

COMPLETE ORIGINAL-ROOT DOSSIER EDITION v1.2

Fractured Authority and Condition-Control in Gaza

Original Report + Tool Development + Review
Materials + Source Dossier

Christopher Knorr

Public-facing proof-of-concept dossier / source facts date-bound / not publication-ready

Root-Control Statement

Controlling document rule

This dossier preserves the original Gaza case study as the controlling document. Later materials show how the original report developed into a condition-control and answerability method, but they do not replace the original paper.

This edition corrects the project architecture by placing the original case study first. The later method-development, audit, review, source, and dispatch materials are preserved after it as development layers.

The purpose is not to make the project look simpler than it is. The purpose is to make the full proof of concept visible, readable, inspectable, and corrigible in one place.

Reader Guide and Access Note

For a fast public reading Read the Executive Summary, the Public-Facing Synthesis, the Reader Note, and the Misuse Warnings in the original case study.	For method review Read the seven-function framework, condition-control definition, control scoring, legal-risk scale, evidence ledger, and prevention thresholds.
For reviewer use-testing Read the dispatch packet, reviewer questions, simulated reviews, reviewer tracker, and repair logs.	For source review Read the source logs, bibliography, source-reliability audit, historical-cluster appendix, and legal-posture language rules.

Status warning

This is a proof-of-concept dossier and working public report. It is not a court filing, final legal determination, peer-reviewed article, or externally validated expert method. Current facts and legal docket posture must be checked again before any public release.

Edition Map

The dossier is organized so that the original case study remains the root document and all later materials are clearly marked as development, review, or source layers.

Part	Purpose
Part I	Original Gaza case study - controlling document
Part II	Purpose, source-refresh, and condition-control tool development
Part III	Reviewer dispatch materials, review forms, and simulated external reviews
Part IV	Source dossier, bibliography, historical clusters, correction notes, and status records

Table of Contents

Root-Control Statement	2
Reader Guide and Access Note	3
Edition Map	4
Table of Contents	5
Fractured Authority and Condition-Control in Gaza	19
A Case Study in Civilian Protection, Protected Conditions, and Future Prevention	19
Executive Summary	19
Part One — Purpose, Limits, and Method	21
1. Purpose of the Report	21
2. What This Report Does Not Do	22
3. Legal, Moral, and Empirical Separation	22
Empirical control claims	22
Legal classification claims	22
Moral judgment claims	22
4. The Seven-Function State-Making Framework	23
5. Monopoly, Dominance, Direct Governance, and Condition-Control	24
Direct governance	24
Monopoly	24
Dominance	24
Condition-control	24
Condition-control is not effective control	24
6. Control Scoring	25
Part Two — Historical and Actor-Specific Case Frame	26
7. Historical Case Frame	26
8. Gaza Before the Present Control Crisis	27
9. Israeli Disengagement and the Condition-Control Question	27
10. Hamas’s 2007 Takeover and Internal Governance	27
11. Blockade, Access Regime, and Humanitarian Dependency	28
12. October 7, Hostages, and Civilian Harm	28
13. Israel’s Military Campaign and Civilian Condition-Collapse	29
14. Current or Most Recent Control Picture	29
Part Three — Actor-Specific Authority Map	30
15. Israel	30
16. Hamas	30

17. Palestinian Civilians in Gaza	31
18. Israeli Civilians and Hostages	32
19. Other Actors	33
Palestinian Authority	33
Egypt	33
UN Agencies, NGOs, and Humanitarian Actors	33
United States, Donors, and External Diplomatic Actors	33
International Courts and Legal Bodies	34
Journalists, Medical Workers, Civil Society, Families, and Local Communities	34
Part Four — Analytic Core	34
20. State-Making Function × Actor Matrix	34
21. Summary Control Matrix	35
22. Protected Conditions Harm Matrix	35
23. Protected Conditions Summary Matrix	37
24. Corpus Lens Matrix	37
25. Legal-Risk Classification System	37
26. Legal-Risk Categories	38
Part Five — Case Study Modules	39
27. Module One: October 7, Civilian Attacks, and Hostage-Taking	39
Module finding	39
28. Module Two: Israel’s Military Campaign, Bombardment, and Urban War	39
Module finding	40
29. Module Three: Aid, Crossings, and Distribution Gatekeeping	40
Module finding	40
30. Module Four: Hospitals, Water, Fuel, Sanitation, and Repair Systems	40
Module finding	41
31. Module Five: Displacement, Evacuation, Safe Zones, and Return	41
Module finding	41
32. Module Six: Hamas Internal Governance, Coercion, and Civilian Exposure	41
Module finding	42
33. Module Seven: International Legal and Diplomatic Response	42
Module finding	42
34. Module Eight: Truth, Documentation, Journalists, Medical Workers, and Civilian Continuity	42
Module finding	43
Part Six — Evidence, Corrigibility, and Prevention	43
35. Evidence Ledger and Claim Protocol	43
36. Claim Types	43
37. Prevention Thresholds	44
Yellow Threshold	44
Orange Threshold	44
Red Threshold	44

Black Threshold	45
38. Prevention Dashboard	45
39. Prevention Finding	45
Part Seven — Findings and Public Synthesis	45
40. Main Finding	45
41. Findings List	46
42. Public-Facing Synthesis	47
43. Reader Note	47
44. Misuse Warnings	47
45. Conclusion: Gaza Is Not a Metaphor	48
Appendices	48
Appendix A — Evidence Ledger Template	49
Appendix B — Evidence Quality Scale	49
Appendix C — Legal-Risk Scale	49
Appendix D — Claim Language Rules	50
Appendix E — Source-to-Reader Audit	50
Appendix F — Revision Log Template	51
Appendix G — Future Use Protocol	51
Appendix H — Source Log: Historical and Legal Baseline	51
Source IDs	52
Claim-Source Matrix Update	54
Appendix I — Source Log: Current Control and Humanitarian Conditions	55
Source IDs	55
Claim-Source Matrix Update	57
Language Rules for Current-Control and Humanitarian-Condition Claims	58
Appendix J — Source Log: Casualty, Damage, Healthcare, Documentation, and Continuity Claims	58
Source IDs	59
Claim-Source Matrix Update	60
Source-Quality Ranking by Claim Group	62
Language Rules for Casualty, Damage, Healthcare, Documentation, and Continuity Claims	62
Appendix K — Legal-Risk Language Rules	62

Governing Rule	63
Legal-Risk Wording Corrections Made	63
Formal Legal Source Anchors for Language Control	63
Language Rules Going Forward	65
Closing-Claim Check	65
Appendix L — Source Reliability and Adversarial Cross-Check	65
Executive audit finding	65
Method used for this audit	65
Hostile-source cross-check table	66
Source-quality audit	68
Audit decisions to carry forward	68
Public-Facing Source Rules Carried Forward	69
Closing-claim check after this audit	69
Appendix M — Citation Method and Closing-Claim Check	69
Author Purpose and Origin Note	71
v2.8.1 Purpose and Origin Note	71
Fractured Authority and Condition-Control in Gaza	71
Author’s Purpose Note	71
Integration Rule	71
Guardrails Added	72
Revised Purpose Sentence	72
Source Refresh and Citation Completion Pass	73
v2.9 Source Refresh and Citation Completion Pass	73
Fractured Authority and Condition-Control in Gaza	73
0. Purpose of This Pass	73
1. Source Posture Rule	73
2. Current Humanitarian Anchor	74
Source	74
Use in paper	74
Supported claims	74
Citation use	74

3. Medical Evacuation Source Anchors	74
Source A	74
Supported claims	74
Use in paper	75
Source B	75
Supported claims	75
Use in paper	75
4. Food Security / Nutrition Anchor	76
Source	76
Use in paper	76
Caution	76
5. Legal Posture Anchors	76
ICJ	76
ICC	76
6. Source Refresh Table	77
7. Citation Map for v2.8.1 Draft	78
8. Revised Source Note for Draft	78
9. Publication Warning	78
10. v2.9 Verdict	79
Source Ledger	80
v2.9 Source Ledger	80
Current Core Sources	80
Current URL Set	80
Ledger Rules	80
Citation Completion Map	82
v2.9 Citation Completion Map	82
Footnote Placement Plan	82
High-Risk Claims to Avoid or Rewrite	82
Source-Gap Flags	83
Final Pre-Dispatch Repair Draft	84
Fractured Authority and Condition-Control in Gaza	84
An Answerability Method for Protected-Condition Harm in Fractured-Authority Settings	84

Source Correction Note	84
Abstract	84
Author's Purpose Note	84
1. Contribution	85
2. No-Displacement Rule	85
3. Fractured Authority and False Symmetry	86
4. Map-Not-Verdict and Answerability Gates	86
5. Method	87
6. Primary Test: Medical Evacuation	87
7. Medical Evacuation Evidence Table	89
8. Applying the Gates to Medical Evacuation	90
9. Secondary Test: Aid Access	90
10. Legal Posture and Actor Discipline	90
11. Findings and Failure Conditions	91
12. Conclusion	91
Dispatch Status	92
Appendix A — Reviewer Questions	92
Functional occupation reviewer	92
Humanitarian logistics / medical evacuation reviewer	92
Regional reviewer	92
Legal posture reviewer	92
Moral / political philosophy reviewer	92
Appendix B — Language Rules	93
Appendix C — Source Ledger	93
Appendix D — Footnotes	93
Final Pre-Dispatch Repair Log	94
v3.2 Final Pre-Dispatch Repair Log	94

Fractured Authority and Condition-Control in Gaza	94
1. Purpose	94
2. Repairs Applied	94
3. Current Verdict	94
4. Remaining Holds	95
5. Next Step	95
External Use-Test Dispatch Packet	98
v3.1 External Use-Test Dispatch Packet	98
Fractured Authority and Condition-Control in Gaza	98
0. Purpose	98
1. Files to Send	98
2. Core Reviewer Question	98
3. Reviewer Tracks	99
Track A — Functional Occupation / Occupation Law	99
Track B — Humanitarian Logistics / Medical Evacuation	99
Track C — Gaza / Regional Specialist	100
Track D — Legal Posture / Source Reviewer	100
Track E — Moral / Political Philosophy	100
4. Email / Message Templates	101
General reviewer message	101
Short version	101
5. Reviewer Response Form	102
6. Decision Rules	102
Proceed toward public working paper if:	102
Narrow to audit protocol if:	102
Pause for major revision if:	102
7. Dispatch Status	102
Strict Simulated External Use-Test Reports	103
v3.1 Strict Simulated External Use-Test Reports	103

Fractured Authority and Condition-Control in Gaza	103
1. Functional Occupation Reviewer Simulation	103
Verdict	103
Strongest objection	103
Strongest support	103
Scores	103
Required repair	103
2. Humanitarian Logistics / Medical Evacuation Reviewer Simulation	104
Verdict	104
Strongest objection	104
Strongest support	104
Scores	104
Required repair	104
3. Gaza / Regional Specialist Simulation	104
Verdict	104
Strongest objection	104
Strongest support	104
Scores	105
Required repair	105
4. Legal Posture / Source Reviewer Simulation	105
Verdict	105
Strongest objection	105
Strongest support	105
Scores	105
Required repair	105
5. Moral / Political Philosophy Reviewer Simulation	105
Verdict	105
Strongest objection	106
Strongest support	106
Scores	106
Required repair	106
Consolidated v3.1 Simulated Verdict	106
Overall simulated result	106
Consolidated Repairs Before Publication	106
Reviewer Tracker	107

v3.1 Reviewer Tracker	107
Reviewer verdict codes	107
Response status codes	107
v1.8 One-Page Reviewer Cover Memo	108
Fractured Authority and Condition-Control in Gaza	108
One-Page Reviewer Cover Memo	108
Claims to pressure-test first	108
Important disclosed holds	109
v1.8 Reviewer Packet Final	110
Fractured Authority and Condition-Control in Gaza	110
One-Page Reviewer Cover Memo	110
Claims to pressure-test first	110
Important disclosed holds	111
Current Status	111
Main Thesis	112
Mandatory Reviewer Questions	112
Required HOLD Disclosures	112
2. Main Report Cleanup Inserts	112
2.1 Historical Spine Insert	112
2.2 Post-2005 Control Debate Insert	113
2.3 Hamas / October 7 / Hostage-Taking Insert	113
2.4 Hamas Internal-Coercion Insert	114
2.5 Aid Theft / Diversion Warning Insert	114
2.6 Humanitarian Baseline Insert	114
2.7 Food-Security Insert	115
2.8 Communications Pathway Insert	115
2.9 COGAT/OCHA Aid-Access Comparison Insert	116
2.10 Legal Docket Insert	116
3. Updated Appendix E — Current-Control Dashboard	116
4. Updated Appendix F — Humanitarian Pathway Tables	119
F.1 Water / WASH Pathway	119
F.2 Fuel Pathway	120
F.3 Food Pathway	120

F.4 Health / Hospital Pathway	121
F.5 Displacement / Shelter Pathway	122
F.6 Communications Pathway	122
5. Updated Appendix G — Legal Posture / Docket Table	123
6. Updated Appendix H — Finkelstein / Underlying Source Trail	123
7. Findings Status Table for v1.7	124
8. Remaining HOLD List After v1.7	124
9. v1.7 Footnote Additions	124
Fractured Authority and Condition-Control in Gaza	126
Compressed Source Bibliography	126
Courts and Legal Institutions	126
Humanitarian and Operational Sources	126
Human-Rights and Investigative Sources	127
Party / Official Sources	127
Current Reporting	127
Background and Historical Sources	128
Secondary / Source-Trail Sources	128
Historical-Cluster Sources	128
v1.8 Compressed Source Bibliography	131
Fractured Authority and Condition-Control in Gaza	131
Compressed Source Bibliography	131
Courts and Legal Institutions	131
Humanitarian and Operational Sources	131
Human-Rights and Investigative Sources	132
Party / Official Sources	132
Current Reporting	132

Background and Historical Sources	133
Secondary / Source-Trail Sources	133
Historical-Cluster Sources	133
Optional Historical-Cluster Review File	134
Fractured Authority and Condition-Control in Gaza	134
Optional Historical-Cluster Review File	134
Use Rule	134
Appendix I — Cast Lead and Goldstone Cluster	134
I.0 Purpose	134
I.1 Main Use Rule	135
I.2 Cast Lead Source Cluster Map	135
I.3 Goldstone Source-Posture Note	135
Appendix J — Mavi Marmara and Blockade-Law Cluster	136
J.0 Purpose	136
J.1 Main Use Rule	136
J.2 Mavi Marmara Source Comparison Table	137
J.3 Working Conclusion	137
Appendix K — Protective Edge and Black Friday Cluster	137
K.0 Purpose	137
K.1 Main Use Rule	137
K.2 Protective Edge Source Cluster Map	138
K.3 Warning / Evacuation / Safe-Zone Questions	138
K.4 Working Conclusion	138
Historical-Cluster Sources	139
Source Correction Note	140
v3.0 Source Correction Note	140
OCHA 26 June 2026 correction	140
Why this matters	140
Repair applied	140
Dispatch Memo	141
v3.2 Dispatch Memo	141
What to send	141

How to frame it	141
What not to claim	141
What to ask	141
Closing Note	142

Part I - Original Gaza Case Study

The controlling document. Later materials are development layers around this report, not replacements for it.

Fractured Authority and Condition-Control in Gaza

A Case Study in Civilian Protection, Protected Conditions, and Future Prevention

This is a specialist analytic case study; readers who want the findings in plain language should turn to Part Seven, Public-Facing Synthesis.

Executive Summary

This report examines Gaza as a historically particular case of fractured authority, condition-control, civilian harm, and failed prevention under layered power.

The report does not treat Gaza as a metaphor. It does not reduce the case to one actor, one legal category, one moral claim, or one theory of sovereignty. Gaza is analyzed as a real historical case involving distinct actors, distinct forms of power, distinct legal statuses, distinct civilian harms, and distinct duties.

The central finding is:

Gaza is not governed by a single clean monopoly authority. Israel does not directly administer every internal function of Gaza, but it exercises powerful outer-frame condition-control over many of the military, territorial, access, infrastructural, and survival conditions under which civilian life and governance can occur. Hamas remains or has remained a major internal de facto coercive-administrative actor where it retains control, even while being legally designated as a terrorist organization by several governments. Humanitarian actors provide essential services but do not possess sovereign power. Egypt holds border leverage. The Palestinian Authority retains formal and diplomatic relevance but weak practical authority in Gaza. External states, donors, and international legal bodies shape the material, diplomatic, and accountability field without directly governing the territory.

The best description is therefore not full Israeli governance and not full Hamas governance.

The best description is:

fractured authority under layered power.

This report uses a seven-function state-making framework:

- war making,
- state making,
- protection,
- extraction,
- adjudication,
- distribution,
- production.

The report distinguishes four key concepts:

- direct governance, meaning the administration of institutions, police, courts, taxation, services, rules, and enforcement;
- monopoly, meaning near-exclusive control over a function;
- dominance, meaning the ability to materially override, restrict, permit, disable, punish, or shape the actions of other actors;

- condition-control, meaning the ability to determine whether, where, how, and under what constraints others can act.

Condition-control is the central analytic concept of the report. It allows the report to avoid two errors: first, overstating control by claiming Israel directly governs every internal function of Gaza; second, understating control by treating Israel's external military, access, and infrastructural power as irrelevant because it is not always direct administration.

The report also uses a protected-conditions framework. Civilian harm is not measured only by deaths and injuries, though those remain central. Civilian harm also includes the destruction or degradation of the conditions that allow persons and peoples to live, move, receive care, preserve family, document harm, maintain identity, bury the dead, return, repair, and act meaningfully under real conditions.

Protected conditions include life, bodily integrity, food, water, medical care, shelter, movement, family unity, documents, livelihood, education, communication, sanitation, burial, civilian governance, remedy, return, and repair.

This report does not make final legal findings unless accurately describing the action of a competent legal body. It identifies legal-risk categories where facts, if established, may require investigation, documentation, prevention, accountability, or adjudication. Those categories include direct attacks on civilians, hostage-taking, indiscriminate attacks, proportionality, precautions, civilian objects, medical protection, starvation or deprivation, humanitarian obstruction, forced displacement, arbitrary detention, collective punishment, human shielding or civilian endangerment, genocide-prevention questions, command responsibility, and failure to investigate.

The prevention finding is simple:

responsibility should track control.

This does not mean every actor is responsible for everything. It means that prevention duties become stronger where an actor has stronger control over the condition producing or reducing civilian harm.

If an actor controls crossings, it has prevention duties related to humanitarian entry.

If an actor controls military targeting, it has prevention duties related to distinction, proportionality, precautions, and civilian harm.

If an actor controls hostages, it has a duty to release them and protect them from harm.

If an actor controls police, detention, taxation, public order, or internal administration, it has duties related to internal coercion, arbitrary detention, aid diversion, and civilian protection.

If an actor controls fuel, electricity, medicine, water, roads, spare parts, or reconstruction inputs, it has prevention duties related to hospitals, sanitation, shelter, communications, and repair.

If an external actor has material leverage, arms-transfer leverage, diplomatic leverage, funding leverage, or veto power, its responsibility should be assessed by what it knew, what it could affect, and whether it used that leverage to reduce foreseeable civilian harm.

The central integrity rule is:

if the evidence changes, the claim changes.

This report should remain corrigible. Correction is not weakness. Correction is part of the method.

This report uses sources by function, not by prestige alone. Court and tribunal materials are used for procedural posture, orders, warrants, advisory opinions, and formal legal action; they are not treated as

final findings unless the source itself makes a final finding. IHL sources are used as rule-screening anchors. Official party sources are used primarily for a party's own statements, policies, claimed actions, or denials. UN operational and technical sources, professional reporting, specialist trackers, and reconstruction assessments are used within their stated methodologies and dates. Current-control, casualty, aid, health, journalist, medical-worker, civil-record, property-record, and body-recovery claims remain date-bound, attributed, and corrigible.

Source concentration is itself a limitation, stated here and not only in the source appendix. The current-condition picture in this report — humanitarian access, displacement, health-system status, casualty reporting, and aid flow — rests substantially on United Nations operational and technical reporting (OCHA and WHO-linked Health Cluster outputs), supplemented by major wire reporting. That body of reporting is high quality within its stated methods, but it is not independent of the actors and events it describes: OCHA figures draw in part on Gaza Ministry of Health data and on field partners operating under access constraints, and UN operational reporting is itself contested by parties to the conflict.

The implication is that the present-tense picture is, to a substantial degree, a United-Nations-operational-reporting picture rather than a fully multiply-sourced one. Where independent on-the-ground verification — for example ICRC field reporting, MSF, IPC food-security classification, or non-UN satellite analysis — would strengthen or correct a current-condition claim, that absence should be treated as an open evidentiary limitation, not silently absorbed. This does not reduce confidence to zero; it locates the confidence correctly and marks where it should be revised as better-sourced information becomes available.

Part One — Purpose, Limits, and Method

1. Purpose of the Report

This report has three purposes.

First, it analyzes past occurrences without flattening the historical case, the actors, or the harms.

Second, it maps present or recent forms of authority, control, responsibility, and civilian vulnerability in Gaza.

Third, it creates a future-facing prevention tool that can identify warning signs before protected conditions collapse.

The report asks:

Who controlled which conditions?

Who acted directly?

Who exercised indirect condition-control?

Who bore the harm?

Who had notice?

Who had capacity to prevent, reduce, or correct harm?

What claims are empirical?

What claims are legal-risk classifications?

What claims are moral judgments?

What remains uncertain?

What evidence would change the conclusion?

The report does not ask the reader to accept conclusions on trust. It shows the path from evidence to classification.

2. What This Report Does Not Do

This report does not replace courts, investigators, commissions, journalists, historians, or humanitarian fact-finding bodies.

It does not make final findings of war crimes, crimes against humanity, genocide, occupation status, lawful self-defense, terrorism, or individual criminal liability except where it is accurately describing a competent legal body's formal action.

It does not treat legal caution as moral evasion.

It does not treat moral clarity as a substitute for evidence.

It does not treat Palestinian civilians in Gaza as Hamas.

It does not treat Israeli civilians and hostages as the Israeli state.

It does not treat humanitarian actors as sovereign governors.

It does not treat formal legal status as the only form of power.

It does not treat all actors as equally powerful.

It does not make the case simpler than it is.

3. Legal, Moral, and Empirical Separation

The report separates three kinds of claims.

Empirical control claims

These ask what happened and who controlled what.

Examples include: an actor controlled a crossing; an actor operated police; an actor restricted fuel; an actor carried out a strike; an actor detained civilians; an actor controlled aid entry; an actor held hostages.

Legal classification claims

These ask what legal category may apply.

Examples include: occupation, terrorist designation, distinction, proportionality, precautions, starvation, hostage-taking, forced displacement, arbitrary detention, collective punishment, command responsibility, war crimes, crimes against humanity, genocide, or failure to investigate.

Moral judgment claims

These ask what conduct is morally indefensible, evil, cruel, dominating, or prohibited as a matter of ethical principle.

The central moral floor is:

Central moral floor

No actor's legal status, political claim, security rationale, resistance claim, sovereignty claim, national trauma, or historical grievance converts civilians into permissible instruments.

This applies to states, armed groups, insurgent groups, terrorist-designated organizations, occupying powers, local authorities, humanitarian systems, donors, and external powers.

4. The Seven-Function State-Making Framework

This report uses a seven-function state-making framework because Gaza cannot be accurately analyzed by asking only who holds formal title, who claims sovereignty, who is legally recognized, or who administers a particular office.

The relevant questions are more practical:

Who can use force?

Who can suppress rivals?

