NGOs and their respective workers is heavily dependent on donor identity, the politicization of aid, related funding restrictions, the limitations imposed by international actors, and the ever-escalating operational bureaucracy, often influenced by the localization of debates.

So how can we move forward? Strengthening operational legitimacy through community-centered, solutions-oriented approaches, expanding local leadership and prioritizing partnerships with locally rooted organizations can reduce dependency on foreign representation while improving cultural fluency, continuity, and trust. Increased investment in trauma-informed training, ethical communications, conflict-sensitive engagement, and regional political literacy would better prepare humanitarian workers for the realities of modern aid environments. Equally important is reinforcing humanitarian independence through transparent accountability structures that help distinguish civilian aid efforts from geopolitical agendas.

Strengthening humanitarian independence can act as a firewall between aid and political agendas. To improve narrative accountability, organizations must center local voices, avoid paternalistic framing, and promote ethical storytelling practices that preserve dignity and agency. Finally, significantly greater investment in mental health support for aid workers—including reflective supervision models, peer support systems, and burnout prevention strategies—is critical to sustaining long-term humanitarian effectiveness.

Maximizing humanitarian neutrality in politically charged environments requires more than logistical coordination alone. It demands localized trust-building, cross-cultural humility, ethical civilian-centered frameworks, and trauma-informed operational models capable of adapting to rapidly changing realities on the ground. In an increasingly polarized global environment, the long-term credibility and effectiveness of humanitarian work may depend on the sector's willingness to critically examine how power, perception, and policy shape both humanitarian access and community trust. Coordinating the multilateral power asymmetries, with trauma-informed operations, will increasingly allow for realities on the ground to influence structural configurations in real time.

References:

- Abbasi, P. (2024, Aug., 23) "Impact of internal access constraints on humanitarian aid." *Centre for Humanitarian Action*. <https://www.chaberlin.org/en/blog/impact-of-internal-access-constraints-on-humanitarian-aid-2/> (Accessed May 16, 2026)
- Clark J. L. (2020). "Ethics and etiquette in humanitarian engagement-101." *Seminars in Hearing*, 41(2), 83–91. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0040-1708526> (Accessed May 18, 2026)
- Duerden, S. (2026, May, 18). "Aid workers face the trauma of war: Employers must do better." *The New Humanitarian*. <https://www.thenewhumanitarian.org/opinion/2026/05/18/aid-workers-face-trauma-war-employers-must-do-better> (Accessed May 18, 2026)
- Harmer, A. Stoddard, A, & Sarazen, A. (2018, Dec.) "Humanitarian access in armed conflict: A need for new principles?" *Strengthening Resilience and Response to Crises*. https://humanitarianoutcomes.org/sites/default/files/publications/scoping_study-humanitarian_access_and_new_principles.pdf (Accessed May 16, 2026)
- ICRC. (2023, Oct., 31). *The critical importance of neutrality: A humanitarian perspective into a multipolar world*. <https://www.icrc.org/en/document/critical-importance-neutrality-humanitarian-perspective-multipolar-world> (Accessed May 18, 2026)
- Leaning J. (2007). "The dilemma of neutrality." *Prehospital and Disaster Medicine*, 22(5), 418–421. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1049023x00005148> (Accessed May 15, 2026)
- McIlreavy, P. (2020, Dec., 08). *Humanitarian action conundrums: Neutrality*. <https://www.interaction.org/blog/humanitarian-action-conundrums-neutrality/> (Accessed May 16, 2026)
- Nahikian, A & Tronc, E. (2024, Nov., 11). "Neutrality, access, and making localisation work." *Global Interagency Security Forum*. <https://gisf.ngo/wp-content/uploads/2024/11/Neutrality-Access-and-Making-Localisation-Work.pdf> (Accessed May 16, 2026)
- Schweizer, B. (2004). "Moral dilemmas for humanitarianism in the era of "humanitarian" military interventions." *IRRC*, 86(855), 547-564. https://www.icrc.org/sites/default/files/external/doc/en/assets/files/other/irrc_855_schweizer.pdf (Accessed May 18, 2026)
- Slim, H. (2020, Aug., 27). "You don't have to be neutral to be a good humanitarian." *The New Humanitarian*. <https://www.thenewhumanitarian.org/opinion/2020/08/27/humanitarian-principles-neutrality> (Accessed May 18, 2026)
- Szczepanska, K. (2023). "The challenge of societal recognition of humanitarian and development NGO practitioners in Japan: A volunteer or a professional?" *Voluntas*, 34, 643–653. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-022-00497-0> (Accessed May 17, 2026)
- Yantzi, R., Burza, S., Hunt, M. et al. (2026). "Their suffering also plagues us: A narrative ethnographic exploration of humanitarian healthcare workers' moral experiences of providing pediatric palliative care in Bangladesh." *International Journal of Humanitarian Action*, 11(13). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41018-026-00194-3> (Accessed May 17, 2026)