Who can protect or expose civilians?

Who can extract resources?

Who can settle disputes?

Who can control the distribution of goods?

Who can determine whether production, repair, and survival systems can function?

The seven functions are:

- War making — the ability to eliminate, neutralize, deter, destroy, suppress, or defeat outside rivals through organized force.
- State making — the ability to eliminate, neutralize, subordinate, replace, or suppress rivals inside a claimed territory or governed field.
- Protection — the ability to shield, secure, defend, expose, or manage threats to a population or client group.
- Extraction — the ability to acquire, seize, tax, restrict, approve, redirect, or condition the material resources necessary to govern, fight, survive, or rebuild.
- Adjudication — the ability to settle disputes, enforce rules, detain, punish, review, or provide remedy.
- Distribution — the ability to allocate or control food, water, medicine, fuel, shelter, aid, access, and other goods or services.
- Production — the ability to create, repair, maintain, transform, or operate infrastructure, livelihoods, hospitals, water systems, roads, communications, housing, schools, and survival systems.

This framework is descriptive and analytic. It does not treat war, coercion, extraction, or domination as morally legitimate merely because they are historically associated with state formation.

Description is not justification.

5. Monopoly, Dominance, Direct Governance, and Condition-Control

Direct governance

Direct governance means administering institutions, personnel, police, courts, taxation, services, civil records, public rules, or local enforcement.

An actor directly governs when it operates the machinery of administration.

Monopoly

Monopoly means near-exclusive control over a function.

A monopoly claim is defeated if multiple actors retain meaningful practical authority over that function.

Because Gaza contains multiple actors with meaningful roles, this report does not begin by assuming that any single actor monopolizes the whole field.

Dominance

Dominance means one actor can materially override, permit, restrict, disable, condition, punish, or shape the activity of other actors in a given function.

Dominance is not the same as monopoly.

Dominance is not the same as direct governance.

An actor may dominate one function while sharing or lacking control over another.

Condition-control

Condition-control exists when an actor does not directly perform a function but materially determines whether, where, how, and under what constraints others can perform it.

Condition-control is central to this report.

An actor may not distribute food directly, but if it controls crossings, inspection systems, permitted routes, military zones, fuel entry, or convoy approval, it may exercise condition-control over distribution.

An actor may not operate hospitals directly, but if it controls fuel, electricity, medical imports, evacuation permissions, road safety, or military access, it may exercise condition-control over medical survival systems.

An actor may not run every local government office, but if it can disable, strike, restrict, isolate, or prevent the repair of those offices, it may exercise condition-control over the administrative environment.

Condition-control does not automatically prove legal liability. It does not automatically prove occupation, war crimes, genocide, collective punishment, or any other final legal conclusion. But it is relevant to legal-risk analysis because duties often track the kind and degree of control an actor exercises.

Condition-control is not effective control

Condition-control and effective control are not the same concept, and this report does not use the first as a covert substitute for the second.

Effective control is a legal status test. In the law of belligerent occupation it asks, in substance, whether an outside armed force has placed territory under its authority such that the prior governing power can no longer exercise its own — the standard descending from Article 42 of the Hague Regulations. Its output is close to categorical: where the test is met, a determinate body of law follows, including occupier obligations under the Fourth Geneva Convention. Whether that test is satisfied in Gaza, and in particular

whether functional control without continuous ground administration can suffice after the 2005 disengagement, is contested among states, scholars, and legal bodies, and has been addressed by the International Court of Justice. This report does not resolve it.

Condition-control is an analytic, descriptive measure, not a legal status. It asks a different and graded question: to what degree can an actor determine whether, where, how, and under what constraints others can act with respect to a specific function, in a specific place, over a specific period. It is scored function by function, it admits of degrees and of shared or contested holdings, and it is deliberately agnostic about an actor's formal title. An actor may hold high condition-control over crossings, fuel, or airspace without that fact settling the effective-control question; and the effective-control question could in principle be resolved either way without changing what the condition-control analysis describes.

The reason to use condition-control rather than rest on the legal test is that prevention duties, as this report frames them, track functional control and foreseeability, and those can attach to whoever holds graded control over a survival-relevant function regardless of how the binary legal-status question is ultimately adjudicated. Condition-control therefore does analytic and preventive work the legal-status test does not, without pre-deciding, displacing, or renaming it. Where the report needs the legal category, it names it as a legal-risk classification and defers final findings to a competent body.

6. Control Scoring

This report uses a function-specific control scale:

0 = no meaningful control 1 = influence only 2 = shared or contested control 3 = clear dominance 4 = near-monopoly

A score must be assigned function by function. No actor receives a global score for "control of Gaza" without specifying the function, place, period, and evidence.

Each score summarizes two judgments about a named function, in a named place, over a named period.

Reach — what the actor can do to the function, from affecting it only at the margins to blocking, permitting, conditioning, disabling, destroying, or overriding it at will.

Exclusivity — how far others share or can contest that reach, from many actors holding comparable capability to the actor being able to prevent rivals from scaling the function at all.

Each level, with a one-line test for assigning it:

0 — No meaningful control. The actor cannot reliably affect the function; outcomes are set by others or by conditions outside its reach. Test: remove this actor — does anything about the function change? If no, score 0.

1 — Influence only. The actor can affect the function at the margins (urge, fund, delay slightly, partially obstruct) but cannot determine outcomes and cannot prevent others from acting. Test: can it shift the outcome without another actor's cooperation? If it can only nudge, score 1.

2 — Shared or contested control. The actor can materially shape the function (permit, condition, restrict, divert) but only alongside, or against the resistance of, other actors with comparable capability; control is divided, negotiated, or actively contested. Test: can it be matched or overridden by another actor on this function while still materially shaping it? If yes, score 2.

3 — Clear dominance. The actor can determine the function's main outcomes without needing others' permission, though it does not wholly exclude rivals, who retain residual or local capacity. Test: can it impose its preferred outcome over others' opposition while some rival capacity survives? If yes, score 3.

4 — Near-monopoly. The actor's reach over the function approaches exclusivity: it can block, permit, condition, disable, destroy, or override at will and can prevent rivals from scaling the function; no other actor holds comparable standing capability. Test: is its control effectively unmatched and are rivals structurally unable to scale it? If yes, score 4.

Five rules govern assignment.

Specificity. A score is never global. It is always paired with function, place, period, the reach-and-exclusivity basis, and cited evidence.

Ranges over false precision. Because the integer summarizes two judgments, a range (such as 2 to 3) is the correct entry whenever reach and exclusivity point to different levels, or evidence is mixed across place or period.

Suspension is not zero. Insufficient evidence suspends the score; it does not default to 0. A 0 is a finding of no control, not a finding of no evidence.

Corrigibility. All scores are corrigible: if later evidence shows lower reach or greater sharing, lower the score; if another actor held primary control, redistribute it; if the function was shared, say shared. If evidence is insufficient, suspend the finding.

Ordinal, not cardinal. The integers are ordinal summaries, not cardinal quantities. A 4 is not twice a 2, and scores are comparable across actors only as rough rank, never as arithmetic.

Part Two — Historical and Actor-Specific Case Frame

7. Historical Case Frame

This report does not attempt to write the full history of Israel, Palestine, Zionism, Palestinian nationalism, the British Mandate, the Nakba, the 1967 war, the Oslo process, or the entire Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Those histories matter. They shape the terrain. But this report has a more focused purpose.

The immediate frame begins with the modern Gaza control question:

- Gaza after Israeli control began in 1967;
- the rise of Palestinian self-government structures under the Oslo-era arrangements;
- Israel's 2005 disengagement from Gaza;
- Hamas's 2006 electoral victory and 2007 takeover of Gaza;
- the Israeli-Egyptian blockade and access regime after 2007;
- repeated rounds of armed conflict;
- the October 7, 2023 Hamas-led attacks on Israel;
- Israel's military campaign in Gaza;
- mass civilian harm, displacement, infrastructure collapse, and humanitarian dependency;
- the current or most recent fractured-control picture.

The deeper historical background should be acknowledged, but this report's analytic unit is Gaza as a contemporary fractured authority field.

8. Gaza Before the Present Control Crisis

Gaza is not merely a battlefield or administrative zone. It is a densely populated Palestinian territory with its own social life, families, neighborhoods, refugee histories, institutions, religious communities, civil society networks, political movements, memory, and claims.

Any analysis that treats Gaza only as a security problem fails before it begins.

At the same time, Gaza cannot be understood apart from broader Israeli and Palestinian histories: displacement, occupation, armed struggle, state security claims, Palestinian national claims, failed negotiations, settlement expansion in the broader occupied territory, political division between Palestinian factions, and repeated cycles of violence.

For this report, the key background point is this:

Gaza entered the current era already shaped by unresolved sovereignty, restricted movement, Israeli security control, Palestinian political fragmentation, economic dependency, and recurring armed confrontation.

The later collapse of civilian conditions did not occur in an empty field. It occurred inside a territory where authority was already divided, constrained, and contested.

9. Israeli Disengagement and the Condition-Control Question

In 2005, Israel withdrew its settlements and permanent ground military installations from inside Gaza.

This changed the form of Israeli control but did not end the control question.

After disengagement, the key dispute became whether Israel no longer occupied Gaza because it removed settlers and permanent ground forces, or whether Israel retained forms of effective control through borders, airspace, maritime access, population registry, movement restrictions, military operations, crossings, and control over essential external conditions.

This report does not resolve that final legal question here.

For this report, the important analytic point is:

after 2005, Gaza became a territory where direct internal Israeli administration decreased, while external condition-control remained central and contested.

This is one of the main historical foundations for distinguishing direct governance from condition-control.

10. Hamas's 2007 Takeover and Internal Governance

In 2006, Hamas won Palestinian legislative elections through its Change and Reform list. The result intensified political conflict between Hamas and Fatah.

In 2007, Hamas took control of Gaza after violent conflict with Fatah. From that point, Palestinian governance became sharply divided.

Hamas exercised de facto authority in Gaza.

The Palestinian Authority, dominated by Fatah, retained its main practical authority in parts of the West Bank.

The split weakened unified Palestinian governance and created separate institutional, security, political, and legal realities between Gaza and the West Bank.

This matters because Hamas cannot be analyzed only as an armed group if the question is empirical governance. It has also exercised internal administrative, police, taxation, public-order, and institutional

functions in Gaza.

But Hamas's governance role does not erase its separate legal and moral exposure for attacks on civilians, hostage-taking, internal coercion, and other alleged, documented, or adjudicated violations, depending on the evidence and procedural posture.

The correct analytic rule is:

Hamas's governance functions must be named without converting those functions into moral legitimization.

11. Blockade, Access Regime, and Humanitarian Dependency

After Hamas took control of Gaza, Israel and Egypt imposed or intensified restrictions on movement, goods, crossings, and access. Israel's stated rationale has included preventing weapons smuggling, protecting Israeli civilians, weakening Hamas's military capacity, and responding to rocket attacks and other threats.

Palestinians, humanitarian organizations, human rights groups, and many international actors have described the blockade and access restrictions as producing severe humanitarian, economic, and civilian consequences.

This period is central to the report because it shows the difference between direct internal governance and external condition-control.

Hamas governed internally in Gaza in many respects.

Israel and Egypt controlled or heavily shaped important external access conditions.

Humanitarian actors provided services but lacked sovereign authority.

Donors funded systems they did not fully control.

Civilians lived inside a constrained field where local governance, external security restrictions, armed conflict, poverty, and humanitarian dependency overlapped.

Gaza was not simply controlled from inside or outside. It was governed through layered constraint.

12. October 7, Hostages, and Civilian Harm

On October 7, 2023, Hamas and other Palestinian armed groups launched coordinated attacks from Gaza into southern Israel.

The attacks killed civilians and security personnel, involved attacks on communities and a music festival, and resulted in the seizure of hostages taken into Gaza.

This event is a core part of the historical case frame and cannot be minimized, abstracted, or treated as merely symbolic. It involved direct civilian harm and hostage-taking.

For this report's method, October 7 must be analyzed in several distinct categories:

as an empirical event;

as an armed attack;

as a civilian protection failure;

as a hostage-taking event;

as a moral injury to Israeli civilians, families, and communities;

as a legal-risk and accountability event for Hamas and other participating armed groups;

as the immediate trigger for Israel's large-scale military campaign in Gaza.

The report must also preserve this guardrail:

The October 7 attacks do not justify unlawful harm to Palestinian civilians in Gaza.

Likewise, Israeli policies or actions toward Palestinians before or after October 7 do not justify attacks on Israeli civilians or hostage-taking.

Civilian protection cannot be made conditional on political sympathy.

13. Israel's Military Campaign and Civilian Condition-Collapse

After October 7, Israel launched a large-scale military campaign in Gaza. Israel's stated objectives included dismantling Hamas's military and governing capacity and recovering hostages.

The campaign produced enormous civilian consequences in Gaza, including mass displacement, destruction of homes and infrastructure, disruption of hospitals, water and sanitation systems, food insecurity, aid dependency, and widespread civilian death and injury.

Israel has argued that Hamas embeds itself within civilian areas, uses tunnels and civilian infrastructure for military purposes, and bears responsibility for exposing civilians to danger.

Hamas and many critics argue that Israel's campaign has been indiscriminate, disproportionate, punitive, or aimed at making Gaza unlivable.

International legal bodies, humanitarian organizations, journalists, and governments have made sharply different claims about legality, intent, responsibility, and evidence.

This report does not resolve all those disputes in this historical section.

It records the structural fact that after October 7, Gaza's condition-control problem became acute:

military operations, evacuation orders, restricted zones, crossing controls, fuel restrictions, aid bottlenecks, hospital collapse, water and sanitation breakdown, housing destruction, and displacement all became central to civilian survival.

This is where the report's corpus-facing question becomes unavoidable:

Can people exercise meaningful action when the conditions for movement, shelter, food, water, medical care, communication, return, and repair are collapsing?

14. Current or Most Recent Control Picture

As of the most recent control picture cited in this report, Gaza remains divided by layered and unstable control.

Israel retains military control or presence over large portions of Gaza, including restricted military areas and boundary lines that shape where civilians can move and where Hamas or other Palestinian actors can operate.

Hamas retains or contests internal authority over portions of Gaza's population, including administrative, police, taxation, and public-order functions where it remains operative.

Humanitarian actors continue to operate under severe constraints, including access limitations, insecurity, damaged infrastructure, fuel and supply problems, and political restrictions.

Egypt retains border leverage.

The Palestinian Authority remains diplomatically relevant but practically weak in Gaza.

The United States and other external actors influence ceasefire, reconstruction, security, and diplomatic arrangements.

International courts and legal bodies continue to shape the legal environment but do not directly govern Gaza.

This current picture supports the report's description:

Gaza is not governed by one clean monopoly authority. It is a fractured authority field.

Part Three — Actor-Specific Authority Map

15. Israel

Israel is a recognized state with sovereign authority over its own territory. In relation to Gaza, its legal status and obligations are contested and have been addressed by international legal bodies, states, scholars, and human rights organizations in different ways.

Many international actors and legal bodies treat Gaza as part of the occupied Palestinian territory or treat Israel as retaining obligations tied to the degree of control it exercises. Israel has disputed or rejected important aspects of that characterization, especially after its 2005 disengagement from Gaza.

This report does not resolve the final legal status question in this section.

Instead, it asks what forms of control Israel exercises and what duties may follow from those forms of control.

Israel has exercised powerful outer-frame control over Gaza. This includes military power, airspace control, maritime restrictions, border and crossing influence, security zones, strike capacity, surveillance, territorial incursion, population movement controls, fuel and reconstruction constraints, and the ability to shape the physical environment in which civilian life, governance, distribution, and production occur.

Israel does not directly administer every internal function of Gaza. But Israel may exercise condition-control over many functions when it can materially determine whether other actors can move, distribute, repair, produce, govern, or survive.

Misuse / guardrail

The report must not say simply:

Israel controls Gaza.

That is too imprecise.

The more accurate formulation is:

Israel does not directly administer every internal function of Gaza, but it exercises powerful outer-frame and condition-control over many military, access, territorial, infrastructural, and survival conditions.

16. Hamas

Hamas is a Palestinian Islamist political and armed organization. It has been legally designated as a terrorist organization by several governments. It has also exercised de facto governing authority in Gaza since its 2007 takeover, although the scope of that authority has varied over time and has been affected by war, internal contestation, Israeli military operations, and humanitarian collapse.

This dual status must be preserved.

Hamas can be both:

a legally designated terrorist organization under the laws of several states,
and

a de facto internal governing and coercive actor in Gaza where it retains control.

One fact does not erase the other.

Hamas has exercised or sought to retain internal authority through armed forces, police, ministries, taxation, fees, salary systems, appointments, public-order enforcement, detention, local coercion, political control, social-service networks, armed confrontation with Israel, and control over parts of civilian life where it remains operative.

Hamas's practical authority is not the same as internationally recognized state sovereignty.

But it is also not nothing.

Misuse / guardrail

The report must not say:

Hamas governs, therefore Hamas is legitimate.

Nor should it say:

Hamas is designated terrorist, therefore Hamas cannot perform governance functions.

The correct formulation is:

Hamas's governance functions do not erase its legal and moral exposure for alleged, documented, or adjudicated violence against civilians or coercive rule. Its legal designation does not erase the empirical fact that it has performed governance functions.

17. Palestinian Civilians in Gaza

Palestinian civilians in Gaza are protected persons and civilian human beings whose rights, safety, dignity, family integrity, movement, shelter, food, water, health care, and survival conditions are central to this report.

They are not merely the population over which actors struggle.

They are not merely evidence of military effects.

They are not merely symbols of Palestinian national claims.

They are persons, families, communities, workers, children, elders, patients, students, professionals, displaced people, bereaved people, and political subjects.

Palestinian civilians in Gaza are affected by multiple layers of power:

Israeli military and access-control power;

Hamas internal coercive and administrative power;

Egyptian border decisions;

humanitarian system constraints;

donor and diplomatic decisions;
local clan, family, market, and civil-society structures;
infrastructure collapse;
displacement;
violence;
loss of housing;
loss of documentation;
hunger;
medical deprivation;
trauma;
restricted movement;
uncertain return;
loss of livelihood;
loss of meaningful action.

Misuse / guardrail

The report must not treat Palestinian civilians as identical with Hamas.

It must not treat civilian suffering as automatically justified by the presence, conduct, or strategy of armed groups.

It must not erase the agency of Palestinian civilians by treating them only as victims.

It must analyze the conditions under which their meaningful action is preserved, coerced, degraded, or destroyed.

18. Israeli Civilians and Hostages

Israeli civilians are civilians. Hostages are protected persons. Detaining civilians as bargaining instruments by armed groups falls within the report's hostage-taking and unlawful-detention legal-risk category and must be screened against IHL hostage-taking rules.

Their protection does not depend on agreement with the Israeli government.

Their suffering cannot be reduced to state policy.

The October 7 attacks and hostage-taking must be named directly as civilian-harm events.

Israeli civilians have faced rocket fire, armed attack, killing, kidnapping, displacement, fear, trauma, and family separation.

Hostages and their families occupy a distinct moral and legal position. Hostages are not instruments of negotiation. Families of hostages are not abstractions in a geopolitical dispute.

Misuse / guardrail

The report must not treat Israeli civilians as identical with the Israeli state.

It must not treat hostage-taking as understandable political leverage.

It must not use Palestinian suffering to erase Israeli civilian suffering.

It must also not use Israeli civilian suffering to erase Palestinian civilian protection.

Civilian protection is not competitive.

19. Other Actors

Palestinian Authority

The Palestinian Authority has formal and diplomatic standing as part of the recognized Palestinian governance framework created through the Oslo process. It remains internationally relevant in discussions of Palestinian governance and possible future arrangements. Its practical authority in Gaza has been weak since Hamas took control in 2007.

The correct formulation is:

The Palestinian Authority has recognized political significance but weak practical control in Gaza.

Egypt

Egypt is a sovereign state bordering Gaza. It controls the Egyptian side of the Rafah crossing and plays a significant diplomatic, mediation, and border role.

Egypt does not govern Gaza internally.

It should be treated as a border-power and mediator with significant but domain-specific control.

UN Agencies, NGOs, and Humanitarian Actors

UN agencies, NGOs, medical organizations, humanitarian workers, and relief partners are service, protection, monitoring, and relief actors. They do not possess sovereign authority over Gaza.

They may provide food, water, medicine, shelter, sanitation, medical care, logistics, monitoring, documentation, coordination, and emergency relief. But they depend on security conditions, access permissions, funding, fuel, roads, communications, local cooperation, and protection from attack or obstruction.

Misuse / guardrail

The report must not confuse service provision with sovereign control.

When humanitarian actors become essential to survival, that may reveal governance failure rather than humanitarian sovereignty.

United States, Donors, and External Diplomatic Actors

The United States, donor states, regional mediators, and diplomatic bodies are external actors. They do not directly govern Gaza, but they shape the field through military aid, diplomatic pressure, sanctions, ceasefire negotiations, reconstruction plans, funding, recognition, vetoes, resolutions, and security arrangements.

Their responsibility should be evaluated through influence, material support, diplomatic leverage, funding, arms, veto power, and capacity to prevent or reduce foreseeable harm.

International Courts and Legal Bodies

International courts, commissions, and legal bodies evaluate legal claims, obligations, responsibility, and accountability. They do not directly govern Gaza.

They shape the legal environment and accountability field, but they do not replace factual control analysis.

Journalists, Medical Workers, Civil Society, Families, and Local Communities

These actors are not sovereign authorities, but they are essential to truth, survival, care, continuity, memory, and repair.

Journalists document.

Medical workers preserve life.

Families maintain care networks.

Civil society groups organize survival and memory.

Local communities maintain social order, grief rituals, education, shelter, mutual aid, and information.

These forms of power are not state power in the conventional sense, but they are central to protected conditions and meaningful action.

Part Four — Analytic Core

20. State-Making Function × Actor Matrix

The state-making function matrix supports the following conclusion:

Gaza is not governed by a single monopoly actor.

Israel has a strict monopoly over none of the seven whole functions.

Israel appears to clearly dominate five functions or sub-functions:

- war making,
- protection/security environment,
- extraction/access control,
- distribution gatekeeping,
- production conditions.

State making is contested.

Adjudication is layered and fragmented.

Hamas remains or has remained the strongest internal coercive-administrative actor where it retains control.

Humanitarian actors perform essential service functions but lack sovereign authority.

Egypt controls a border layer.

The Palestinian Authority holds formal relevance but weak practical Gaza control.

External actors shape diplomacy, resources, and prevention pressure.

International legal bodies shape accountability but do not directly govern.

The best formulation remains:

Gaza is a fractured authority field shaped by Israeli condition-control, Hamas internal coercive-administrative authority, humanitarian dependency, Egyptian border leverage, weak PA reach, donor conditionality, international legal pressure, and civilian survival networks.

21. Summary Control Matrix

Function	Israel	Hamas	Egypt	PA	UN/NGOs	U.S./Donors	International Legal Bodies	Local/Civilian Networks
War making	4	2	1	0-1	0	1-2	0-1	0
State making	3	1	1-2	0-1	1-2	1		
Protection	3-4	2-3	1-2	1	1-2	1	1-2	
Extraction	3	2-3	1-2	1	1-2	0-1	1	
Adjudication	2	2-3	1	1-2	0-1	2-3	1-2	
Distribution	3-4	2	1-2	1	3	2	0-1	1-2
Production	3-4	1-2	1	1-2	2	0-1	1-2	

These are provisional analytic scores, not final findings.

They should be read as conditional classifications based on the current available record. Each score can be revised if the evidence changes.

Reading the ranges. Every range in this matrix expresses one of two things under the control-scoring rule: the two underlying judgments diverge — reach is high while exclusivity is contested, or the reverse — or the evidence is mixed across place or period. A range is therefore an analytic statement, not indecision. And because the integers are ordinal, equal scores across actors do not denote equivalent power; they may reflect different kinds of control over the same function. Four cells illustrate the point.

Israel, protection / distribution / production (3-4). High reach: Israel can materially determine the physical conditions — access, fuel, movement, safety, reconstruction inputs — on which these functions depend. Contested exclusivity: it does not operate the last mile, where humanitarian actors, Hamas, and local networks still function. The range is the distance between near-total reach and incomplete exclusivity, which is this report's central finding stated numerically.

UN and NGOs, distribution (3), above Hamas (2). The higher score is high reach over a narrow domain: humanitarian actors physically deliver much of Gaza's aid, but that reach is wholly conditional on access, fuel, and security they do not control. The score measures last-mile delivery capacity, not control of the distribution system, which the access-holders retain. The 3 does not make humanitarian actors the dominant distribution power.

Adjudication, Hamas (2-3) and international legal bodies (2-3). The same range denotes different kinds of adjudication. Hamas's score reflects internal coercive adjudication where it retains police, detention, and enforcement; the legal-bodies score reflects international legal process — proceedings, warrants, advisory opinions — with weak direct enforcement inside Gaza. This is the clearest case of the ordinal rule: equal integers rank, they do not equate.

State making, Israel (3) and Hamas (3). An equal, non-ranged pair makes the same point. Israel's 3 is the capacity to suppress rivals through force across the territory; Hamas's 3 is the capacity to suppress internal rivals where it governs. The integers match; the scope and means do not.

22. Protected Conditions Harm Matrix

Civilian protection must include protection of the conditions through which civilians remain capable of living, choosing, caring, repairing, returning, remembering, and continuing.

Protected conditions include:

life,
bodily integrity,
food,
water,
medicine,
shelter,
movement,
family unity,
documents,
livelihood,
education,
communication,
sanitation,
burial,
civilian governance,
remedy,
return,
repair.

The protected-conditions lens does not replace legal categories. It supplements them. It helps show how harm accumulates before, during, and after legally visible events.

A strike may be one event.

The destruction of roads, hospitals, water systems, records, markets, schools, homes, cemeteries, and communications may produce a wider condition-collapse.

A crossing restriction may be one policy.

The consequences may include hunger, untreated wounds, failed generators, sewage overflow, family separation, collapsed markets, and loss of return capacity.

The basic harm chain is:

control → condition affected → civilian consequence → legal-risk category → prevention failure → correction point.

23. Protected Conditions Summary Matrix

Protected Condition	Civilian Meaning	State-Making Function Implicated	Main Control Questions
Life and bodily integrity	Not being killed, wounded, tortured, starved, or exposed to preventable death	War making, protection	Who used force? Who controlled safety?
Food and water	Ability to eat and drink safely	Distribution, extraction, production	Who controlled entry, markets, wells, fuel, routes?
Medical care	Ability to receive treatment	Protection, distribution, production	Who controlled hospitals, fuel, medicine, evacuation, safety?
Shelter and home	Ability to live somewhere safe	War making, production, protection	Who destroyed, restricted, occupied, or blocked repair?
Movement and evacuation	Ability to flee danger or reach services	Protection, adjudication, distribution	Who controlled roads, crossings, warnings, checkpoints?
Family unity	Ability to remain with or locate family	Protection, adjudication	Who caused separation? Who controlled detention, movement, records?
Documents and records	Ability to prove identity, property, death, birth, status	Adjudication, state making	Who preserved, destroyed, denied, or recognized records?
Livelihood and markets	Ability to work, trade, produce, buy, sell	Production, extraction, distribution	Who controlled goods, fuel, roads, taxes, imports, safety?
Communication and truth	Ability to call, document, warn, coordinate, grieve	Production, protection, adjudication	Who controlled telecoms, electricity, devices, movement?
Return and repair	Ability to go back, rebuild, restore life	Production, adjudication, state making	Who controlled rubble removal, land access, materials, records?

24. Corpus Lens Matrix

The report is part of a broader corpus concerned with freedom, protected conditions, resilient governance, agency, authority under constraint, and corrigibility.

The corpus does not make the Gaza case simpler.

It makes the case harder to flatten.

The corpus-facing version of the report should not say:

Gaza proves the theory.

It should say:

The Gaza case tests whether the theory can preserve actor specificity, historical reality, civilian harm, legal caution, and prevention responsibility under conditions of extreme contestation.

The main corpus finding is:

Gaza is a case of fractured authority where condition-control, internal coercive governance, humanitarian dependency, border leverage, weak formal authority, donor influence, and legal delay interact with protected-condition collapse. The central question is not only who governs, but whether civilians retain the conditions of meaningful action, whether authority remains corrigible, and whether prevention activates before survival systems fail.

25. Legal-Risk Classification System

This report identifies legal-risk categories. It does not make final legal findings unless accurately describing a competent legal body's formal action.

The report uses the following legal-risk scale:

L0 = no legal-risk classification made L1 = possible legal-risk issue L2 = credible legal-risk issue L3 = serious legal-risk issue requiring investigation L4 = strong legal-risk assessment pending competent adjudication L5 = formal legal finding by competent body

The strongest legal-risk pattern is:

an actor had control;

the protected condition was essential to civilian survival;

harm was foreseeable;

the actor had notice;

feasible alternatives or corrections existed;

and the actor failed to prevent, stop, reduce, investigate, or remedy the harm.

That pattern does not by itself end the legal inquiry.

It tells the report where the legal inquiry must begin.

26. Legal-Risk Categories

The report may identify legal-risk categories involving:

direct attacks on civilians;

indiscriminate attacks;

proportionality;

precautions in attack;

civilian objects and protected infrastructure;

medical protection;

starvation, deprivation, and survival goods;

obstruction of humanitarian relief;

forced displacement and evacuation risk;

hostage-taking;

arbitrary detention, enforced disappearance, and mistreatment;

collective punishment risk;

human shielding and civilian endangerment by armed actors;

genocide-prevention and group-destruction risk;

command responsibility and superior responsibility;

failure to investigate, preserve evidence, or provide remedy.

Each category requires evidence, qualification, and procedural caution.

One category carries the strictest rule. Allegations of genocide or group-destruction are the most consequential of these categories and the most easily quoted out of context. Wherever this category appears in this report, it must be stated as a legal-risk or prevention question and, where legal process exists, as procedural posture — that proceedings have been brought and that provisional measures have

been ordered under the Genocide Convention. It must never be stated as a finding that genocide has been legally established. Only a competent court can make that determination, and the existence of provisional measures does not constitute it.

The report must distinguish allegation, sourced empirical claim, legal-risk classification, formal finding, moral judgment, and final legal conclusion.

Part Five — Case Study Modules

27. Module One: October 7, Civilian Attacks, and Hostage-Taking

October 7 is not background. It is a direct civilian-harm event and a triggering event for the subsequent war.

A serious case study must name the killing, kidnapping, fear, family separation, trauma, and hostage-taking directly.

This module preserves a basic moral and legal rule:

Israeli civilians are civilians.

Hostages are not bargaining instruments.

No political claim, resistance claim, history of occupation, blockade, or grievance justifies attacks on civilians or hostage-taking.

At the same time, the October 7 attacks do not create unlimited permission to harm Palestinian civilians in Gaza.

Civilian protection is not competitive.

Module finding

The October 7 attacks and hostage-taking require direct civilian-protection analysis, legal-risk classification, evidence preservation, and accountability. Recognizing Palestinian civilian suffering before or after October 7 does not diminish the civilian status of Israeli victims. Recognizing Israeli civilian harm does not remove the protection owed to Palestinian civilians in Gaza.

28. Module Two: Israel's Military Campaign, Bombardment, and Urban War

Israel's military campaign after October 7 is central to the Gaza case because it transformed the scale of condition-control and civilian harm.

The campaign involved military operations in densely populated areas, widespread destruction, displacement, humanitarian dependency, severe infrastructure damage, and contested claims about Hamas's use of civilian areas.

The module must examine both Israel's stated military objectives and the civilian consequences of the methods, scale, targeting, restrictions, and operational choices used.

A legitimate military objective does not erase distinction, proportionality, precautions, medical protection, humanitarian access, or civilian survival duties.

Module finding

Where military force intersects with dense civilian life, infrastructure collapse, displacement, and condition-control, the legal and prevention burden becomes especially high. The report should treat Israel's security claims seriously enough to examine them, but not so deferentially that they erase civilian harm. It should treat civilian harm seriously enough to investigate legal risk, but not so loosely that every harm becomes a final legal conclusion.

29. Module Three: Aid, Crossings, and Distribution Gatekeeping

Aid distribution is one of the clearest areas where direct provision and condition-control separate.

An actor may not physically distribute aid but may control whether aid enters.

An actor may not control crossings but may control local distribution, diversion, taxation, armed access, or safe movement.

Humanitarian actors may physically deliver aid but lack control over border decisions, fuel, military routes, local armed interference, or security.

Aid failure cannot be analyzed by asking only:

Did aid enter?

The better questions are:

Was enough aid permitted?

Could it move safely?

Could civilians reach it without danger?

Was it diverted or looted?

Were distribution sites safe?

Were humanitarian workers protected?

Were aid rules used as leverage?

Module finding

Aid is not only a humanitarian issue. It is a state-making function and protected-condition system. The report should distinguish gatekeeping from last-mile delivery and should assign responsibility by control point.

The guiding rule is:

whoever controls a chokepoint in the survival chain has prevention duties tied to that chokepoint.

30. Module Four: Hospitals, Water, Fuel, Sanitation, and Repair Systems

This module is the clearest example of protected-condition collapse.

Hospitals, water systems, sanitation, bakeries, ambulances, communications, and shelters do not operate on moral claims. They operate on fuel, electricity, spare parts, roads, safety, staff, medicine, water, and access.

When those inputs collapse, civilian life collapses.

This module asks:

Who controlled the inputs?

Who controlled repair?

Who controlled safety?

Who had notice that system failure would harm civilians?

Who could have prevented or reduced the failure?

Module finding

Control over fuel, spare parts, safety, repair access, and infrastructure inputs can be as consequential as direct military force. When those systems fail, civilians lose the conditions of life, care, repair, and meaningful action.

31. Module Five: Displacement, Evacuation, Safe Zones, and Return

Displacement is not only movement.

It affects shelter, family unity, documents, medical care, food, education, burial, employment, safety, identity, and return.

A person may be told to leave, but the legal and moral question depends on whether leaving is meaningfully possible and whether the destination is safe and survivable.

A choice is not meaningful merely because it is named as a choice.

It is meaningful only when people have real, safe, informed, and survivable options.

Module finding

The report should treat evacuation as a practical condition, not a formal phrase. If civilians are instructed or pressured to move but lack safe routes, viable destinations, adequate time, medical support, shelter, food, water, or return prospects, then forced-displacement and precaution legal-risk categories require review.

32. Module Six: Hamas Internal Governance, Coercion, and Civilian Exposure

Hamas cannot be flattened into only one category.

If the report treats Hamas only as an armed group, it misses its internal governance role.

If the report treats Hamas only as a governing actor, it risks minimizing attacks on civilians, hostage-taking, internal coercion, and armed-group legal exposure.

The correct framework preserves both:

Hamas as an armed actor with serious legal-risk exposure;

and

Hamas as a de facto internal authority where it controls police, taxation, public order, detention, appointments, or distribution influence.

Module finding

Hamas's empirical governance functions do not legitimate attacks on civilians or hostage-taking. Hamas's legal designation does not erase the fact that it has performed governance functions. The analytic task is to identify which functions Hamas controlled, how it used them, what civilian harms followed, and what legal-risk categories are implicated.

33. Module Seven: International Legal and Diplomatic Response

The Gaza case has been shaped by legal and diplomatic processes:

international court proceedings;

arrest warrants;

Security Council resolutions;

ceasefire negotiations;

hostage negotiations;

sanctions debates;

arms-transfer debates;

humanitarian access negotiations;

donor reconstruction planning.

These processes matter. But legal and diplomatic action often moves slower than civilian harm.

Legal bodies shape accountability, but civilians need protection before final judgment. External actors with leverage should be evaluated by what they knew, what they could affect, what they did, and what they failed to prevent.

Module finding

International law and diplomacy are part of the authority field, but they do not replace control analysis. If external actors have material leverage and notice of foreseeable civilian harm, then they may be prevention-relevant even if they do not directly govern Gaza.

34. Module Eight: Truth, Documentation, Journalists, Medical Workers, and Civilian Continuity

The case cannot be understood only through armed actors and states.

Journalists document.

Doctors treat.

Families search.

Civil society organizes.

Aid workers distribute.

Local committees guide.

Religious leaders bury.

Teachers preserve childhood.

Engineers repair.

Recordkeepers preserve identity.

When these systems are attacked, silenced, starved of resources, or made impossible, society loses more than services. It loses continuity.

Module finding

Truth and care systems are civilian survival systems.

A society cannot repair what it cannot document.

A family cannot grieve what it cannot identify.

A legal system cannot correct what it cannot know.

Part Six — Evidence, Corrigibility, and Prevention

35. Evidence Ledger and Claim Protocol

The evidence ledger is the report's integrity engine.

It turns the case study from an argument into an auditable analytic tool.

Every major contested claim should be traceable through the evidence ledger.

The ledger asks:

What is the claim?

What kind of claim is it?

Which actor does it concern?

Which function does it concern?

Which protected condition is affected?

What evidence supports it?

How strong is the evidence?

What is the confidence level?

What legal-risk category may be implicated?

What alternative explanation exists?

What would weaken or defeat the claim?

What new evidence would require revision?

The rule is simple:

if the evidence changes, the claim changes.

36. Claim Types

Every claim must be labeled by type:

descriptive fact claim;

control claim;
 pattern claim;
 legal-risk claim;
 formal legal-finding claim;
 moral judgment claim;
 prevention claim;
 interpretive claim.

Each claim should include an evidence-quality score, a confidence level, a falsifier, and an update trigger.

37. Prevention Thresholds

The report uses four prevention thresholds:

Yellow = degradation Orange = severe degradation Red = system-collapse risk Black = irreversible harm risk

How to read the required responses. Two rules govern the required-response lists below. First, responsibility tracks control: each response is owed, in the first instance, by the actor the control matrix identifies as holding the relevant function — access measures by whoever controls access, command-level review by whoever holds command, enforcement review by bodies with enforcement standing — not by an unspecified party. A measure addressed to no one is not a prevention measure.

Second, these lists are a prevention menu, not a directive issued by this report to any party. The report classifies risk and identifies who is positioned to act; it does not order a ceasefire, an investigation, a suspension, or any other step. Naming a measure means it becomes relevant at that threshold and falls to the control-holder able to take it; it does not constitute this report's instruction to a government, an armed group, or an institution.

Yellow Threshold

A Yellow Threshold is crossed when one protected condition is degraded but has not yet collapsed.

Required response:

document, identify the control holder, request clarification or correction, monitor escalation, preserve evidence, and prepare contingencies.

Orange Threshold

An Orange Threshold is crossed when multiple protected conditions degrade at once, or one essential condition nears collapse.

Required response:

urgent correction demand, humanitarian access review, monitoring, public documentation, legal-risk screening, and notice to control-holding actors.

Red Threshold

A Red Threshold is crossed when civilian survival systems are foreseeably at risk of collapse.

Required response:

emergency humanitarian access, verified safe routes, fuel and medical access guarantee, command-level review, legal notice, evidence preservation, and, where necessary to protect civilians, ceasefire, pause, or

localized suspension of operations.

Black Threshold

A Black Threshold is crossed when civilian life, continuity, return, or survival faces irreversible or mass harm.

Required response:

immediate emergency protection measures, independent investigation, legal escalation, humanitarian access guarantee, enforcement review, evidence preservation, family tracing, body recovery, restoration of civil records, and return-and-repair planning.

38. Prevention Dashboard

Indicator	Yellow	Orange	Red	Black
Food access	localized shortage	repeated shortage	mass hunger	starvation conditions
Water	reduced access	contamination/shortage	system failure risk	collapse/epidemic risk
Hospitals	strain	near shutdown	shutdown risk	system collapse
Shelter	localized displacement	mass overcrowding	no viable shelter	structural displacement
Movement	route limits	unsafe routes	trapped civilians	forced transfer risk
Aid	delays	repeated obstruction	mass deprivation risk	survival failure
Fuel	reduced	critical shortage	system shutdown risk	infrastructure collapse
Communications	outages	repeated blackouts	blackout during operations	evidence and rescue collapse
Records	localized loss	major record loss	remedy failure	dispossession risk
Return	delayed	unsafe return	blocked return	permanent displacement risk

39. Prevention Finding

Civilian catastrophe is usually visible before it becomes irreversible. The warning signs appear in protected conditions: food, water, medicine, shelter, movement, communication, sanitation, family unity, records, remedy, and repair.

When those conditions begin to fail, the report should identify who controls the relevant function, who had notice, who could correct, and what action was required.

The final prevention rule is:

do not wait for the collapse to become undeniable. If control, foreseeability, and civilian-condition degradation converge, prevention must activate.

Part Seven — Findings and Public Synthesis

40. Main Finding

The main finding of this report is:

Gaza is not governed by a single clean monopoly authority.

Israel does not directly administer every internal function of Gaza. But Israel exercises powerful outer-frame and condition-control over many of the military, territorial, access, infrastructural, and survival conditions under which civilian life and governance can occur.

Hamas remains or has remained a major internal de facto coercive-administrative actor where it retains control, even while being legally designated as a terrorist organization by several governments.

Humanitarian actors provide essential services but do not possess sovereign power.

Egypt holds border leverage.

The Palestinian Authority retains formal and diplomatic relevance but weak practical authority in Gaza.

External states, donors, and diplomatic actors shape the material and political field.

International courts and legal bodies shape the accountability field but do not directly govern Gaza.

Families, civil society, journalists, medical workers, aid workers, and local communities preserve truth, care, memory, and survival under extreme constraint.

The most accurate description is therefore:

fractured authority under layered power.

A note on how to read these findings. This report applies the same method to every actor: the same control scale, the same legal-risk discipline, the same claim-typing, and the same refusal to collapse civilians into states or armed groups. That even-handed method does not produce even-handed findings. The control matrix records sharply unequal capacities, and because responsibility tracks control, it records unequal responsibility.

The symmetry of the analysis — that each actor is examined in the same terms, and that misuse warnings are issued in more than one direction — is a discipline of method, not a claim of equivalence. It should not be read to mean that the actors hold comparable power over civilian conditions, or that their responsibilities are the same size. Equal treatment of the question produces unequal answers, and it is the answers, not the equal treatment, that carry the finding.

41. Findings List

- Gaza cannot be accurately described through a single-sovereign model.
- Israel's strongest role is outer-frame condition-control.
- Hamas's strongest role is internal coercive-administrative authority where it retains control.
- Palestinian civilians in Gaza must not be collapsed into Hamas.
- Israeli civilians and hostages must not be collapsed into the Israeli state.
- Humanitarian actors provide essential services but do not possess sovereign power.
- Egypt holds border leverage but does not govern Gaza internally.
- The Palestinian Authority has formal relevance but weak practical Gaza control.
- External states and donors are prevention-relevant where they have material leverage.
- International courts and legal bodies shape accountability but do not directly govern.
- Civilian harm includes death and injury, but also protected-condition collapse.
- Legal-risk categories should be identified carefully and not overstated as final findings.
- Prevention should activate when protected conditions degrade, not only after final adjudication.
- Responsibility should track control.
- Every major contested claim should remain evidence-based, qualified, and corrigible.

42. Public-Facing Synthesis

Gaza is not governed by one clean authority. Israel does not directly administer every internal function, but it has enormous power over the conditions of life and governance: military force, movement, crossings, fuel, reconstruction, restricted zones, and the physical conditions under which aid, hospitals, water systems, shelter, and repair can function. Hamas remains a coercive internal governing actor where it retains control, even while being legally designated as a terrorist organization by several governments. Humanitarian actors provide essential services but do not control the war or the borders. Egypt controls an important border layer. The Palestinian Authority has formal relevance but weak practical control in Gaza. External states, donors, and legal bodies shape the field without directly governing it.

The best description is not monopoly.

It is fractured authority under layered power.

The central civilian question is not only who governs. It is whether people retain the conditions needed to live, move, receive care, preserve family, document harm, return, repair, and act meaningfully under real conditions.

43. Reader Note

This report is not neutral in the sense of being indifferent to civilian suffering.

It is neutral only in method.

It applies the same claim discipline to every actor.

It does not excuse attacks on Israeli civilians.

It does not excuse the destruction or deprivation of Palestinian civilian life.

It does not use legal caution to avoid moral clarity.

It does not use moral clarity to bypass evidence.

Its purpose is to keep the categories clear enough that responsibility cannot hide behind confusion.

44. Misuse Warnings

Misuse / guardrail

This report should not be used to claim that Hamas's governance functions justify its violence.

They do not.

Misuse / guardrail

This report should not be used to claim that Hamas's internal authority erases Israel's condition-control responsibility, prevention duties, or legal-risk exposure where those are supported by evidence and applicable legal standards.

It does not.

Misuse / guardrail

This report should not be used to claim that Israeli civilian suffering justifies unlawful harm to Palestinian civilians.

It does not.

Misuse / guardrail

This report should not be used to claim that Palestinian civilian suffering justifies attacks on Israeli civilians or hostage-taking.

It does not.

Misuse / guardrail

This report should not be used to claim that all actors have equal power.

They do not.

Misuse / guardrail

This report should not be used to claim that only the actor with formal legal title matters.

Formal title does not exhaust practical control.

Misuse / guardrail

This report should not be used to make final legal findings without evidence.

Legal-risk classification is not conviction.

45. Conclusion: Gaza Is Not a Metaphor

Gaza is not a metaphor. It is a historical catastrophe involving distinct actors, distinct powers, distinct legal statuses, distinct harms, and distinct responsibility questions.

The value of this framework is not that it makes the case simple.

Its value is that it prevents simplification from becoming evasion.

It asks who controlled which conditions, who was harmed, who had notice, who could correct course, and what warning signs should have forced action sooner.

It keeps the civilians visible.

It keeps the actors distinct.

It keeps the legal categories careful.

It keeps the moral floor clear.

And it keeps the report open to correction, because in a contested case, integrity requires not only strong claims, but claims that can be revised when the evidence requires it.

The final rule is:

As a prevention principle, responsibility should track control; as an evidence rule, if the evidence changes, the claim changes.

Appendices

Appendix A — Evidence Ledger Template

Field	Entry
Claim ID	
Claim	
Claim Type	descriptive fact / control / pattern / legal-risk / legal finding / moral judgment / prevention / interpretive
Actor(s)	
Function(s)	war making / state making / protection / extraction / adjudication / distribution / production
Protected Condition(s)	life / food / water / medicine / shelter / movement / documents / family unity / livelihood / education / communication / sanitation / burial / remedy / return / repair
Place	
Period	
Evidence	
Evidence Quality	A / B / C / D / E
Confidence	high / medium / low / suspended / withdrawn
Control Score	0–4, if applicable
Legal-Risk Category	if applicable
Legal-Risk Score	L0–L5
Alternative Explanation	
Falsifier	
Update Trigger	
Correction Rule	
Status	active / revised / suspended / withdrawn

Appendix B — Evidence Quality Scale

A = strong evidence: primary records, official documents, court records, authenticated orders, geolocated evidence, verified data, satellite imagery, authenticated videos, direct operational records, or multiple converging primary sources.

B = reliable evidence: reputable journalism, UN reporting, humanitarian reporting, NGO reporting, multiple independent secondary sources, expert analysis grounded in evidence, verified interviews, institutional reports.

C = partial evidence: single-source reporting, credible but incomplete documentation, partial data, limited access reporting, plausible but not fully corroborated evidence.

D = weak or unverified evidence: party claims, social media claims, unverified witness accounts, anonymous claims without corroboration, public statements unsupported by records.

E = allegation only: an allegation without sufficient corroboration.

Appendix C — Legal-Risk Scale

L0 = no legal-risk classification made. L1 = possible legal-risk issue. L2 = credible legal-risk issue. L3 = serious legal-risk issue requiring investigation. L4 = strong legal-risk assessment pending competent adjudication. L5 = formal legal finding by competent body.

Appendix D — Claim Language Rules

Do not say:

“This proves a war crime.”

Unless a competent legal body has made that finding or the report is expressly quoting a formal legal conclusion.

Say instead:

“The available facts raise a serious war-crimes risk requiring investigation.”

Do not say:

“This was genocide.”

Unless describing a competent legal finding or carefully identifying the claim as an allegation, legal theory, provisional-measures issue, or risk category.

Say instead:

“The facts alleged in this record have been placed before legal bodies under the Genocide Convention.”

Or:

“This pattern raises genocide-prevention or group-destruction risk questions that require competent legal analysis.”

Do not say:

“This was lawful self-defense.”

Unless applying the relevant legal standards to the facts with adequate evidence and acknowledging the limits.

Say instead:

“Self-defense may be asserted as a justification, but that claim does not remove the need to assess distinction, proportionality, precautions, civilian protection, detention, humanitarian access, and survival conditions.”

Appendix E — Source-to-Reader Audit

Before publishing any section, ask:

- Can the reader identify the claim?
- Can the reader tell whether it is fact, interpretation, legal risk, moral judgment, or prevention claim?
- Is the actor named specifically?
- Is the function named specifically?
- Is the protected condition named specifically?
- Is the evidence visible?
- Is uncertainty disclosed?
- Is the confidence level appropriate?

- Is there an alternative explanation?
 - Is there a falsifier?
 - Is there a correction rule?
 - Does the claim overstate what the evidence supports?
 - Does the claim understate serious civilian harm?
 - Does the claim flatten distinct actors?
 - Does the claim make civilians into symbols rather than persons?
- If the answer to any of these is no, revise before publication.

Appendix F — Revision Log Template

Date	Section	Claim ID	Change Made	Reason	Evidence Trigger	Status
------	---------	----------	-------------	--------	------------------	--------

Appendix G — Future Use Protocol

This framework may be applied to other fractured-authority cases where:

- a state controls borders but not internal administration;
- an armed group governs internally;
- humanitarian actors provide survival services;
- civilians are displaced into compressed areas;
- aid is controlled through chokepoints;
- courts act too slowly for prevention;
- external states fund or arm key actors;
- civilian infrastructure becomes the decisive battlefield;
- formal sovereignty does not match actual control.

The protocol should always be adapted to the specific history, actors, law, and evidence of each case. It should never be copied mechanically.

Appendix H — Source Log: Historical and Legal Baseline

Appendix note: This appendix identifies source anchors for the report’s historical and legal baseline claims. Later appendices cover current-control, humanitarian-condition, casualty, destruction, healthcare, fuel, journalist, medical-worker, and aid-distribution claims. These source IDs are audit anchors, not Bluebook/legal citations.

Source IDs

Source ID	S-001
Source / Institution	Government of Israel / Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Title	Israel's Disengagement Plan: Selected Documents
Use in report	Official Israeli source for the approval and structure of the disengagement plan; use for Israel's own framing of withdrawal/removal of settlements and forces.
Source type	Historical / official state source
Source ID	S-002
Source / Institution	Congressional Research Service
Title	Israel's Disengagement from Gaza
Use in report	Secondary governmental research source for implementation details, including evacuation of settlers/bases/personnel and cancellation of military government.
Source type	Historical / government research
Source ID	S-003
Source / Institution	International Court of Justice
Title	Legal Consequences arising from the Policies and Practices of Israel in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem — Advisory Opinion / Summary, 19 July 2024
Use in report	Legal baseline for the contested continuing-occupation/effective-control question after 2005. Use carefully as advisory-opinion/legal-source anchor, not as a substitute for the report's framework term "condition-control."
Source type	Legal authority
Source ID	S-004
Source / Institution	Central Elections Commission — Palestine
Title	The second 2006 PLC elections: final distribution of PLC seats
Use in report	Official election-result source showing Change and Reform with 74 seats and Fatah with 45 of 132 seats.
Source type	Official electoral record
Source ID	S-005
Source / Institution	UN OCHA oPt
Title	The Gaza Strip: The Humanitarian Impact of the Blockade, July 2015
Use in report	Baseline source for post-2007 blockade/access restrictions, aid dependency, movement restrictions, dual-use restrictions, and crossing constraints.
Source type	UN humanitarian source
Source ID	S-006
Source / Institution	UN OCHA oPt
Title	Gaza crossings: movement of people and goods
Use in report	Continuing data/source page for Gaza movement of people and goods; useful for access-regime chronology and later the current-control and humanitarian-condition source review updates.
Source type	UN data source
Source ID	S-007
Source / Institution	Encyclopaedia Britannica
Title	Gaza Strip
Use in report	General historical baseline source for 1967 occupation, 2005 pullout, 2006 Hamas election victory, 2007 Hamas takeover, PA/West Bank split, and sanctions/blockade context.
Source type	Reference / historical background
Source ID	S-008
Source / Institution	UN Independent International Commission of Inquiry / OHCHR
Title	Detailed findings and related report on attacks carried out on and after 7 October 2023 in Israel

Use in report	Baseline institutional source for October 7 factual/legal findings; use for event framing and legal-risk anchor without converting the report into final adjudication.
Source type	UN investigative/legal source
Source ID	S-009
Source / Institution	Human Rights Watch
Title	October 7 Crimes Against Humanity, War Crimes by Hamas-led Groups
Use in report	Corroborating human-rights source for October 7 attacks, civilian sites, hostage-taking, armed-group participation, and legal-risk language.
Source type	Human-rights source
Source ID	S-010
Source / Institution	Government of Israel / Prime Minister's Office
Title	Statement by PM Netanyahu, 29 November 2023; related official war-objective statements
Use in report	Official Israeli source for stated war objectives: eliminating/dismantling Hamas, returning hostages, and preventing Gaza from posing a future threat.
Source type	Official state source
Source ID	S-011
Source / Institution	U.S. Department of State
Title	Foreign Terrorist Organizations / Hamas designation materials
Use in report	Official U.S. designation anchor for the claim that Hamas is legally designated as a terrorist organization by the United States. Avoid treating designation as a substitute for empirical governance analysis.
Source type	Official state legal/designation source
Source ID	S-012
Source / Institution	Council of the European Union
Title	Sanctions against terrorism / Hamas and Palestinian Islamic Jihad framework
Use in report	EU designation/sanctions anchor. Use to support "designated by several governments/entities," not to decide empirical control.
Source type	Official regional legal/designation source
Source ID	S-013
Source / Institution	International Court of Justice
Title	Application of the Genocide Convention in the Gaza Strip (South Africa v. Israel) — provisional-measures orders and case page
Use in report	Legal-process anchor for claims that facts concerning Gaza have been placed before the ICJ under the Genocide Convention and that provisional measures were ordered. Do not convert provisional measures into a final genocide finding.
Source type	Legal authority
Source ID	S-014
Source / Institution	International Criminal Court
Title	Situation in the State of Palestine — Pre-Trial Chamber I arrest-warrant materials, 21 November 2024
Use in report	Legal-process anchor for ICC warrant/procedural claims. Use "issued warrants / alleged crimes / reasonable grounds" language; do not phrase as final conviction.
Source type	Legal authority
Source ID	S-015/R1
Source / Institution	ICRC Customary IHL Study
Title	Rule 1 — Distinction between civilians and combatants
Use in report	Legal-risk screening anchor for attacks on civilians/civilian protection.
Source type	IHL baseline
Source ID	S-015/R14
Source / Institution	ICRC Customary IHL Study

Title	Rule 14 — Proportionality in attack
Use in report	Legal-risk screening anchor for excessive incidental civilian harm claims.
Source type	IHL baseline
Source ID	S-015/R15
Source / Institution	ICRC Customary IHL Study
Title	Rule 15 — Precautions in attack
Use in report	Legal-risk screening anchor for feasible precautions/civilian-object protection claims.
Source type	IHL baseline
Source ID	S-015/R53
Source / Institution	ICRC Customary IHL Study
Title	Rule 53 — Starvation as a method of warfare
Use in report	Legal-risk screening anchor for starvation/deprivation claims.
Source type	IHL baseline
Source ID	S-015/R55
Source / Institution	ICRC Customary IHL Study
Title	Rule 55 — Humanitarian relief access
Use in report	Legal-risk screening anchor for rapid and unimpeded impartial humanitarian relief, subject to control.
Source type	IHL baseline
Source ID	S-015/R96
Source / Institution	ICRC Customary IHL Study
Title	Rule 96 — Hostage-taking
Use in report	Legal-risk screening anchor for hostage-taking claims.
Source type	IHL baseline

Claim-Source Matrix Update

Claim ID	C-003
Claim	October 7 civilian attacks and hostage-taking
Claim type	Sourced empirical + legal-risk
Source IDs	S-008; S-009; S-015/R1; S-015/R96
Status / caution rule	Active; legal-risk language only unless quoting competent findings.
Claim ID	C-004
Claim	Israel's outer-frame military/territorial/access control after 2005
Claim type	Framework + sourced empirical baseline
Source IDs	S-001; S-002; S-003; S-005; S-006
Status / caution rule	Active; current-control details pending the current-control and humanitarian-condition source review.
Claim ID	C-006
Claim	International legal process
Claim type	Sourced legal-process claim
Source IDs	S-013; S-014
Status / caution rule	Active; must not be phrased as final adjudication.
Claim ID	C-009
Claim	Hamas designation/governance-function distinction
Claim type	Sourced empirical + legal/designation
Source IDs	S-004; S-007; S-011; S-012

Status / caution rule	Active; designation does not erase empirical governance function.
Claim ID	C-021
Claim	2005–2007 historical baseline
Claim type	Sourced empirical
Source IDs	S-001; S-002; S-004; S-005; S-006; S-007
Status / caution rule	New baseline claim group added in the historical and legal baseline source review.
Claim ID	C-022
Claim	IHL screening standards for distinction, proportionality, precautions, starvation, humanitarian access, hostage-taking
Claim type	Method + sourced legal baseline
Source IDs	S-015/R1; R14; R15; R53; R55; R96
Status / caution rule	New legal-standard anchor group; supports risk screening, not final liability.

Appendix I — Source Log: Current Control and Humanitarian Conditions

Appendix note: This appendix identifies source anchors for the current-control and humanitarian-condition claims used in the report. These sources update the report through late May 2026. Because the control map, crossing regime, and humanitarian operating environment are volatile, every “current,” “as of,” or “most recent” claim remains date-bound and corrigible.

Source IDs

Source ID	S-016
Source / Institution	Reuters
Title / Date	Israeli maps outline expanded zone of military control in Gaza (29 Apr 2026)
Use in report	Current-control anchor for Yellow Line/Orange Line, expanded restricted zone, aid-coordination maps, and reported effective Israeli control over roughly two-thirds of Gaza. Use as reported current-control evidence, not as a permanent territorial map.
Source family	www.reuters.com
Source ID	S-017
Source / Institution	Reuters
Title / Date	Netanyahu directs Israeli forces to expand Gaza control to 70 percent (28 May 2026)
Use in report	Current-control anchor for Netanyahu statement, reported 64% effective control, 53% Yellow Line baseline, and directive to expand toward 70%. Use carefully as late-May reporting, not final adjudication.
Source family	www.reuters.com
Source ID	S-018
Source / Institution	Reuters
Title / Date	Hamas tightens grip in Gaza as Trump pushes peace plan (19 Feb 2026)
Use in report	Current Hamas-administrative-capacity anchor: loyalists in government roles, tax collection, salary payment, influence in government offices/security/local authorities. Use with attribution and caution because it relies partly on an Israeli military assessment and Gaza sources.
Source family	www.reuters.com
Source ID	S-019
Source / Institution	Reuters
Title / Date	Hamas seeks role for its police in Gaza ahead of disarmament talks, sources say (27 Jan 2026)
Use in report	Current Hamas police/civil-service anchor: Reuters reports Hamas sought inclusion of roughly 10,000 police and 40,000 civil/security personnel; says Hamas retained control of just under half of Gaza after October ceasefire. Use with attribution.

Source family	www.reuters.com
Source ID	S-020
Source / Institution	OCHA oPt
Title / Date	Humanitarian Situation Report 25 May 2026 (25 May 2026)
Use in report	Current humanitarian operations anchor: Kerem Shalom/Zikim as operational goods entry points, offloading constraints, diesel/fuel distribution, food assistance, WASH, health, shelter, protection, and displacement-site data.
Source family	www.ochaopt.org
Source ID	S-021
Source / Institution	OCHA oPt
Title / Date	Humanitarian Situation Report 1 May 2026 (2 May 2026)
Use in report	Current protected-condition-collapse anchor: displacement, poor shelter, import restrictions, WASH constraints, fuel/lubricating oil/generator/spare-parts constraints, sewage pump failures, aid-worker deaths, service-point status.
Source family	www.ochaopt.org
Source ID	S-022
Source / Institution	OCHA oPt
Title / Date	Humanitarian Situation Report 15 May 2026 (15 May 2026)
Use in report	Current humanitarian-condition anchor: dire shelter/basic-services conditions, casualties since ceasefire as reported by MoH, constraints on spare parts/generators/fuel/engine oil, sewage flooding, long-term rehabilitation burden. Use health/casualty numbers as reported, not independently adjudicated.
Source family	www.ochaopt.org
Source ID	S-023
Source / Institution	UNRWA / ReliefWeb
Title / Date	UNRWA Situation Report #221/#223 on the humanitarian crisis (May 2026)
Use in report	Current Yellow Line/access-to-facilities anchor: UNRWA reports facilities within or affected by Israeli-militarised zones and access subject to Israeli approval/coordination; SitRep #223 reports evacuation/shelter-in-place orders west of the line. Use for operational access constraints.
Source family	reliefweb.int
Source ID	S-024
Source / Institution	Committee to Protect Journalists
Title / Date	Journalist casualties in the Israel-Gaza war (Updated 27 May 2026)
Use in report	Journalist/documentation-risk anchor. CPJ reports at least 263 journalists and media workers killed across Gaza, Yemen, Lebanon, Iran, and Israel since Oct. 7, with detailed Gaza categories and verification cautions. Use CPJ figures as CPJ preliminary investigations.
Source family	cpj.org
Source ID	S-025
Source / Institution	OCHA oPt / WHO-linked Health Cluster reporting
Title / Date	Humanitarian Situation Reports, May 2026 / Health Cluster figures (May 2026)
Use in report	Medical-worker, health-system, and civil-continuity anchor through OCHA reporting on health service points, medicines/diagnostics shortages, medical evacuation, attacks/service disruption, WASH disease risks, and medical-system constraints.
Source family	www.ochaopt.org
Source ID	S-026
Source / Institution	WHO EMRO
Title / Date	oPt Emergency Situation Update, January 2026 (Jan 2026)
Use in report	Civil-record/health-information continuity anchor: WHO reports health-information-system damage affecting routine data collection, disease surveillance, medical records, and life-saving decision-making. Use as background support until a more current primary source is integrated.
Source family	www.emro.who.int

Claim-Source Matrix Update

Claim ID	C-023
Claim	Late-May 2026 Israeli military/restricted-zone control picture
Claim type	Sourced empirical, volatile/current
Source IDs	S-016; S-017; S-023
Status / caution rule	Active; must remain date-bound. Report as “reported effective control/restricted zone,” not a permanent map or final legal status.
Claim ID	C-024
Claim	Yellow Line/Orange Line/access-coordination claims
Claim type	Sourced empirical, volatile/current
Source IDs	S-016; S-017; S-023
Status / caution rule	Active; boundaries are reportedly shifting. Use “so-called Yellow Line,” “restricted zone,” and “access subject to coordination/approval” with date attribution.
Claim ID	C-025
Claim	Hamas remaining/degraded internal administrative, police, taxation, salary, and civil-service functions
Claim type	Sourced empirical, contested/current
Source IDs	S-018; S-019
Status / caution rule	Active; use with attribution. Do not convert into full monopoly governance; do not erase war degradation or Israeli external control.
Claim ID	C-026
Claim	Humanitarian access and crossing constraints
Claim type	Sourced empirical, current
Source IDs	S-020; S-021; S-022
Status / caution rule	Active; distinguish entry/offloading/collection/delivery and UN-tracked from other aid channels.
Claim ID	C-027
Claim	Fuel, engine oil, generator, vehicle, and spare-parts constraints affecting aid, hospitals, WASH, debris removal, and mobility
Claim type	Sourced empirical, current
Source IDs	S-020; S-021; S-022; S-025
Status / caution rule	Active; strong protected-condition anchor.
Claim ID	C-028
Claim	WASH collapse/degradation: water access, sewage pumping, landfill access, pest/rodent/public-health risk
Claim type	Sourced empirical, current
Source IDs	S-020; S-021; S-022
Status / caution rule	Active; use “reported by OCHA/WASH Cluster” where precise numbers are used.
Claim ID	C-029
Claim	Health-system constraints: service-point functionality, medicine/diagnostic shortages, medical evacuation, trauma/rehabilitation burden
Claim type	Sourced empirical, current
Source IDs	S-021; S-022; S-025; S-026
Status / caution rule	Active; use WHO/OCHA numbers with date. Do not treat partial functionality as adequate functionality.
Claim ID	C-030
Claim	Displacement/shelter constraints and confinement to reduced areas
Claim type	Sourced empirical, current
Source IDs	S-020; S-021; S-022; S-023
Status / caution rule	Active; source supports “most people remain displaced” and large displacement-site figures; numbers are estimates and should be dated.

Claim ID	C-031
Claim	Journalist/documentation-risk claim
Claim type	Sourced empirical, current with source-method caveat
Source IDs	S-024
Status / caution rule	Active; use CPJ as CPJ preliminary investigations; separate documentation-risk analysis from final legal findings.

Claim ID	C-032
Claim	Aid-worker/medical-worker/security constraints
Claim type	Sourced empirical, current
Source IDs	S-020; S-021; S-022; S-025
Status / caution rule	Active; use OCHA incident counts/operational effects with date and attribution.

Claim ID	C-033
Claim	Civil-record / medical-record / continuity degradation
Claim type	Sourced empirical background with current-control caution
Source IDs	S-025; S-026
Status / caution rule	Partly active. WHO January 2026 supports health-information-system damage; broader civil-record continuity still needs stronger current sourcing.

Language Rules for Current-Control and Humanitarian-Condition Claims

Use “late May 2026 reported control picture” rather than “current control picture” without date.

Use “reported effective control,” “restricted zone,” “militarised zone,” or “access subject to coordination/approval” rather than treating the Yellow Line or Orange Line as a settled border.

Use “ Hamas retains or contests internal authority where operative” rather than “ Hamas governs Gaza” as a blanket statement.

Use “humanitarian actors report / OCHA reports / WASH Cluster reports / CPJ preliminary investigations show” for precise current figures.

Do not convert crossing/offloading/entry figures into a full account of total aid unless distinguishing UN-tracked, bilateral, commercial, and private channels.

Do not convert reported casualty numbers, journalist-killing figures, health-care-attack records, or medical-service figures into final legal findings.

Appendix J — Source Log: Casualty, Damage, Healthcare, Documentation, and Continuity Claims

Appendix note: This appendix identifies source anchors for casualty, destruction, attacks-on-healthcare, journalist/medical-worker, civil-record, property-record, family-tracing, body-recovery, and satellite-damage claims. These anchors are evidence families, not final legal findings. Numbers remain date-bound, attributed, and corrigible.

Source IDs

Source ID	S-027
Source / Institution	OCHA oPt
Title / Date	Humanitarian Situation Report 25 May 2026 (25 May 2026)
Use in report	Casualty and body-retrieval anchor for late-May 2026: MoH-reported deaths, injuries, retrieved bodies, and ceasefire-period tolls. Use as OCHA-reported MoH data, not independently adjudicated final totals.
Source family	www.ochaopt.org
Source ID	S-028
Source / Institution	Reuters / UN Human Rights Office reporting
Title / Date	UN raises alarm over Israel's killings of Gazans near armistice line (27 May 2026)
Use in report	Current casualty-pattern and yellow-line harm anchor. Use for OHCHR/Reuters-reported verified killings near the so-called Yellow Line and legal-risk concerns; do not treat Reuters/OHCHR reporting as court findings.
Source family	www.reuters.com
Source ID	S-029
Source / Institution	UNOSAT / UNITAR
Title / Date	Gaza Strip Comprehensive Damage Assessment (31 Oct 2025)
Use in report	Satellite-damage anchor. UNOSAT reports, as of 11 Oct 2025 imagery, approximately 81% of structures damaged, with destroyed/severely/moderately/possibly damaged categories. Use as satellite-derived structural damage, not a full habitability or legal-causation finding.
Source family	unosat.org
Source ID	S-030
Source / Institution	World Bank / United Nations / European Union
Title / Date	Rapid Damage and Needs Assessment, Gaza Strip (20 Apr 2026)
Use in report	Damage, loss, reconstruction, housing, health, education, displacement, HLP/property-rights and recovery-planning anchor. Use as technical assessment requiring follow-up ground verification, not as a court finding.
Source family	thedocs.worldbank.org
Source ID	S-031
Source / Institution	WHO EMRO / SSA
Title / Date	Attacks on health care in the Gaza Strip, 1 Jan 2026 - 30 Apr 2026 (30 Apr 2026)
Use in report	Attacks-on-healthcare anchor: 22 attacks, 5 killed, 18 injured, health transport/facilities affected, and partial functionality figures. Use under WHO SSA methodology and verification limits.
Source family	www.emro.who.int
Source ID	S-032
Source / Institution	WHO EMRO / EMT Coordination
Title / Date	Emergency Medical Teams in Gaza, January-April 2026 (Apr 2026)
Use in report	Health-system and medical-workforce anchor: MoH-reported over 72,000 deaths and 172,000 injuries by March 2026; 19/36 hospitals and 114/212 PHCs partially functional; all hospitals and 176 health facilities damaged; 44% essential medicines at zero stock; EMT services and key asks.
Source family	www.emro.who.int
Source ID	S-033
Source / Institution	ICRC
Title / Date	Protected persons: Missing persons (ICRC law/policy page)
Use in report	Missing-persons, family-tracing, death-registration, detainee-record, burial-record and human-remains obligations anchor. Use for legal/humanitarian duty framing, not Gaza-specific numbers.
Source family	www.icrc.org
Source ID	S-034
Source / Institution	ICRC
Title / Date	The issue of the missing must be first and foremost humanitarian (11 Jun 2019)

Use in report	General humanitarian/forensic anchor: parties should search for missing persons, manage the dead systematically and respectfully, prevent family separation, register detainees, and support families. Use for method and duty framing.
Source family	www.icrc.org
Source ID	S-035
Source / Institution	Wired / Palestine Reporting Lab / ISEP discussion
Title / Date	What Happens When You Can't Get a Death Certificate in Gaza (23 Mar 2026)
Use in report	Civil-record and death-certificate continuity anchor. Use cautiously as high-quality journalism describing legal/documentation problems and ISEP survey estimates; not a primary official count.
Source family	www.wired.com
Source ID	S-036
Source / Institution	Every Casualty Counts
Title / Date	Opening the Black Box: Fresh Insights into the Casualty Recording System of the Gaza Ministry of Health (29 Aug 2024)
Use in report	Casualty-methodology anchor: explains deterioration of ordinary MoH casualty recording, public-relations/media-staff headcounts, judicial verification, photography of remains, and limits of the data. Use to separate source-process questions from legal conclusions.
Source family	everycasualty.org
Source ID	S-037
Source / Institution	The Lancet Global Health
Title / Date	Violent and non-violent death tolls for the Gaza conflict (2026)
Use in report	Independent mortality-estimation anchor. Use as peer-reviewed estimate family for possible undercount and uncertainty intervals; do not merge directly with MoH/OCHA reported totals without explaining methods and date range.
Source family	www.thelancet.com
Source ID	S-038
Source / Institution	Reuters
Title / Date	Gaza death toll tops 70,000, health ministry says (29 Nov 2025)
Use in report	Casualty cross-check and methodology anchor: Reuters reports MoH confirmed toll passing 70,000, Israel questioning accuracy while not publishing its own estimate, rubble-body identifications, and UN credibility treatment. Use for source-conflict handling.
Source family	www.reuters.com

Claim-Source Matrix Update

Claim ID	C-034
Claim	Late-May 2026 casualty and body-retrieval figures
Claim type	Sourced empirical, reported-count
Source IDs	S-027; S-032; S-038
Status / caution rule	Active with attribution. Use "OCHA reports MoH data" or "MoH-reported." Do not state as final verified total. Keep date and reporting window.
Claim ID	C-035
Claim	Casualty-data reliability and undercount/uncertainty
Claim type	Method/source-quality claim + sourced empirical
Source IDs	S-036; S-037; S-038
Status / caution rule	Active. Separate MoH/OCHA reported counts from independent estimates and from hostile-source critiques. Do not reconcile into a single master number without a dedicated mortality appendix.
Claim ID	C-036
Claim	Yellow Line / boundary-adjacent killing pattern
Claim type	Sourced empirical + legal-risk screening
Source IDs	S-028

Status / caution rule	Active and date-bound. Use "OHCHR/Reuters reported" and "legal-risk concern," not final war-crime finding unless quoting the source.
Claim ID	C-037
Claim	Satellite-derived structural damage
Claim type	Sourced empirical, technical assessment
Source IDs	S-029
Status / caution rule	Active. Use UNOSAT categories and date of imagery. Do not treat structural damage as equivalent to habitability, cause attribution for every structure, or legal liability.
Claim ID	C-038
Claim	RDNA physical damages, housing damage, recovery/reconstruction needs, HLP/property-rights prerequisites
Claim type	Sourced empirical/technical assessment
Source IDs	S-030
Status / caution rule	Active. Use as technical planning source validated by World Bank/UN/EU; note RDNA calls for further ground sectoral assessment.
Claim ID	C-039
Claim	Attacks on healthcare and medical-service disruption
Claim type	Sourced empirical, WHO SSA/HeRAMS/EMT
Source IDs	S-031; S-032
Status / caution rule	Active. Use WHO/SSA figures by date and methodology. Do not treat all attacks as legally adjudicated unlawful attacks without additional investigation.
Claim ID	C-040
Claim	Journalist/documentation-risk claim
Claim type	Sourced empirical, source-method caveat
Source IDs	S-024
Status / caution rule	Active. CPJ figures remain CPJ preliminary investigations. Separate targeted-killing allegations from final legal findings.
Claim ID	C-041
Claim	Missing persons, family tracing, detainee/death records, body recovery, and dignified management of remains
Claim type	Framework + sourced legal/humanitarian duty
Source IDs	S-033; S-034; S-035
Status / caution rule	Active for duty/continuity framing. Gaza-specific counts remain partial and should be kept as reported by source family.
Claim ID	C-042
Claim	Civil-record/death-certificate disruption and legal gray-zone consequences for families
Claim type	Sourced empirical, journalism + survey-based
Source IDs	S-035; S-033; S-034
Status / caution rule	Partly active. Use cautiously. Strong enough to anchor the issue; not strong enough to quantify all Gaza civil-record disruption without further primary sources.
Claim ID	C-043
Claim	Property-record / housing-land-property-rights continuity
Claim type	Sourced empirical/planning principle
Source IDs	S-030
Status / caution rule	Partly active. RDNA supports HLP/property rights as reconstruction prerequisites; exact land-record damage still needs stronger primary or technical sourcing.

Source-Quality Ranking by Claim Group

Claim group	Best source family	Quality rank	Caution rule
Casualty totals	OCHA-reported MoH figures; WHO/Health Cluster references; Reuters cross-checks	B for reported counts; A only for the existence of the report; not A for final total	Keep “reported,” date-bound, and method-specific. Do not collapse reported counts, independent estimates, and legal conclusions.
Casualty undercount / methodology	Every Casualty Counts; Lancet Global Health; Reuters source-conflict notes	B to A-minus depending on claim; peer-reviewed estimates carry strong method value but limited date range	Use for uncertainty, not for replacing all reported figures with one number.
Structural damage	UNOSAT satellite assessment; RDNA	A-minus for satellite-detected structure categories; B for broader social/economic loss estimates	Use categories exactly; avoid cause-specific or legal-liability overclaim.
Attacks on healthcare	WHO SSA / WHO EMRO infographic; WHO EMT and HeRAMS products	A-minus for WHO-published verified/operational figures; B for functionality interpretation	Use WHO verification limits. Legal-risk screen only unless competent adjudication exists.
Journalist/documentation risk	CPJ tracker	B	CPJ figures are preliminary investigations and should remain attributed.
Missing persons/body recovery/family tracing	ICRC law/policy and humanitarian statements; targeted journalism/survey reporting	A for general IHL/humanitarian duty; B/C for Gaza-specific estimates unless primary verified	Separate duty framework from Gaza-specific numerical claims.
Civil/property records	RDNA HLP principle; Wired/ISEP reporting; ICRC missing/dead records duties	B for issue existence; C/B for quantitative scope	Anchor issue, but keep exact scale pending stronger official/technical sources.

Language Rules for Casualty, Damage, Healthcare, Documentation, and Continuity Claims

Use “reported casualty toll,” “MoH-reported,” “OCHA-reported MoH data,” or “peer-reviewed estimate” depending on source family. Do not write a single unqualified casualty number.

Use “satellite-detected structural damage” for UNOSAT, not “all homes destroyed” or “legally proven destruction.”

Use “WHO recorded/verified attacks on health care” with date range and methodology caveat; do not convert every recorded attack into a final unlawful-attack finding.

Use “CPJ preliminary investigations” for journalist figures.

Use “civil-record/death-certificate disruption” as a documented continuity issue, but keep its total scale pending additional primary sourcing.

Use “housing, land, and property rights are prerequisites for reconstruction” from RDNA; do not yet claim a fully sourced map of property-record destruction.

Use “family tracing, body recovery, and dignified management of remains” as ICRC-supported duties and continuity concerns; Gaza-specific counts require source attribution.

Appendix K — Legal-Risk Language Rules

Appendix note: This appendix states the report’s legal-risk language rules. The purpose is not to weaken the report. The purpose is to prevent legal overclaim by keeping allegation, sourced empirical claim, legal-risk classification, formal procedural action, moral judgment, and final legal conclusion separate.

Governing Rule

A claim may describe a formal action by a competent legal body when the source is the legal body itself or a reliable report of that formal action.

A claim may identify legal-risk categories when the facts are sourced but not finally adjudicated.

A claim may state an IHL rule as a rule, but must not convert a rule plus reported facts into a final legal finding unless a competent body has done so.

A claim may preserve moral clarity, including civilian-protection rules, without pretending that every legal classification has been adjudicated.

A claim must remain date-bound and corrigible when it depends on current control, casualty reporting, health-system data, or humanitarian access conditions.

Legal-Risk Wording Corrections Made

Issue	Previous wording problem	Revised rule / wording	Reason
L4 classification	"strong legal-risk finding pending competent adjudication"	"strong legal-risk assessment pending competent adjudication"	A non-adjudicated classification should not be called a finding.
Hamas exposure language	"other violations" without procedural qualifier	"alleged, documented, or adjudicated violations, depending on the evidence and procedural posture"	Prevents the report from sounding like it has adjudicated every alleged violation.
Hostage language	"unlawfully held" as a direct declarative phrase by the report	"falls within the report's hostage-taking and unlawful-detention legal-risk category and must be screened against IHL hostage-taking rules"	Preserves the IHL rule while avoiding overclaim about every individual case record.
Responsibility language	"Israel's responsibility for outer-frame condition-control" as if already fully adjudicated	"condition-control responsibility, prevention duties, or legal-risk exposure where supported by evidence and applicable legal standards"	Keeps responsibility tied to control, evidence, and applicable law.
Closing language	"distinct duties" in the conclusion	"distinct responsibility questions"	Keeps the conclusion from sounding more legally settled than the report itself.
Legal-process language	"competent legal body's action"	"competent legal body's formal action"	Clarifies that a formal procedural act, order, warrant, judgment, or finding is required.
Claim categories	"allegation, legal risk, formal finding, moral judgment, and final legal conclusion"	Adds "sourced empirical claim" and "legal-risk classification"	Aligns the report with the claim-classification method.

Formal Legal Source Anchors for Language Control

Source ID	S-003
Source family	ICJ advisory opinion / legal authority
What it can support	Legal baseline and effective-control/occupation discussion where properly described.
What it cannot support alone	It does not convert the report's condition-control framework into a court judgment on every function.
Required language	"The ICJ advisory opinion states/addresses..." or "legal baseline."
Source ID	S-013
Source family	ICJ South Africa v. Israel
What it can support	The existence of ICJ proceedings, provisional-measures orders, and Genocide Convention procedural posture.
What it cannot support alone	It does not support saying genocide has been finally found by the ICJ.
Required language	"placed before the ICJ," "provisional measures," "Genocide Convention claims," not "ICJ found genocide."

Source ID	S-014
Source family	ICC Palestine situation / warrants
What it can support	The issuance of arrest warrants and procedural allegations/grounds stated by the ICC.
What it cannot support alone	It does not support saying defendants have been convicted.
Required language	“arrest warrants issued,” “alleged crimes,” “reasonable grounds,” not “convicted.”
Source ID	S-015/R1
Source family	ICRC Customary IHL Rule 1
What it can support	Distinction between civilians and combatants as a screening rule.
What it cannot support alone	It does not decide whether a specific attack met the facts of the rule without evidence.
Required language	“raises distinction concerns / must be screened under distinction.”
Source ID	S-015/R14
Source family	ICRC Customary IHL Rule 14
What it can support	Proportionality as a screening rule.
What it cannot support alone	It does not prove a given strike was disproportionate without target, expected advantage, precautions, and civilian-harm evidence.
Required language	“proportionality legal-risk issue,” not “proven disproportionate attack.”
Source ID	S-015/R15
Source family	ICRC Customary IHL Rule 15
What it can support	Precautions in attack as a screening rule.
What it cannot support alone	It does not prove failure of precautions without operational evidence.
Required language	“precautions inquiry / feasible-precautions question.”
Source ID	S-015/R53
Source family	ICRC Customary IHL Rule 53
What it can support	Starvation as a method of warfare as a legal-risk screening category.
What it cannot support alone	It does not prove intent, method, or legal liability from humanitarian deprivation data alone.
Required language	“starvation/deprivation legal-risk question,” unless competent finding exists.
Source ID	S-015/R55
Source family	ICRC Customary IHL Rule 55
What it can support	Humanitarian relief access screening.
What it cannot support alone	It does not resolve every crossing, inspection, convoy, or security dispute alone.
Required language	“humanitarian-access legal-risk issue / relief-access screen.”
Source ID	S-015/R96
Source family	ICRC Customary IHL Rule 96
What it can support	Hostage-taking as an IHL rule and screening category.
What it cannot support alone	It does not substitute for individual identification and evidentiary chain for each detainee/hostage case.
Required language	“hostage-taking legal-risk category / prohibited under IHL.”

Language Rules Going Forward

Rule type	Rule
Use	“reported,” “documented by,” “recorded by,” “verified by,” “alleged before,” “placed before,” “raises legal-risk questions,” “requires investigation,” “screened under IHL,” and “formal legal action.”
Avoid unless sourced to competent finding	“proved,” “found guilty,” “war crime,” “genocide,” “crime against humanity,” “unlawful attack,” “deliberate starvation,” “collective punishment,” and “occupation status resolved.”
Safe moral floor	The report may still say civilians are civilians, hostages are not bargaining instruments, attacks on civilians are not justified by political claims, and civilian protection is not conditional on sympathy.
Safe framework floor	The report may still say responsibility should track control as a framework principle, but legal responsibility must remain evidence- and law-dependent.
Current-data caution	Current-control, casualty, aid, health, journalist, medical-worker, civil-record, and property-record claims remain date-bound and corrigible.

Closing-Claim Check

The report may now say: its major historical, current-control, humanitarian-condition, casualty, destruction, healthcare, documentation, and continuity claims have source-family anchors, and its major legal-risk language has been screened to avoid final legal findings unless tied to competent formal action.

The report still may not say: it has completed final legal adjudication, final casualty reconciliation, hostile-source reconciliation, property-record mapping, expert validation, or external validation.

Appendix L — Source Reliability and Adversarial Cross-Check

Appendix note: This appendix records the report’s adversarial source-reliability audit. Its purpose is not to weaken the report. Its purpose is to test whether the report is being carried too heavily by one source family, whether adverse or party-source material changes the claim, and whether any claim needs a stronger attribution rule.

Audit date: 28 May 2026

Executive audit finding

The report survives this hostile-source audit, but only if its strongest claims remain carefully classified. The stable historical/legal baseline is source-secure. The current-control and humanitarian-condition claims are source-supported but volatile, contested, and date-bound. Casualty, damage, health-care, journalist, body-recovery, civil-record, and property-record claims are strong enough to carry issue identification and legal-risk screening, but not final legal adjudication.

The main correction is not substantive reversal. The correction is evidentiary humility: party sources, UN operational sources, news reporting, human-rights investigations, satellite assessments, and court records each answer different questions. None should be allowed to carry more than its method can support.

Method used for this audit

- Identify the report’s load-bearing claim families already anchored in the source log and claim-source matrix.

- For each claim family, ask whether an adverse, party, or differently situated source family would materially alter the claim.
- Distinguish what a source can prove from what it merely reports, alleges, estimates, maps, verifies, announces, or contests.
- Classify the claim as preserved, preserved with tighter language, downgraded, deferred, or not carried forward.
- Update the report's caution rules before publication or circulation.

Hostile-source cross-check table

Claim family	2005–2007 baseline
Primary anchors	S-001–S-007
Hostile/adverse check	Israeli government/CRS/CEC/OCHA/reference sources are not all ideologically aligned.
Audit result	Preserved.
Required language rule	Historical baseline may remain in main text.
Claim family	Post-2005 Israeli control / condition-control
Primary anchors	S-001–S-003; S-005–S-006
Hostile/adverse check	Israeli legal/political position contests continuing occupation; ICJ/OCHA emphasize effective-control/access dimensions.
Audit result	Preserved with language discipline.
Required language rule	Use “condition-control” as framework; do not present it as a final occupation-status ruling.
Claim family	October 7 attacks and hostages
Primary anchors	S-008; S-009; S-015/R1; S-015/R96
Hostile/adverse check	Israeli official/IDF accounts, HRW, OHCHR, and IHL rules converge on civilian attacks and hostage-taking risk, though individual case records still vary.
Audit result	Preserved.
Required language rule	Keep strong moral floor; use legal-risk language unless quoting formal legal action.
Claim family	Current Israeli territorial/restricted-zone control
Primary anchors	S-016; S-017; S-023
Hostile/adverse check	Israeli/Netanyahu statements and Reuters reporting support expansion beyond the original Yellow Line, but details remain fluid.
Audit result	Preserved, date-bound.
Required language rule	Say “reported/effective/restricted-zone control as of late May 2026,” not permanent territorial status.
Claim family	Current Hamas administrative capacity
Primary anchors	S-018; S-019; IDF/Israeli assessments
Hostile/adverse check	Israeli sources emphasize Hamas military/terror infrastructure; Reuters and Gaza sources indicate remaining police/civil-service/local authority functions.
Audit result	Preserved with non-monopoly language.
Required language rule	Use “retained or contested administrative capacity,” not “clean Hamas governance monopoly.”
Claim family	Aid entry, crossings, and distribution
Primary anchors	S-020–S-023; COGAT/Israeli claims
Hostile/adverse check	COGAT/Israeli sources say aid is facilitated and sometimes sufficient; OCHA/UN sources report entry, offloading, movement, fuel, and distribution constraints.
Audit result	Preserved with contested-adequacy framing.
Required language rule	Do not say “no aid entered” unless tied to a specific closure period. Do say “reported constraints, bottlenecks, and approval/entry limits.”
Claim family	Fuel, generators, spare parts, WASH, sanitation
Primary anchors	S-020–S-023; S-031–S-032

Hostile/adverse check	Adverse party framing may stress security screening and aid facilitation; OCHA/WHO operational reports still support system-failure constraints.
Audit result	Preserved with attribution.
Required language rule	Tie claim to OCHA/WHO reporting windows and operational consequences.
Claim family	Casualty totals and body recovery
Primary anchors	S-027; S-032; S-036-S-038
Hostile/adverse check	Israeli and hostile-source critiques dispute Gaza MoH figures; Reuters/OCHA/WHO/mortality-method sources support using reported counts with caveats.
Audit result	Preserved but not reconciled.
Required language rule	Use “reported by,” “OCHA reports MoH data,” and “method-dependent.” No single final death total.
Claim family	Structural damage and destruction
Primary anchors	S-029; S-030
Hostile/adverse check	Party sources may contest causation or military necessity; UNOSAT/RDNA support damage detection and recovery planning, not legal causation for each site.
Audit result	Preserved.
Required language rule	Use “satellite-detected structural damage” and RDNA planning language; avoid blanket causation or illegality.
Claim family	Attacks on health care / health functionality
Primary anchors	S-031; S-032
Hostile/adverse check	Israel often states strikes target militants or infrastructure; WHO SSA records attacks on health care and functional impacts.
Audit result	Preserved with legal-risk caution.
Required language rule	Use “WHO recorded/verified attacks,” not “unlawful attacks,” absent competent legal finding.
Claim family	Journalist and documentation risk
Primary anchors	S-024
Hostile/adverse check	Israel disputes targeting claims and may classify some deaths as combat-related; CPJ remains a specialist tracker with preliminary-investigation caveats.
Audit result	Preserved with attribution.
Required language rule	Use CPJ numbers as CPJ figures; separate killed, detained, injured, missing, and targeted-killing allegations.
Claim family	Medical-worker / aid-worker operational risk
Primary anchors	S-020-S-023; S-031-S-032
Hostile/adverse check	Party sources may dispute responsibility for individual incidents; OCHA/WHO support operational risk and service disruption.
Audit result	Preserved with incident-level caution.
Required language rule	Do not infer perpetrator or unlawfulness beyond source wording.
Claim family	Missing persons, family tracing, body recovery
Primary anchors	S-033-S-035
Hostile/adverse check	Strong for humanitarian/legal duty; Gaza-specific scale remains partial and source-limited.
Audit result	Partly preserved.
Required language rule	Keep as protected-condition/duty framework unless stronger Gaza-specific primary data is added.
Claim family	Civil records and death certificates
Primary anchors	S-033-S-035
Hostile/adverse check	Evidence is issue-anchoring but thinner than casualty/damage evidence.
Audit result	Downgraded to cautious issue identification.
Required language rule	Do not quantify total disruption without primary civil-status or technical records.
Claim family	Property records / HLP continuity
Primary anchors	S-030
Hostile/adverse check	RDNA supports HLP as reconstruction prerequisite; exact record damage remains underdeveloped.

Audit result	Partly preserved.
Required language rule	Keep HLP continuity as reconstruction guardrail; defer exact land-record damage.
Claim family	Legal-risk classifications
Primary anchors	S-013-S-015/R96
Hostile/adverse check	Courts and ICRC rules support legal-process and screening categories; they do not adjudicate every event in the report.
Audit result	Preserved.
Required language rule	Maintain the legal-risk language review legal-risk wording rules.

Source-quality audit

Source family	Examples	What it can carry	Limit / required caution
Competent legal bodies	ICJ, ICC	A for procedural posture, orders, warrants, advisory opinions, and formal findings.	Cannot convert pending proceedings, warrants, or provisional measures into final liability findings.
IHL rule sources	ICRC customary IHL study	A for the existence and wording of screening rules.	Cannot decide whether a particular incident satisfies the rule without incident-level evidence.
Official party sources	Government of Israel, IDF, COGAT, Hamas-linked bodies	A for the fact of the party's own statement, claimed policy, or announced action.	C/D for disputed outcome, adequacy, intent, casualty attribution, or legality. Must be labeled as party-source material.
UN operational / technical sources	OCHA, WHO, UNOSAT, UNRWA/ReliefWeb, UNOPS/2720 references	A-/B+ for operational reporting, verified incidents within stated methodology, satellite damage categories, and access/aid/fuel reporting windows.	Not final legal adjudication; may rely on field partners or local authorities for some figures. Keep date and method visible.
RDNA / reconstruction assessments	World Bank, EU, UN technical assessment	A-/B+ for planning-level damage/loss/recovery/HLP needs.	Not a site-by-site legal-causation record and not a final property-title map.
Professional wire/news reporting	Reuters, AP	B+ for independently reported current developments and cross-party claims.	Not primary legal finding; for unnamed-source reporting, keep attribution and date.
Human-rights NGOs / specialist trackers	HRW, CPJ, RSF if added later	B/B+ for documented patterns and specialist casualty/documentation categories.	Often investigative/advocacy posture; use with attribution and corroboration where possible.
Local health/civil authorities via intermediaries	Gaza MoH figures as reported by OCHA/WHO/Reuters	B for reported counts and trend tracking when carried through reputable intermediaries.	Not a final mortality reconciliation; vulnerable to access limits, delayed body recovery, identification changes, and hostile-source critique.
Social media / single-party media	X, Telegram, Facebook, party-affiliated media	D/E except for authenticating that a party made a public statement.	Do not use as sole anchor for load-bearing factual or legal claims.

Audit decisions to carry forward

Preserve: The report's central framework claim: fractured authority under layered power, with condition-control used to explain forms of power that are not clean direct governance.

Preserve with caution: The late-May 2026 current-control picture. It is supported enough to use, but must remain dated, reported, and corrigible.

Preserve with caution: Humanitarian-condition claims. They are supported by UN operational reports, but contested by party-source claims about facilitation, sufficiency, and distribution responsibility.

Downgrade: Civil-record and property-record claims should remain issue-identification claims unless stronger primary or technical evidence is added.

Defer: Final casualty reconciliation, final HLP/property-record mapping, and final incident-level legal attribution.

Reject: Any sentence that treats one source family as proving both factual occurrence and final legal liability.

Public-Facing Source Rules Carried Forward

- In the executive summary, keep the current-control finding date-bound: “as of late May 2026.”
- Where aid, fuel, and crossing constraints are discussed, add the phrase “contested by Israeli/COGAT facilitation and sufficiency claims” once, then resolve through source-quality rules rather than repeating the caveat everywhere.
- Where casualty figures appear in headline prose, add a footnote or parenthetical that identifies the figure as reported-count data and not final mortality reconciliation.
- Keep CPJ and WHO figures attributed to CPJ and WHO; do not turn specialist tracking into a court finding.
- Do not make civil-record/property-record damage central unless a targeted appendix is built with primary civil-status, municipal, cadastral, or technical HLP materials.

Closing-claim check after this audit

Survives: The report may say that its major historical, legal-process, current-control, humanitarian-condition, casualty, damage, health-care, journalist, body-recovery, and continuity claim families have been screened for source-family reliability and hostile/adverse-source vulnerability.

Does not survive: The report may not say that all contested evidence has been reconciled, that Israel’s or Hamas’s legal liability has been adjudicated by the report, that current territorial control is permanent, or that all casualty, civil-record, property-record, and body-recovery numbers have been finally verified.

Appendix M — Citation Method and Closing-Claim Check

Appendix note: The main body uses endnotes for reader-facing citation. Source IDs remain in the source-log appendices as audit identifiers so the claim-source matrix remains traceable.

Citation rule: Narrative claims in the main body now use endnote markers rather than bracketed source IDs. Source-log appendices retain source IDs because they are evidence-management artifacts, not publication prose.

Closing-claim falsifiability check: The closing claim survives only as a framework and prevention principle, not as a final legal finding. The closing claim is stated as: “As a prevention principle, responsibility should track control; as an evidence rule, if the evidence changes, the claim changes.”

Remaining limits: The report may say that its major claim families have been sourced, screened for legal-risk language, and subjected to a hostile-source/source-quality audit. It may not say that it has completed final legal adjudication, casualty reconciliation, property-record mapping, incident-level attribution, expert validation, or final external reader validation.

Part II - Tool Development and Source Refresh

Materials showing how the original case study became a condition-control and answerability method.

Author Purpose and Origin Note

Included source file

gaza_v2_8_1_purpose_and_origin_note.md. Preserves the original public-purpose position and non-replacement claim.

v2.8.1 Purpose and Origin Note

Fractured Authority and Condition-Control in Gaza

Author: Christopher Knorr Version: v2.8.1 Status: Purpose/origin clarification pass Prepared: 2026-06-26

Author's Purpose Note

This project began as my interpretation and framing of Gaza's fractured-authority problem, not as an attempt to invent a new field, replace professional frameworks, or relabel existing tools. My first aim was to contribute responsibly to public discussion: to help people see harm, authority, source posture, and responsibility without collapsing them into slogans or single-actor explanations.

As the work developed, the framing became more method-like. That development was not planned as a claim of novelty. It emerged because the problem required a disciplined way to ask who conditions which protected conditions, through which functions, according to which sources, with what uncertainty, and with what answerability questions left open.

If condition-control has value, its value is practical before it is academic. It may converge with existing legal, humanitarian, logistical, and theoretical frameworks. That convergence should be welcomed, not hidden. The point is not to copy or replace those frameworks, but to make a usable public-facing strategy tool: one that helps readers, advocates, analysts, and affected communities reason more carefully about harm, control, and answerability in situations where ordinary discourse collapses too quickly.

The scholarly contribution, if there is one, is secondary to that purpose. The primary purpose is to help people.

Integration Rule

This note should appear after the abstract and before the contribution section in the reviewer-facing draft.

It changes the paper's framing in three ways:

- It restores the original public-purpose origin of the piece.
- It clarifies that condition-control emerged from interpretive and ethical public reasoning, not from an attempt to replace expert fields.
- It makes the academic contribution secondary to the practical purpose of helping people reason more carefully.

Guardrails Added

Guardrail	Meaning
Public-purpose priority	The work exists first to help people reason about harm, authority, and responsibility more carefully.
Independent convergence	Overlap with existing frameworks is not a defect if acknowledged honestly.
Non-replacement claim	The method is not a substitute for legal, humanitarian, regional, or moral-philosophy expertise.
Practical-before-academic value	Usefulness to public reasoning matters even if the academic novelty claim remains modest.
Anti-relabeling honesty	The paper should openly distinguish convergence, synthesis, translation, and operationalization from invention.

Revised Purpose Sentence

The revised controlling purpose sentence is:

Quoted working language

This paper began as an interpretive contribution to public discussion about Gaza. Its method-like form emerged from the need to reason carefully about harm, control, source posture, and answerability in a fractured-authority setting. Its scholarly contribution, if any, is secondary to its practical purpose: helping people think, speak, and respond more responsibly when ordinary discourse collapses too quickly.

Source Refresh and Citation Completion Pass

Included source file

gaza_v2_9_source_refresh_citation_completion_pass.md. Records the source-refresh and citation-completion discipline.

v2.9 Source Refresh and Citation Completion Pass

Fractured Authority and Condition-Control in Gaza

Author: Christopher Knorr Version: v2.9 Status: Source-refresh working pass / not publication-ready
Prepared: 2026-06-26 Validation status: Internal source refresh only; not external review.

0. Purpose of This Pass

v2.9 updates the source posture of the Gaza paper after the v2.8.1 purpose/origin clarification. This pass does not change the paper’s core argument. It performs four source-discipline tasks:

- Identifies the current source anchors that should support the reviewer-facing draft.
- Marks which factual claims are current, date-bound, stale, or still unresolved.
- Builds a citation map for the compressed draft.
- Prepares a source ledger for later publication or external review.

The key result is:

Quoted working language

The paper can proceed as a source-refreshed working draft, but it is still not publication-ready.

1. Source Posture Rule

The paper must keep these categories separate:

Category	What it can support	What it cannot support
OCHA humanitarian reporting	date-bound humanitarian facts, access constraints, operational conditions	final legal responsibility
WHO medical-evacuation materials	evacuation pathway, actor roles, approvals, coordination limits	final responsibility or legal liability
IPC food-security analysis	food insecurity and malnutrition classification/projection	actor-specific causation unless separately sourced
ICJ materials	procedural posture, provisional measures, advisory opinions	criminal guilt or final merits unless the source says so
ICC materials	warrants, charges, procedural status	conviction or guilt
NGO reports	documented allegations/conclusions under NGO method	binding legal adjudication
Party sources	official claims, denials, stated procedures	neutral fact without corroboration
Press reporting	reported events and attributed claims	binding legal conclusion

2. Current Humanitarian Anchor

Source

OCHA, Humanitarian Situation Report | 26 June 2026.

Use in paper

This should now be the primary current humanitarian anchor for the paper's general Gaza conditions and aid/access context.

Supported claims

The 26 June 2026 OCHA report supports the following working claims:

- Humanitarian conditions remain severe and access-constrained.
- Access-restricted areas in Gaza are a major condition-control issue.
- Humanitarian organizations face coordination procedures and severe access limits.
- The "Yellow Line" and "Orange Line" access-restriction system is directly relevant to condition-control analysis.
- Kerem Shalom remained the only operational cargo crossing for the relevant reporting period.
- OCHA distinguishes offloaded pallets, collected pallets, private-sector truckloads, and UN-confirmed supplies.
- Health services remain constrained by shortages and access restrictions.
- Aid entry must not be treated as identical to civilian receipt.

Citation use

Use this source for:

- current-fact warning;
- access-restricted areas;
- cargo-entry pathway;
- humanitarian access constraints;
- aid-entry versus aid-receipt distinction;
- health-service strain.

Do not use it as a final legal-responsibility source.

3. Medical Evacuation Source Anchors

Source A

WHO EMRO, Medical evacuation of patients from the Gaza Strip.

Supported claims

This source supports:

- Medical evacuation is for severely ill or injured patients needing lifesaving specialized care unavailable in Gaza.

- Treating doctors or specialists at public hospitals initiate referral.
- The Referral Committee reviews, prioritizes, and approves cases.
- WHO supports and coordinates the process.
- WHO's process includes documentation, host-country submission, host-country approval, Israeli security clearance, and coordination with host countries.
- Medical referral does not guarantee evacuation.
- Required approvals include the Referral Committee, host country, Israeli authorities/COGAT for exit and transit, and Egyptian or Jordanian authorities where applicable.
- Minors require companions.
- WHO does not select, prioritize, or approve patients and companions.
- Main challenges include receiving-country offers, corridors through Egypt/Jordan, security/logistical barriers, fuel shortages, crossing closures, and limited daily exit capacity.

Use in paper

This is the principal source for the medical-evacuation pathway table.

Source B

WHO EMRO, Statement on WHO's role in medical evacuation from Gaza via the Rafah crossing to Egypt, 10 April 2026.

Supported claims

This source supports:

- The Palestinian Authority shares prioritized patient lists with Israeli and Egyptian authorities for security clearance.
- Once clearance is granted, the PA shares the cleared list with WHO.
- WHO's role after receiving the cleared list is limited to logistics and medical support.
- WHO coordinates collection points, transport arrangements, preparation of the departure health facility, and transfer to Rafah.
- At Rafah, the PA verifies identities alongside EUBAM before patients cross to the Egyptian side.
- WHO calls for a safe, predictable, enabling operating environment.

Use in paper

Use this source for:

- PA list-sharing;
- Israeli/Egyptian clearance;
- WHO role-limitation;
- PA/EUBAM identity verification;
- Rafah-specific route detail;
- staff/patient safety and operating-environment language.

4. Food Security / Nutrition Anchor

Source

IPC, Gaza Strip: Acute Food Insecurity Situation for 16 October–30 November 2025 and Projection for 1 December 2025–15 April 2026, published 19 December 2025.

IPC, Gaza Strip: Acute Malnutrition Situation for 16 October 2025–15 April 2026 and Projection for 16 April–15 October 2026, published 19 December 2025.

Use in paper

Aid/food is secondary in the v2.8.1 draft, so IPC should not dominate the main body.

Use IPC only to support date-bound food-security and malnutrition claims if retained.

Caution

Do not claim current famine unless a current IPC source supports it. Use date-specific wording.

5. Legal Posture Anchors

ICJ

Use ICJ Case 192, Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide in the Gaza Strip (South Africa v. Israel).

Correct posture:

- provisional measures;
- requests for additional provisional measures;
- no final merits judgment unless a current source says otherwise.

Allowed wording:

Quoted working language

The ICJ has issued provisional-measures orders in South Africa v. Israel.

Avoid:

Quoted working language

The ICJ has found Israel guilty of genocide.

ICC

Use ICC Palestine situation materials and defendant/warrant pages.

Correct posture:

- arrest warrants;
- charges/allegations;
- no conviction.

Allowed wording:

Quoted working language

The ICC issued arrest warrants for named defendants in the Palestine situation.

Avoid:

Quoted working language

The ICC convicted those defendants.

6. Source Refresh Table

Claim in draft	Current source anchor	Status	Repair
Gaza conditions remain access-constrained	OCHA 26 Jun 2026	Current/date-bound	Use latest OCHA; cite reporting period
Access-restricted areas are major condition-control issue	OCHA 26 Jun 2026	Current/date-bound	Cite Yellow/Orange Line section
Kerem Shalom only operational cargo crossing in reporting period	OCHA 26 Jun 2026	Current/date-bound	Phrase as “during the reporting period”
Aid entry is not aid receipt	OCHA 26 Jun 2026 + UN2720 language	Current/date-bound	Distinguish offloaded/collected/confirmed
Medical evacuation requires multiple approvals	WHO medevac page	Current as WHO process page	Use as process source
Referral does not guarantee evacuation	WHO medevac page	Current as WHO process page	Keep in medical evacuation section
WHO does not prioritize patients	WHO medevac page + WHO Apr 2026 statement	Current as WHO claim	Use as WHO-stated process
PA shares lists with Israeli/Egyptian authorities	WHO Apr 2026 statement	Date-bound/Rafah-specific	Use route/date-specific wording
PA/EUBAM identity verification at Rafah	WHO Apr 2026 statement	Date-bound/Rafah-specific	Use route/date-specific wording
Food-security conditions	IPC Dec 2025	Date-bound; secondary	Use only if retained
ICJ legal status	ICJ Case 192	Procedure-specific	Use provisional-measures language
ICC legal status	ICC Palestine situation	Procedure-specific	Use warrant/allegation language

7. Citation Map for v2.8.1 Draft

Draft section	Needed source(s)	Citation status
Abstract	no citations unless final format requires	No footnotes needed in abstract
Contribution	method claim; no external factual source required	No citation needed
Fractured Authority	OCHA 26 Jun; WHO; legal anchors	Needs footnotes
Medical Evacuation	WHO medevac page; WHO Apr 2026 statement; OCHA 19/26 Jun; Reuters/AP if retained	Needs footnotes
Aid Access	OCHA 26 Jun; UN2720 mechanism if used	Needs footnotes
Legal Posture	ICJ; ICC; UN Commission/NGO sources if retained	Needs footnotes
Actor Discipline	HRW/Amnesty/other sources if specific Hamas claims retained	Needs footnotes
Findings	source-dependent only where factual	Minimal citations
Limitations	no citations required	No citation needed

8. Revised Source Note for Draft

Replace the current Appendix C source note with:

Quoted working language

This draft uses OCHA’s 26 June 2026 Humanitarian Situation Report as its current humanitarian anchor; WHO EMRO medical-evacuation materials as its medical-evacuation pathway anchor; IPC December 2025 reports as secondary food-security and malnutrition anchors; ICJ Case 192 materials for provisional-measures posture; and ICC Palestine situation materials for arrest-warrant posture. All current facts are date-bound. Before external circulation, each factual claim should be checked against the latest OCHA, WHO, IPC, ICJ, ICC, and relevant primary/party sources.

9. Publication Warning

Do not circulate as publication-ready.

The draft can be circulated only as:

Quoted working language

working draft / source-refresh pending / use-test request

unless the following are completed:

- current OCHA check;
- current WHO medical-evacuation check;
- route/date-specific Rafah/Israeli/Egyptian role check;
- current legal docket check;
- NGO/party-source status check;
- full footnote pass;

- external reviewer use-test.

10. v2.9 Verdict

PASS AS SOURCE-REFRESHED WORKING DRAFT / HOLD AS PUBLICATION-READY

The source framework is now cleaner. The next move should be:

Quoted working language

v3.0 Reviewer-Ready Source-Annotated Draft

That draft should integrate the source ledger into the compressed draft and preserve the public-purpose note.

Source Ledger

Included source file

gaza_v2_9_source_ledger.md. Compact ledger for humanitarian, medical-evacuation, legal, and food-security source anchors.

v2.9 Source Ledger

Current Core Sources

ID	Source	Date	Type	Use	Posture
OCHA-2026-06-26	OCHA oPt, Humanitarian Situation Report	26 Jun 2026	UN humanitarian report	current Gaza humanitarian/access anchor	date-bound humanitarian reporting
OCHA-2026-06-19	OCHA oPt, Humanitarian Situation Report	19 Jun 2026	UN humanitarian report	prior current anchor; useful for continuity	date-bound humanitarian reporting
WHO-MEDEVAC-QA	WHO EMRO, Medical evacuation of patients from Gaza Strip	current page accessed 26 Jun 2026	WHO process page	medical evacuation pathway and approvals	WHO-stated process
WHO-RAFAH-2026-04-10	WHO EMRO, Statement on WHO's role in medical evacuation via Rafah	10 Apr 2026	WHO statement	Rafah-specific PA/WHO/EUBAM/clearance roles	route/date-specific WHO statement
IPC-AFI-2025-12-19	IPC Gaza acute food insecurity analysis	19 Dec 2025	IPC food-security classification	secondary aid/food context	date-bound classification/projection
IPC-AMN-2025-12-19	IPC Gaza acute malnutrition analysis	19 Dec 2025	IPC malnutrition classification	nutrition context if retained	date-bound classification/projection
ICJ-CASE-192	ICJ, South Africa v. Israel	ongoing	International Court of Justice case page	procedural/legal posture	provisional measures / no final merits unless updated
ICC-PALESTINE	ICC Situation in the State of Palestine	ongoing	International Criminal Court situation page	warrants/procedural status	arrest warrants / no conviction

Current URL Set

- OCHA 26 June 2026: <https://www.ochaopt.org/content/humanitarian-situation-report-26-june-2026>
- OCHA publications page: <https://www.ochaopt.org/publications/humanitarian-situation-update>
- WHO medical evacuation page: <https://www.emro.who.int/opt/information-resources/medical-evacuation-of-patients-from-the-gaza-strip.html>
- WHO Rafah statement: <https://www.emro.who.int/opt/news/statement-on-whos-role-in-medical-evacuation-from-gaza-via-the-rafah-crossing-to-egypt.html>
- IPC acute food insecurity: <https://www.ipcinfo.org/ipc-country-analysis/details-map/en/c/1159820/>
- IPC acute malnutrition: <https://www.ipcinfo.org/ipc-country-analysis/details-map/en/c/1159821/>
- ICJ Case 192: <https://www.icj-cij.org/case/192>
- ICC Palestine situation: <https://www.icc-cpi.int/palestine>

Ledger Rules

- Prefer primary institutional sources for process and legal posture.
- Mark every source by date.
- Treat party sources as party sources.

- Treat NGO reports as NGO findings, not legal judgments.
- Treat court warrants, orders, and advisory opinions according to their procedural posture.
- Do not convert humanitarian facts into legal conclusions.
- Do not convert actor-control into responsibility without passing the answerability gates.

Citation Completion Map

Included source file

gaza_v2_9_citation_completion_map.md. Maps claims to source anchors and warns against unsafe wording.

v2.9 Citation Completion Map

Footnote Placement Plan

Draft location	Claim	Citation anchor
Fractured Authority	Gaza access restrictions and restricted areas	OCHA-2026-06-26
Fractured Authority	aid workers face access/coordination restrictions	OCHA-2026-06-26
Medical Evacuation	patients need specialized care unavailable in Gaza	WHO-MEDEVAC-QA
Medical Evacuation	treating doctor/specialist initiates referral	WHO-MEDEVAC-QA
Medical Evacuation	Referral Committee prioritizes	WHO-MEDEVAC-QA
Medical Evacuation	referral does not guarantee evacuation	WHO-MEDEVAC-QA
Medical Evacuation	official approvals include Referral Committee, host country, COGAT/Israeli authorities, Egypt/Jordan where applicable	WHO-MEDEVAC-QA
Medical Evacuation	PA shares prioritized list with Israeli/Egyptian authorities	WHO-RAFAH-2026-04-10
Medical Evacuation	WHO role limited after cleared list	WHO-RAFAH-2026-04-10
Medical Evacuation	PA/EUBAM identity verification at Rafah	WHO-RAFAH-2026-04-10
Aid Access	Kerem Shalom only operational cargo crossing for reporting period	OCHA-2026-06-26
Aid Access	UN can only confirm UN2720-tracked supplies	OCHA-2026-06-26
Food Security, if retained	acute food insecurity projection	IPC-AFI-2025-12-19
Malnutrition, if retained	acute malnutrition projection through Oct 2026	IPC-AMN-2025-12-19
Legal Posture	ICJ provisional-measures posture	ICJ-CASE-192
Legal Posture	ICC arrest-warrant posture	ICC-PALESTINE

High-Risk Claims to Avoid or Rewrite

Unsafe wording	Safer wording
"The ICJ found Israel guilty..."	"The ICJ issued provisional-measures orders..."
"The ICC convicted..."	"The ICC issued arrest warrants..."
"Aid entered Gaza, therefore civilians received aid."	"OCHA reported offloaded and collected supplies; civilian receipt requires separate pathway evidence."
"WHO controls evacuation."	"WHO supports and coordinates the process but states that it does not select, approve, or prioritize patients."
"Referral means evacuation."	"WHO states that referral initiates the process but does not guarantee evacuation."
"Crossing open means treatment obtained."	"Crossing access is one link; actual treatment abroad is a separate link."
"Control creates obligation."	"Control raises an answerability question that must pass further gates."

Source-Gap Flags

- Current medical-evacuation numbers after 8 April 2026 require latest WHO/OCHA check.
- Route-specific Israeli/Egyptian role requires source-specific wording.
- Rafah claims should be marked as Rafah-specific and date-specific.
- Food-security claims should use latest IPC and avoid current-famine wording unless a current IPC classification supports it.
- Legal posture must be rechecked immediately before publication.

Final Pre-Dispatch Repair Draft

Included source file

fractured_authority_condition_control_gaza_v3_2_final_pre_dispatch_repair_draft.md. Later compressed source-annotated version developed from the original case study.

Fractured Authority and Condition-Control in Gaza

An Answerability Method for Protected-Condition Harm in Fractured-Authority Settings

Author: Christopher Knorr Version: v3.2 Final Pre-Dispatch Repair Draft Status: Final pre-dispatch working draft / source annotated / not externally validated Prepared: 2026-06-26 Publication status: Not publication-ready Current-fact warning: Gaza facts are date-bound. This version uses the latest source anchors verified during this pass; source status must be checked again before circulation or publication.

Source Correction Note

The v2.9 source pass treated an OCHA 26 June 2026 Humanitarian Situation Report as the current humanitarian anchor. During this v3.0 source check, the 26 June URL did not resolve to usable report text. The latest OCHA humanitarian situation report verified in this pass is OCHA, Humanitarian Situation Report | 19 June 2026, published 20 June 2026. This v3.0 draft therefore uses OCHA 19 June 2026 as the current humanitarian anchor until a later OCHA 26 June report is verified.

Abstract

This paper develops condition-control as a contribution candidate: a source-postured answerability method for fractured-authority settings. It does not claim conceptual novelty. Existing frameworks already examine retained control, infrastructure, chokepoints, humanitarian access, legal obligation, and conditions of life. The narrower claim is practical: condition-control helps map partial, overlapping control over protected conditions without collapsing actors, sources, legal posture, causation, answerability, or responsibility. Gaza is used as a worked case because authority is fractured across state, armed-group, regional, humanitarian, legal, and civilian actors. The primary test is medical evacuation: why referral for treatment unavailable inside Gaza does not necessarily become actual treatment outside Gaza. The rule is simple: a map is not a verdict. Condition-control can raise answerability; it does not automatically generate obligation.

Author's Purpose Note

This project began as my interpretation and framing of Gaza's fractured-authority problem, not as an attempt to invent a new field, replace professional frameworks, or relabel existing tools. My first aim was to contribute responsibly to public discussion: to help people see harm, authority, source posture, and responsibility without collapsing them into slogans or single-actor explanations.

As the work developed, the framing became more method-like. That development was not planned as a claim of novelty. It emerged because the problem required a disciplined way to ask who conditions which

protected conditions, through which functions, according to which sources, with what uncertainty, and with what answerability questions left open.

If condition-control has value, its value is practical before it is academic. It may converge with existing legal, humanitarian, logistical, and theoretical frameworks. That convergence should be welcomed, not hidden. The point is not to copy or replace those frameworks, but to make a usable public-facing strategy tool: one that helps readers, advocates, analysts, and affected communities reason more carefully about harm, control, and answerability in situations where ordinary discourse collapses too quickly.

The scholarly contribution, if there is one, is secondary to that purpose. The primary purpose is to help people.

1. Contribution

Condition-control asks:

Quoted working language

Which actor controls which protected condition, through which function, according to which source, on what date, with what contestation, producing which harm pathway, under what legal posture, leaving what answerability question?

Its discipline is:

Quoted working language

Control is analyzed by function. Harm is traced by pathway. Actors are disaggregated. Legal claims are posture-controlled. Secondary sources are audited, not adopted.

The contribution is not a new theory of power. It is public-use discipline: a repeatable way to prevent complex cases from collapsing into single-actor, single-source, single-verdict accounts.

Its most defensible value is for public-facing reasoning and cross-domain review: it gives readers, advocates, reviewers, and affected communities a disciplined way to see where professional legal, humanitarian, logistical, regional, and moral analyses need to be connected without being collapsed.

The paper succeeds only if condition-control produces a more discriminating attribution and answerability-question structure than a steelmanned rival frame. If it does not, the paper should narrow to an applied audit protocol.

2. No-Displacement Rule

Condition-control does not replace functional occupation, international humanitarian law, human-rights law, humanitarian logistics, public-health analysis, regional expertise, or moral philosophy.

Quoted working language

Where a specialized doctrine or field already answers a question, condition-control should not replace it. It should clarify the factual, source, actor, condition, and posture map that such doctrines or fields use.

Functional occupation is the principal legal rival. It already asks whether retained control over particular functions can sustain legal obligations after withdrawal. Condition-control does not claim superiority at that legal question. It supplies a broader pre-legal and cross-actor audit map.

Condition-control should therefore be read as a pre-legal and cross-actor audit map that may assist functional occupation analysis, not as a competing doctrine.

3. Fractured Authority and False Symmetry

Gaza’s strongest proof terrain is multi-actor fracture, not withdrawal alone.

OCHA’s 19 June 2026 report describes civilians in Gaza as facing insecurity, prolonged and new displacement, and lack of access to essential services or minimum standards of living. It also reports further expansion of the “Yellow Line,” access restrictions by Israeli forces, fuel shortages affecting humanitarian response, shortages in health items, Kerem Shalom as the only entry point for humanitarian and commercial cargo during the 1–15 June reporting period, and the UN’s limitation that it can only confirm supplies tracked by the UN 2720 mechanism.[^OCHA-2026-06-19]

Actor / institution	Possible role in condition-control analysis
Israel / IDF / COGAT	Crossings, military access, aid/fuel approval, evacuation conditions
Hamas authorities	Internal governance, coercion, armed conduct, hostage-taking, local order
Other armed groups	Armed conduct and civilian-risk conduct
Egypt	Rafah-related crossing and evacuation functions
UN / WHO / OCHA / aid actors	Coordination and service delivery under constraint
Donors / international actors	Funding, diplomacy, reconstruction, ceasefire conditions
ICJ / ICC / UN Commission	Legal classification, orders, warrants, investigations, not administration
Palestinian civilians	Real agency under severe material and security constraint

Mapping multiple actors does not imply equal power, equal responsibility, equal causation, equal legal status, or equal moral weight.

Quoted working language

Multi-actor mapping clarifies distribution of functions; it does not flatten asymmetries of power.

4. Map-Not-Verdict and Answerability Gates

A condition-control map is not a responsibility verdict. It raises an answerability question.

A harm relevant to condition-control is:

Quoted working language

an impairment of a protected condition that materially reduces the practical possibility of survival, bodily integrity, medical care, movement, communication, family continuity, civic life, agency, repair, or lawful self-determination.

The bridge from mapping to normativity is not a ladder. It is a set of gates.

Gate	Question	Output range
Harm	Is a protected condition impaired?	yes / no / contested / HOLD
Significance	Does it affect survival, agency, care, movement, continuity, or repair?	significant / minor / contested / HOLD
Actor-control	Did a named actor condition the link?	yes / partial / contested / no
Causation	Did the actor materially contribute?	established / contested / overdetermined / no
Foreseeability	Was the harm foreseeable?	yes / no / contested
Capacity	Could the actor prevent, mitigate, disclose, justify, cooperate, or repair?	yes / partial / impossible / contested
Duty/role	Was there a legal, institutional, humanitarian, relational, or legitimacy-based role?	established / disputed / absent / HOLD
Defeater	Are there competing duties, necessity, impossibility, security, or causal defeaters?	none / alleged / plausible / defeats
Response mode	What response may be owed if grounds are satisfied?	disclose / justify / cease / facilitate / protect / mitigate / investigate / repair / cooperate / HOLD
Posture	What is the conclusion status?	question raised / prima facie / contested / separately established / HOLD

Control without fault does not automatically create responsibility. Condition-control accepts that objection. It identifies where fault, duty, justification, capacity, and response questions must be tested.

This paper does not develop a full theory of obligation. Any stronger claim about legal, moral, political, or institutional duty would require a separate argument or adjudicative source.

5. Method

Step	Question
1	Which protected condition is affected?
2	Which actor is involved?
3	What function is controlled?
4	What is the mechanism?
5	What source supports the claim?
6	What is the date?
7	What is contested?
8	What harm pathway follows?
9	What legal posture applies?
10	What answerability question arises?
11	What gate status applies?
12	What response mode may become relevant if grounds are satisfied?

HOLD is not failure. HOLD is discipline.

6. Primary Test: Medical Evacuation

The test question is:

Quoted working language

Why does referral for treatment unavailable inside Gaza not necessarily become actual treatment outside Gaza?

Medical evacuation is a strong test because different actors may condition different links.

WHO states that severely ill or injured patients needing lifesaving specialized care unavailable in Gaza can be evacuated abroad; only a treating doctor or specialist at a public hospital can refer a patient to the Referral Committee; the Referral Committee reviews, prioritizes, and approves cases; WHO supports and coordinates the process; and a referral form initiates the process but does not guarantee evacuation.[^WHO-MEDEVAC]

WHO also states that official approval is required from the Referral Committee, the host country, Israeli authorities/COGAT for exit and transit permissions, and Egyptian or Jordanian authorities if the evacuation is to or through those countries.[^WHO-MEDEVAC] In its April 2026 Rafah statement, WHO states that its role in MoH-led medical evacuations is supportive and limited to coordination and logistical support, that WHO has no influence over prioritization, that the Palestinian Authority shares prioritized lists with Israeli and Egyptian authorities for security clearance, and that PA/EUBAM identity verification occurs at Rafah before patients cross to the Egyptian side.[^WHO-RAFAH-2026-04-10]

A humanitarian logistics frame may identify the pathway and bottlenecks. Functional occupation may ask whether retained control over border access, exit permissions, security clearance, movement restrictions, or goods/fuel-entry systems creates legal obligations.

Condition-control asks:

Quoted working language

Which actor conditions each bottleneck, and what non-verdict answerability question arises at that link?

Link	Condition-control question	Why it matters
Medical need	What condition makes treatment unavailable inside Gaza?	Separates need from evacuation pathway
Referral	Who identifies the patient as needing unavailable care?	Separates medical judgment from crossing access
Prioritization	Who ranks patients for evacuation?	Separates local triage from external movement control
WHO support	What does WHO coordinate, and what does WHO not control?	Prevents coordination/authority collapse
Staff/patient safety	Who can make movement safe enough to occur?	Converts “unsafe route” into protected-condition question
Crossing availability	Which crossing is open, when, under whose conditions?	Prevents “exit blocked” from becoming one undifferentiated claim
Screening/admission	Who permits, delays, screens, or denies movement?	Locates control by route/date/source
Receiving capacity	Who accepts the patient abroad?	Adds condition not reducible to Gaza-side access
Companion approval	Who can travel with the patient?	Shows medical approval and practical evacuation can diverge
Actual treatment	Did evacuation become care?	Separates exit from medical outcome

This shifts the question from:

Quoted working language

Why did evacuation fail?

to:

Quoted working language

At which link did the pathway fail, which actor conditioned that link, what source supports that attribution, what remains contested, and what answerability question follows?

7. Medical Evacuation Evidence Table

Route/date caution: Medical-evacuation roles vary by crossing, route, period, authority, and receiving country. The table identifies process roles and answerability sites; it does not claim that every actor listed controlled every route or every evacuation at every date.

Link	Actor(s)	Function	Evidence status	Answerability question
Specialized care unavailable	Gaza health system; patients; physicians	need for external care	high, date-bound	What conditions made care unavailable?
Referral	treating doctor/specialist	initiates referral	high	Who can initiate the pathway?
Submission	patient; hospital desk	moves referral into process	high	Can patients submit under displacement/communications constraints?
Prioritization	local Referral Committee	reviews, prioritizes, approves	high	How is priority distinct from exit permission?
WHO role	WHO and partners	coordination, not prioritization	high	Does coordination become mistaken for authority?
Documentation	WHO; patients; host states	checks medical/documentation data	medium/high	Does documentation delay movement?
Host-country approval	receiving states / hospitals	accepts patients/companions	high as process	Who accepts or refuses treatment?
Companion approval	host and route authorities	approves companions	high as process	Can companion rules block evacuation?
Israeli clearance	Israeli authorities where applicable	clearance/screening	high as process; route-specific	When does clearance condition evacuation?
Egyptian/Jordanian approval	regional authorities where applicable	crossing/transit/admission	high as process; route-specific	When does regional approval condition movement?
PA / EUBAM role	PA; EUBAM at Rafah	list-sharing/identity verification	medium/high; Rafah-specific	Administrative verification or control?
Safety	WHO; relevant parties; route actors	safety commitments	high for suspension/resumption claim	Who can provide safe movement?
Transport	WHO partners; contracted transport	movement to collection/crossing	high as process	Who conditions safe transport?
Crossing availability	crossing actors	open/closed/capped route	high for reported events; update needed	Does crossing operation prevent exit?
Actual exit	WHO; patients; crossing actors	physical departure	high for reported missions	Which approvals remain missing?
Actual treatment	host states; hospitals	care after exit	medium	Does exit become treatment?

8. Applying the Gates to Medical Evacuation

A patient may have a referral but not leave Gaza.

Gate	Medical-evacuation application
Harm	Specialized care unavailable; patient unable to access treatment
Significance	Medical care affects survival, bodily integrity, and care
Actor-control	Which actor controls the link where the pathway stopped?
Causation	Did that actor materially contribute to the failure?
Foreseeability	Was the effect foreseeable?
Capacity	Could the actor prevent, mitigate, disclose, justify, or cooperate?
Duty/role	Was there a legal, institutional, humanitarian, or legitimacy-based role?
Defeater	Were there security, impossibility, competing-duty, or shared-causation claims?
Response mode	Disclosure, justification, facilitation, protection, mitigation, cooperation, or HOLD
Posture	Question raised / prima facie answerability / contested / HOLD

Each row below is a question, not a final answer.

Pathway stop	Possible answerability site	Possible response-mode question
No referral	medical identification / hospital capacity	disclosure, repair of referral access, capacity support
Referral but no prioritization	Referral Committee process	explanation, review, prioritization transparency
Prioritization but no WHO support	safety or operational support conditions	protection, safety assurance, coordination
WHO support but crossing unavailable	crossing operation / route access	justification, facilitation, cooperation
Crossing available but no clearance	screening or clearance authority	disclosure, justification, review, facilitation
Clearance but no host acceptance	host-country capacity	cooperation, referral expansion, capacity support
Exit but no treatment	receiving-care continuity	disclosure, repair, transfer coordination

9. Secondary Test: Aid Access

Aid access remains important but secondary. It is well documented, but less distinctive because it can become a single-axis dispute over entry permission plus internal-diversion allegations.

OCHA’s 19 June 2026 report distinguishes supplies offloaded at Kerem Shalom, supplies collected into the Strip, fuel movements, and supplies tracked by the UN 2720 mechanism. That distinction supports the paper’s rule that entry into a crossing should not be treated as identical to civilian receipt.[^OCHA-2026-06-19]

Quoted working language

Truck entry is not civilian receipt.

10. Legal Posture and Actor Discipline

The paper does not issue final legal judgments.

Source type	Allowed wording
ICJ provisional measures	"The ICJ ordered provisional measures..."
ICJ advisory opinion	"The ICJ concluded in an advisory opinion..."
ICC arrest warrant	"The ICC issued an arrest warrant alleging..."
UN Commission	"The Commission found/concluded..."
NGO report	"HRW/Amnesty concluded/reported..."
Party source	"COGAT/Israel stated, denied, or alleged..."

ICJ Case 192 should be cited only for procedural posture and provisional-measures materials unless a final merits judgment exists at the time of review.[^ICJ-CASE-192] ICC Palestine materials should be cited for arrest-warrant posture, not conviction language.[^ICC-PALESTINE]

Condition-control must preserve two truths at once:

- Hamas is a responsible governing, coercive, and armed actor.
- Palestinian civilians are not Hamas.

Actor disaggregation is part of the method.

11. Findings and Failure Conditions

Findings:

- The contribution is methodological, not conceptual novelty.
- Functional occupation is the principal rival and is not displaced.
- Medical evacuation is the primary discrimination test.
- Aid access is secondary.
- A responsibility question is not a verdict.
- Condition-control can raise answerability; it does not automatically generate obligation.
- The normative bridge is gates, not a ladder.
- Legal posture is part of the method.

The paper fails as a contribution paper if:

- functional occupation already produces the same multi-actor attribution structure;
- humanitarian logistics already produces the same answerability-question map;
- condition-control produces only a more complete description, not a different attribution;
- the medical-evacuation test cannot be sourced at the necessary level;
- the answerability bridge becomes an obligation engine;
- the method depends on the author’s broader corpus rather than external standards.

12. Conclusion

Condition-control earns its place only if it does more than rename known relations of power. It must show that, in fractured-authority settings, per-function mapping produces an answerability-question structure that dyadic or single-frame analyses tend to collapse.

The map matters because it sharpens answerability. It identifies where harm, control, causation, foreseeability, capacity, duty, defeaters, and possible response modes must be tested. It does not decide

them automatically.

That is the contribution worth testing:

Quoted working language

a disciplined method for mapping partial, overlapping control over protected conditions without collapsing actors, sources, legal posture, causation, answerability, or responsibility.

Dispatch Status

This version is ready for targeted reviewer use-testing as a working draft.

It should not be presented as publication-ready, externally validated, or methodologically settled. The correct dispatch posture is:

Quoted working language

working draft / use-test request / source-annotated / current-fact check required before any public release

The requested reviewer task is not endorsement. It is pressure-testing whether condition-control adds useful discrimination or merely renames what existing fields already do.

Appendix A — Reviewer Questions

Functional occupation reviewer

Does functional occupation already produce the full multi-actor medical-evacuation map? Does condition-control add anything before or outside the legal occupation question?

Humanitarian logistics / medical evacuation reviewer

Does logistics already produce the same actor-specific answerability-question map? Does condition-control add a useful answerability overlay?

Regional reviewer

Does the actor map clarify or flatten? Does it avoid false symmetry? Are Egypt/Rafah and route-specific claims sufficiently precise?

Legal posture reviewer

Are legal sources described by correct posture? Does the map-not-verdict rule hold?

Moral / political philosophy reviewer

Does the answerability bridge avoid control-equals-obligation? Are the gates coherent? Is “answerability site” a legitimate endpoint?

Appendix B — Language Rules

Use: raises an answerability question; answerability site; non-verdict; may owe; possible response mode; if established; prima facie answerability; contested answerability; HOLD; further legal or normative analysis required.

Avoid: must do now; control creates obligation; required response as automatic output; responsibility established by the map; obligation established by the table; legal duty without legal posture; final moral duty without argument.

Appendix C — Source Ledger

ID	Source	Date/status	Use
OCHA-2026-06-19	OCHA, Humanitarian Situation Report	report dated 19 June 2026, published 20 June 2026	current humanitarian/access anchor verified in this pass
WHO-MEDEVAC	WHO EMRO, Medical evacuation of patients from the Gaza Strip	WHO process page, accessed in v3.0 pass	medical evacuation pathway, approvals, role distinctions
WHO-RAFAH-2026-04-10	WHO EMRO, Statement on WHO's role in medical evacuation from Gaza via Rafah	10 April 2026	Rafah-specific PA/WHO/EUBAM/clearance details
IPC-AFI-2025-12-19	IPC Gaza acute food insecurity analysis	19 December 2025	secondary food-security context if retained
IPC-AMN-2025-12-19	IPC Gaza acute malnutrition analysis	current IPC page accessed in v3.0 pass	secondary nutrition context if retained
ICJ-CASE-192	ICJ, South Africa v. Israel	ongoing case page	provisional-measures posture
ICC-PALESTINE	ICC, Situation in the State of Palestine	ongoing situation page	arrest-warrant posture

Appendix D — Footnotes

[^OCHA-2026-06-19]: OCHA oPt, “Humanitarian Situation Report | 19 June 2026,” published 20 June 2026, <https://www.ochaopt.org/content/humanitarian-situation-report-19-june-2026>.

[^WHO-MEDEVAC]: WHO EMRO, “Medical evacuation of patients from the Gaza Strip,” <https://www.emro.who.int/opt/information-resources/medical-evacuation-of-patients-from-the-gaza-strip.html>.

[^WHO-RAFAH-2026-04-10]: WHO EMRO, “Statement on WHO's role in medical evacuation from Gaza via the Rafah crossing to Egypt,” 10 April 2026, <https://www.emro.who.int/opt/news/statement-on-whos-role-in-medical-evacuation-from-gaza-via-the-rafah-crossing-to-egypt.html>.

[^IPC-AFI-2025-12-19]: IPC, “Gaza Strip: Acute Food Insecurity Situation for 16 October–30 November 2025 and Projection for 1 December 2025–15 April 2026,” published 19 December 2025, <https://www.ipcinfo.org/ipc-country-analysis/details-map/en/c/1159820/>.

[^IPC-AMN-2025-12-19]: IPC, “Gaza Strip: Acute Malnutrition Situation for 16 October 2025–15 April 2026 and Projection for 16 April–15 October 2026,” <https://www.ipcinfo.org/ipc-country-analysis/details-map/en/c/1159821/>.

[^ICJ-CASE-192]: International Court of Justice, “Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide in the Gaza Strip (South Africa v. Israel),” Case 192, <https://www.icj-cij.org/case/192>.

[^ICC-PALESTINE]: International Criminal Court, “State of Palestine,” <https://www.icc-cpi.int/palestine>.

Final Pre-Dispatch Repair Log

Included source file
gaza_v3_2_final_pre_dispatch_repair_log.md. Records route/date caution, pre-legal audit-map clarification, and answerability bridge limits.

v3.2 Final Pre-Dispatch Repair Log

Fractured Authority and Condition-Control in Gaza

Target: v3.0 reviewer-ready source-annotated draft Version: v3.2 Status: Final pre-dispatch repair pass
Prepared: 2026-06-26

1. Purpose

v3.2 applies the repairs identified in the v3.1 simulated external use-test.
The goal is to make the draft safer for targeted reviewer dispatch without expanding the argument.

2. Repairs Applied

Repair	Applied change	Status
Route/date caution	Added a caution before the medical-evacuation evidence table explaining that roles vary by crossing, route, period, authority, and receiving country.	Complete
Pre-legal audit map clarification	Added sentence clarifying that condition-control is a pre-legal and cross-actor audit map, not a competing doctrine.	Complete
Public-facing value clarification	Added sentence clarifying that the method’s strongest value is public-facing reasoning and cross-domain review.	Complete
Modest bridge protection	Added reminder that the paper does not develop a full theory of obligation.	Complete
Dispatch posture	Added dispatch-status section clarifying working draft / use-test request / not publication-ready.	Complete

3. Current Verdict

READY FOR TARGETED USE-TEST DISPATCH / NOT PUBLICATION-READY

The draft is now safe to send to carefully chosen reviewers as a working paper, provided the message asks for critique rather than endorsement.

4. Remaining Holds

Hold	Reason
External validation	Still not done.
Current-fact check	Must be repeated before public release.
Route/date specificity	Must be checked by regional/logistics reviewers.
Legal posture	Must be checked by legal reviewer before publication.
Full obligation theory	Not attempted and should not be added here.

5. Next Step

Send the v3.2 draft with the v3.1 dispatch packet and reviewer tracker.

Part III - Review and Use-Test Materials

Reviewer-facing packets, forms, trackers, and simulated adversarial review.

External Use-Test Dispatch Packet

Included source file

gaza_v3_1_external_use_test_dispatch_packet.md. Reviewer tracks, email templates, response form, and decision rules.

v3.1 External Use-Test Dispatch Packet

Fractured Authority and Condition-Control in Gaza

Author: Christopher Knorr Version: v3.1 Status: External use-test packet / working draft / not publication-ready Prepared: 2026-06-26

0. Purpose

This packet prepares the Gaza paper for targeted use-testing.

The purpose is not endorsement. The purpose is to test whether condition-control actually adds useful discrimination, or whether it merely redescribes what existing fields already do.

The draft's purpose remains practical before academic:

Quoted working language

The paper began as an interpretive contribution to public discussion and developed into a public-facing answerability strategy tool.

The scholarly contribution, if any, remains secondary.

1. Files to Send

Recommended file set:

- `fractured\_authority\_condition\_control\_gaza\_v3\_0\_reviewer\_ready\_source\_annotated\_draft.md`
- `gaza\_v3\_0\_source\_correction\_note.md`
- `gaza\_v3\_0\_reviewer\_packet.md`
- this v3.1 dispatch packet

Optional supporting files:

- v2.8.1 Purpose and Origin Note;
- v2.9 Source Ledger;
- v2.9 Citation Completion Map.

2. Core Reviewer Question

Ask every reviewer the same controlling question:

Quoted working language

Does condition-control add useful discrimination, or does it merely rename what your field already does?

The strongest criticism would show that functional occupation, humanitarian logistics, regional analysis, legal posture review, or moral/political philosophy already produces the same output without needing condition-control.

3. Reviewer Tracks

Track A — Functional Occupation / Occupation Law

Reviewer task: Use functional occupation at full strength on the medical-evacuation case, then compare it to condition-control.

Key questions:

- Does functional occupation already produce the full multi-actor map?
- Does condition-control add anything before or outside the legal occupation question?
- Does the draft respect functional occupation as the principal legal rival?
- Does condition-control overclaim by implying novelty where functional occupation already works?
- Should the paper narrow to “audit protocol” rather than “contribution candidate”?

Possible verdicts:

- Strong contribution candidate.
- Useful pre-legal audit layer.
- Functionally redundant.
- Overclaims relation to occupation law.
- Needs narrowing.

Track B — Humanitarian Logistics / Medical Evacuation

Reviewer task: Use ordinary humanitarian logistics or medical-evacuation analysis first. Then run condition-control on the same pathway.

Key questions:

- Does logistics already produce the same actor-specific answerability map?
- Does condition-control add a useful responsibility-question overlay?
- Does the medical-evacuation test accurately describe referral, prioritization, WHO coordination, clearance, host-country approval, companion approval, and treatment?
- Does the method add clarity, or just columns?
- Does it overstate control where the source shows coordination?

Possible verdicts:

- Strongly useful.
- Useful as audit layer.
- More detailed but not distinctive.

- Redundant.
- Misleading or overbroad.

Track C — Gaza / Regional Specialist

Reviewer task: Evaluate whether the actor map clarifies Gaza's real structure or flattens it.

Key questions:

- Does the map avoid false symmetry?
- Does it distinguish Hamas authorities, armed groups, Palestinian civilians, Israel, Egypt, the PA, WHO/UN, and receiving countries accurately?
- Are Rafah and route-specific claims precise enough?
- Does the paper avoid treating Palestinians as Hamas?
- Does it avoid treating humanitarian coordination as authority?

Possible verdicts:

- Clarifying.
- Useful but needs route/date repairs.
- Risks false symmetry.
- Actor map is incomplete.
- Not usable without regional revision.

Track D — Legal Posture / Source Reviewer

Reviewer task: Check source posture and legal posture.

Key questions:

- Are ICJ provisional measures distinguished from final merits judgments?
- Are ICC arrest warrants distinguished from convictions?
- Are UN Commission findings, NGO reports, party sources, and press reports used with correct posture?
- Are dated humanitarian claims marked as date-bound?
- Does any current claim require refresh before circulation?

Possible verdicts:

- Source posture sound.
- Minor citation repairs needed.
- Major source gaps.
- Legal-posture collapse present.
- Not ready for circulation.

Track E — Moral / Political Philosophy

Reviewer task: Review the answerability gate bridge.

Key questions:

- Does the bridge avoid control-equals-obligation?

- Are the gates coherent?
- Does the control-without-fault objection receive adequate treatment?
- Is “answerability site” a legitimate endpoint?
- Does the paper avoid silently becoming a full theory of obligation?
- Does the public-purpose framing help or weaken the argument?

Possible verdicts:

- Modest normative bridge survives.
- Useful but needs philosophical grounding.
- Gates are coherent but underargued.
- Control-to-obligation risk remains.
- Bridge should move to separate paper.

4. Email / Message Templates

General reviewer message

Subject: Use-test request — Gaza condition-control draft

I’m sending a working draft for use-testing, not endorsement.

The paper began as my interpretation of Gaza’s fractured-authority problem and developed into a possible public-facing answerability method. The method, condition-control, asks which actor conditions which protected link, through which function, according to which source, with what uncertainty, and what answerability question remains open.

The primary test case is medical evacuation from Gaza: why referral for treatment unavailable inside Gaza does not necessarily become actual treatment outside Gaza.

The main question I need tested is simple:

Quoted working language

Does condition-control add useful discrimination, or does it merely rename what your field already does?

The draft is not publication-ready and not externally validated. I’m especially looking for strong objections, overclaim warnings, source/posture problems, and whether the method should be narrowed to an audit protocol.

Thank you for any time you can give it.

Short version

Subject: Quick use-test request

I have a working draft on Gaza and fractured authority. It proposes condition-control as a public-facing answerability method, but I need to know whether it adds useful discrimination or merely renames existing tools.

The test case is medical evacuation from Gaza. Could you review whether the method adds anything beyond your ordinary framework?

This is not publication-ready; I'm looking for hard objections.

5. Reviewer Response Form

Question	Reviewer answer
Reviewer track	
Ordinary method used first?	yes / no
Does condition-control add useful discrimination?	yes / no / partial
Is the medical-evacuation test accurate?	yes / no / partial
Does the paper overclaim?	yes / no / partial
Should the paper narrow to audit protocol?	yes / no / maybe
Biggest strength	
Biggest weakness	
Required repair before publication	
Overall verdict	strong / useful / redundant / misleading / hold

6. Decision Rules

Proceed toward public working paper if:

- at least two reviewer tracks find useful discrimination;
- no reviewer finds fatal legal-posture collapse;
- no reviewer finds the answerability bridge turns into obligation engine;
- source refresh issues are repairable.

Narrow to audit protocol if:

- functional occupation or humanitarian logistics already produces the same map;
- reviewers find the method useful only as a checklist;
- novelty/contribution claim remains too strong.

Pause for major revision if:

- medical evacuation is inaccurate or under-sourced;
- false symmetry persists;
- legal posture collapses;
- answerability bridge overclaims obligation;
- public-purpose framing conflicts with method.

7. Dispatch Status

The paper is ready for targeted use-test dispatch as a working draft.

It is not ready for publication, posting, or broad circulation.

Strict Simulated External Use-Test Reports

Included source file

gaza_v3_1_strict_simulated_external_use_test_reports.md. Simulated adversarial reviews across legal, logistics, regional, source, and philosophy tracks.

v3.1 Strict Simulated External Use-Test Reports

Fractured Authority and Condition-Control in Gaza

Status: Simulated external use-test only
Warning: This does not replace actual external review.
Target: v3.0 reviewer-ready source-annotated draft

1. Functional Occupation Reviewer Simulation

Verdict

Useful pre-legal audit layer / needs narrower legal framing.

Strongest objection

Functional occupation already does much of the retained-function work. The paper must not imply that function-specific control after withdrawal is a discovery of condition-control.

Strongest support

Condition-control usefully maps actors and links outside the occupation-law dyad: Referral Committee, WHO coordination, PA/EUBAM verification, host-country approval, companion approval, and actual treatment.

Scores

Criterion	Score / 3	Reason
Functional occupation steelmanned	2.5	Properly centered, but specialist literature still needed.
No-displacement rule	3	Clear and effective.
Distinct pre-legal map	2.5	Strong where non-occupation actors appear.
Medical-evacuation test	2	Promising; route/date details still matter.
Legal overclaim control	2.5	Mostly controlled.

Required repair

Add one sentence:

Quoted working language

Condition-control should be read as a pre-legal and cross-actor audit map that may assist functional occupation analysis, not as a competing doctrine.

2. Humanitarian Logistics / Medical Evacuation Reviewer Simulation

Verdict

Useful as an audit layer / not yet proven as distinct from expert logistics practice.

Strongest objection

A competent medical-evacuation analyst already maps referral, prioritization, documentation, host approval, clearance, crossing, transport, safety, companions, and care. Condition-control risks formalizing existing practice.

Strongest support

The paper adds value by explicitly asking what answerability question follows at each link and by preventing WHO coordination from being mistaken for total control.

Scores

Criterion	Score / 3	Reason
Logistics steelmanned	3	The draft no longer straw-mans logistics.
Actor-function distinction	2.5	Strong, especially WHO/Referral Committee/clearance.
Practical utility	2	Useful checklist, but maybe not new for specialists.
Medical pathway accuracy	2	Needs route/date-specific validation.
Answerability overlay	2.5	Useful if kept non-verdict.

Required repair

Mark the method as especially useful for public-facing reasoning and cross-domain review, not necessarily as a replacement for expert logistics workflows.

3. Gaza / Regional Specialist Simulation

Verdict

Clarifying / route-date detail required.

Strongest objection

The actor map risks flattening power differences unless the false-symmetry guardrail remains visible. Egypt/Rafah and Israeli clearance claims must be route- and date-specific.

Strongest support

The paper avoids collapsing Palestinians into Hamas and avoids treating WHO as controlling the process. That is a major strength.

Scores

Criterion	Score / 3	Reason
Actor disaggregation	3	Strong.
False-symmetry control	2.5	Good guardrail; must remain prominent.
Route/date specificity	1.8	Still needs more precision before publication.
Civilian agency under constraint	2.5	Present and useful.
Gaza complexity handling	2.3	Strong as public reasoning tool.

Required repair

Add route/date caution into the medical-evacuation table header.

4. Legal Posture / Source Reviewer Simulation

Verdict

Source posture mostly sound / current-source correction improves credibility.

Strongest objection

The v2.9 OCHA 26 June issue shows why current-source claims must be verified before circulation. The correction in v3.0 is good, but it should remain visible.

Strongest support

The paper carefully distinguishes provisional measures, advisory opinions, arrest warrants, NGO reports, party sources, and humanitarian reporting.

Scores

Criterion	Score / 3	Reason
Legal posture discipline	3	Strong.
Current source caution	2.5	Correction improves trust.
Footnote adequacy	2	Working draft, not final legal citation format.
Party-source handling	2.5	Good but should remain explicit.
Source map coherence	2.5	Good.

Required repair

Before any broad circulation, run a final live-source check and add line-specific or paragraph-specific citations where possible.

5. Moral / Political Philosophy Reviewer Simulation

Verdict

Modest bridge survives / full obligation theory not attempted.

Strongest objection

The bridge remains underargued if presented as a theory of obligation. The paper must continue to say it identifies answerability sites, not final obligations.

Strongest support

The gates and the control-without-fault objection are exactly the right safeguards. The public-purpose note also helps: the paper’s primary ambition is not to settle moral philosophy but to improve public reasoning.

Scores

Criterion	Score / 3	Reason
Avoids control-equals-obligation	3	Clear.
Gate coherence	2.5	Strong enough for working draft.
Control-without-fault treatment	2.5	Adequate for modest bridge.
Answerability site endpoint	2.5	Defensible.
Risk of hidden obligation theory	2	Present but controlled.

Required repair

Do not expand the bridge in this paper. Save any full theory of obligation for a separate paper.

Consolidated v3.1 Simulated Verdict

Reviewer track	Verdict	Score range
Functional occupation	Useful pre-legal audit layer	2.4–2.7
Humanitarian logistics	Useful audit layer, not replacement	2.2–2.6
Gaza/regional	Clarifying, route/date repair needed	2.2–2.6
Legal posture/source	Strong with final source check	2.5–3.0
Moral/political philosophy	Modest bridge survives	2.3–2.7

Overall simulated result

PASS AS REVIEWER-READY WORKING DRAFT / HOLD AS VALIDATED CONTRIBUTION

The draft is ready for targeted use-testing.

It is not publication-ready.

Consolidated Repairs Before Publication

- Add route/date caution to medical-evacuation table.
- Add one sentence clarifying condition-control as pre-legal audit map, not doctrine.
- Add one sentence clarifying value for public-facing reasoning and cross-domain review.
- Run final live-source check before circulation.
- Keep answerability bridge modest.
- Do not expand into full obligation theory inside this paper.

Reviewer Tracker

Included source file
gaza_v3_1_reviewer_tracker.md. Practical table for tracking review dispatch and response status.

v3.1 Reviewer Tracker

Reviewer	Track	Contact	Sent date	Deadline	Response status	Verdict	High-priority repairs	Notes
R-A	Functional occupation / occupation law				Not sent			
R-B	Humanitarian logistics / medical evacuation				Not sent			
R-C	Gaza / regional specialist				Not sent			
R-D	Legal posture / source reviewer				Not sent			
R-E	Moral / political philosophy				Not sent			

Reviewer verdict codes

Code	Meaning
S	Strongly useful
U	Useful audit layer
D	More detailed but not distinctive
R	Redundant
M	Misleading / overbroad
H	Hold pending repairs

Response status codes

Code	Meaning
Not sent	Not yet contacted
Sent	Materials sent
Reading	Reviewer acknowledged
Received	Feedback received
Closed	Feedback incorporated

v1.8 One-Page Reviewer Cover Memo

Included source file

gaza_paper_v1_8_one_page_reviewer_cover_memo.md. Earlier adversarial reviewer memo and pressure-test questions.

Fractured Authority and Condition-Control in Gaza One-Page Reviewer Cover Memo

Author: Christopher Knorr Version: v1.8 Reviewer Packet Finalization Status: Review Draft — Not for Publication Review request: Adversarial review of method, sourcing, legal posture, actor disaggregation, humanitarian pathway analysis, and current-fact handling.

Thank you for reviewing this draft.

This is a source-led framework for analyzing Gaza through condition-control: the capacity of an actor to enable, disable, restrict, delay, authorize, deny, or determine the conditions under which others can act.

The paper is not a court judgment, criminal indictment, journalism, advocacy brief, or final legal determination. It does not issue final judgments on genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity, occupation, illegal occupation, apartheid, collective punishment, starvation as a method of warfare, or human-shields violations. It classifies legal claims by source, date, procedure, posture, contestation, and evidentiary status.

The core discipline is:

Quoted working language

Control is analyzed by function. Harm is traced by pathway. Actors are disaggregated. Legal claims are posture-controlled. Secondary sources are audited, not adopted.

Please review adversarially. The most useful feedback is not general agreement. The most useful feedback identifies:

- overclaims;
- stale current facts;
- weak or missing sources;
- legal-posture errors;
- actor collapse;
- unsupported causation;
- overreliance on secondary sources;
- places where the report is too cautious and should be stronger.

Claims to pressure-test first

- Does condition-control add analytic value?
- Does the report avoid saying "Israel controls Gaza" without specifying function?
- Does the report preserve Palestinian agency while separating Palestinians from Hamas?

- Does the report include Hamas responsibility clearly enough?
- Does the report correctly distinguish Hamas internal coercion from contested aid-theft claims?
- Does the humanitarian pathway model clarify harm without oversimplifying causation?
- Does the aid-access section correctly separate entry, inspection, offloading, distribution, fuel, route safety, civilian receipt, and source posture?
- Does the legal section correctly distinguish ICJ provisional measures, ICJ advisory opinions, ICC arrest warrants, UN Commission findings, NGO conclusions, and party denials?
- Does the report use current food-security language correctly?
- What must be narrowed, moved to appendix, or removed before wider circulation?

Important disclosed holds

The draft remains not publication-ready. The following still need final checking:

- latest food-security classification after 15 April 2026;
- current communications status;
- primary Israeli official legal source on post-2005 occupation obligations;
- Roy/UNCTAD de-development source completion;
- Egypt/Rafah current role;
- exact Yellow Line map/route if visualized;
- final ICJ/ICC/UN docket check immediately before circulation;
- pinpoint citations for optional historical-cluster appendices.

Please mark any passage that exceeds its evidence.

v1.8 Reviewer Packet Final

Included source file

fractured_authority_condition_control_gaza_v1_8_reviewer_packet_final.md. Earlier reviewer packet with mandatory questions, HOLD disclosures, insert bank, dashboard, pathway tables, and legal-posture tables.

Fractured Authority and Condition-Control in Gaza

One-Page Reviewer Cover Memo

Author: Christopher Knorr Version: v1.8 Reviewer Packet Finalization Status: Review Draft — Not for Publication Review request: Adversarial review of method, sourcing, legal posture, actor disaggregation, humanitarian pathway analysis, and current-fact handling.

Thank you for reviewing this draft.

This is a source-led framework for analyzing Gaza through condition-control: the capacity of an actor to enable, disable, restrict, delay, authorize, deny, or determine the conditions under which others can act.

The paper is not a court judgment, criminal indictment, journalism, advocacy brief, or final legal determination. It does not issue final judgments on genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity, occupation, illegal occupation, apartheid, collective punishment, starvation as a method of warfare, or human-shields violations. It classifies legal claims by source, date, procedure, posture, contestation, and evidentiary status.

The core discipline is:

Quoted working language

Control is analyzed by function. Harm is traced by pathway. Actors are disaggregated. Legal claims are posture-controlled. Secondary sources are audited, not adopted.

Please review adversarially. The most useful feedback is not general agreement. The most useful feedback identifies:

- overclaims;
- stale current facts;
- weak or missing sources;
- legal-posture errors;
- actor collapse;
- unsupported causation;
- overreliance on secondary sources;
- places where the report is too cautious and should be stronger.

Claims to pressure-test first

- Does condition-control add analytic value?
- Does the report avoid saying "Israel controls Gaza" without specifying function?
- Does the report preserve Palestinian agency while separating Palestinians from Hamas?

- Does the report include Hamas responsibility clearly enough?
- Does the report correctly distinguish Hamas internal coercion from contested aid-theft claims?
- Does the humanitarian pathway model clarify harm without oversimplifying causation?
- Does the aid-access section correctly separate entry, inspection, offloading, distribution, fuel, route safety, civilian receipt, and source posture?
- Does the legal section correctly distinguish ICJ provisional measures, ICJ advisory opinions, ICC arrest warrants, UN Commission findings, NGO conclusions, and party denials?
- Does the report use current food-security language correctly?
- What must be narrowed, moved to appendix, or removed before wider circulation?

Important disclosed holds

The draft remains not publication-ready. The following still need final checking:

- latest food-security classification after 15 April 2026;
- current communications status;
- primary Israeli official legal source on post-2005 occupation obligations;
- Roy/UNCTAD de-development source completion;
- Egypt/Rafah current role;
- exact Yellow Line map/route if visualized;
- final ICJ/ICC/UN docket check immediately before circulation;
- pinpoint citations for optional historical-cluster appendices.

Please mark any passage that exceeds its evidence.

Current Status

Area	Status
Core method	PASS
Condition-control framework	PASS
Actor disaggregation	PASS
Hamas / October 7 / hostage-taking	PASS
Hamas internal coercion	PASS WITH COMMISSION POSTURE
Hamas aid theft/diversion	CONTESTED / DO NOT STATE AS SETTLED
Humanitarian baseline	PASS WITH UPDATE WARNING
Food-security status	PARTIAL PASS / CURRENT FAMINE CLAIM HOLD
Communications pathway	PASS AS PATHWAY / CURRENT STATUS HOLD
Legal posture	PASS WITH FINAL DOCKET CHECK
Current-control dashboard	UPDATED BUT UPDATE-REQUIRED
Publication readiness	NO

Main Thesis

Gaza's civilian harm cannot be adequately analyzed only through formal sovereignty, direct administration, or battlefield presence. It must also be analyzed through condition-control: the power to shape whether civilians, local institutions, humanitarian actors, medical systems, and public services can act at all.

The report's governing discipline is:

Quoted working language

Control is analyzed by function. Harm is traced by pathway. Actors are disaggregated. Legal claims are posture-controlled. Secondary sources are audited, not adopted.

Mandatory Reviewer Questions

- Does condition-control add analytic value, or does it duplicate existing legal categories?
- Does the report avoid saying "Israel controls Gaza" without specifying function?
- Does it preserve Palestinian agency while separating Palestinians from Hamas?
- Does it include Hamas responsibility strongly enough?
- Does it distinguish Hamas internal coercion from contested aid-theft claims?
- Does it treat humanitarian harm as a pathway rather than a slogan?
- Does it keep aid access separate from truck counts?
- Does it use food-security classifications correctly?
- Does it keep ICJ/ICC/UN/NGO/legal claims in proper posture?
- What claim must be narrowed before wider circulation?

Required HOLD Disclosures

The following remain on hold:

- latest food-security classification after 15 April 2026;
- current communications status as of June 2026;
- primary Israeli official legal source on post-2005 occupation obligations;
- Roy/UNCTAD de-development source completion;
- Egypt/Rafah current role;
- exact Yellow Line map/route if visualized;
- final ICJ/ICC/UN docket check immediately before circulation;
- full pinpoint citations/page numbers for historical-cluster appendices.

2. Main Report Cleanup Inserts

2.1 Historical Spine Insert

Use this in Part II:

Quoted working language

Gaza's present authority and humanitarian crisis should be situated within a longer historical sequence: the 1947 UN Partition Plan; the 1948 war and large-scale Palestinian displacement; the 1967 war, after which Israel gained control of Gaza, the West Bank, and East Jerusalem; the Oslo framework and creation of interim Palestinian self-governance structures; Israel's 2005 disengagement from permanent settlements and military bases inside Gaza; Hamas's electoral victory in 2006 and takeover of Gaza in 2007; subsequent blockade and access-restriction disputes; repeated Gaza-war report clusters; Hamas-led attacks on 7 October 2023; and the subsequent 2023–26 war sequence.[^HIST-CFR-TIMELINE][^HIST-CFR-TRACKER][^HIST-UNISPAL] This historical spine does not settle responsibility or legal status. It establishes why Gaza requires a function-specific control analysis.

Status tag: PASS WITH PRIMARY-SOURCE UPGRADE.

2.2 Post-2005 Control Debate Insert

Use this in Part IV and Appendix L:

Quoted working language

The report should not say either that disengagement ended the control question or that nothing changed in 2005. The safer finding is that the 2005 disengagement changed the form of the control question. HRW argued before disengagement that removing troops and settlements would not end occupation if Israel retained control over borders, airspace, coastline, economy, and movement of people and goods.[^CTRL-HRW-DISENGAGEMENT] Gisha later argued that disengagement changed the degree but not the kind of Israeli control because Israel retained control over Gaza's borders, airspace, territorial waters, population registry, and tax system.[^CTRL-GISHA-DISENGAGED] Gisha also records Israel's contrary position that disengagement ended Israel's control and responsibility for Gaza.[^CTRL-GISHA-ISRAEL-POSITION] This report does not resolve the full occupation-law debate in the main body. It analyzes retained, recurring, or newly created control functions and moves the deeper legal question to Appendix L.

Status tag: PASS WITH CONTESTATION.

2.3 Hamas / October 7 / Hostage-Taking Insert

Use this in Part III and Part VII:

Quoted working language

The report does not excuse or erase Hamas-led crimes. HRW concluded that Hamas's military wing, the Qassam Brigades, and at least four other Palestinian armed groups committed numerous war crimes and crimes against humanity against civilians during the 7 October 2023 assault, and called for the release of civilian hostages, describing hostage-taking as an ongoing war crime.[^HAMAS-HRW-OCT7] HRW's full report provides the detailed investigative source base for those claims.[^HAMAS-HRW-REPORT] Amnesty's later report should be used as a source-comparison entry for abuses by Hamas and other armed groups during October 7 and against captives taken into Gaza.[^HAMAS-AMNESTY-OCT7] These claims must remain actor-specific: Hamas-led armed groups are not Palestinian civilians.

Status tag: PASS.

2.4 Hamas Internal-Coercion Insert

Use this in Part III and Part VII:

Quoted working language

Hamas internal coercion is now source-supported as a narrow, source-postured claim. Reporting on a June 2026 UN Commission/OHCHR report states that the Commission documented executions, severe physical violence, public punishments, torture allegations, and other abuses against Palestinians in Gaza between August 2024 and January 2026. Reuters reported that Hamas-affiliated forces were involved in at least 60 of 249 documented cases of executions and severe physical violence, while AP and Le Monde reported similar findings from the UN/OHCHR record.[^HAMAS-UNCOI-2026-ABUSES-REUTERS][^HAMAS-UNCOI-2026-ABUSES-AP][^HAMAS-UNCOI-2026-ABUSES-LEMONDE] This report treats those claims as Commission/investigative findings, not court judgments, and keeps them separate from Palestinian civilians.

Status tag: PASS WITH COMMISSION POSTURE.

Do not use: “Hamas controls all Palestinians.” Do not use: “Palestinians are responsible for Hamas coercion.”

2.5 Aid Theft / Diversion Warning Insert

Use this warning in Part V, Part VII, Appendix E, and Appendix F:

Quoted working language

Aid theft and diversion claims remain contested. COGAT and Israeli sources allege violent interference, theft, and hoarding by Hamas and other actors. Reuters reported that a USAID internal analysis found no evidence of systematic Hamas theft of U.S.-funded humanitarian supplies in 156 reported incidents between October 2023 and May 2025, while Israel says Hamas diverts aid based on intelligence reports and Hamas denies the allegations.[^AID-COGAT-FAQ-2026][^AID-REUTERS-USAID-HAMAS-THEFT] The report should therefore attribute aid-theft claims by source and should not state them as settled fact unless independently corroborated.

Status tag: CONTESTED / DO NOT STATE AS SETTLED.

2.6 Humanitarian Baseline Insert

Use this in Part V and Part VI:

Quoted working language

As of OCHA's 19 June 2026 situation report, families across Gaza continued to face insecurity, prolonged and new displacement, lack of access to essential services, and exposure of civilians and civilian infrastructure to airstrikes, shelling, and gunfire.[^HUM-OCHA-2026-06-19] OCHA reported further westward encroachment of the "Yellow Line" in eastern Gaza city, marked by yellow cement blocks, and reported that the line has been used to mark areas inside Gaza where access is restricted by Israeli forces.[^HUM-OCHA-2026-06-19] OCHA also reported fuel shortages affecting critical humanitarian activities, Kerem Shalom as the only entry point for humanitarian and commercial cargo after Zikim's closure, restricted fuel entry through Kerem Shalom during limited operating hours, and health-item shortages that could suspend over 520 endoscopic and surgical procedures.[^HUM-OCHA-2026-06-19] These claims are current only as of OCHA's report date and must be updated before wider review.

Status tag: PASS WITH UPDATE WARNING.

2.7 Food-Security Insert

Use this in Part V and Appendix F:

Quoted working language

Food-security language in this report is date-controlled. IPC confirmed Famine (IPC Phase 5) in Gaza Governorate in August 2025.[^FOOD-IPC-2025-08] A later IPC acute food insecurity analysis covering 16 October to 30 November 2025 and projecting 1 December 2025 to 15 April 2026 reported severe food insecurity across Gaza, including Crisis, Emergency, and Catastrophe levels, while projecting a reduction in the population in Catastrophe by April 2026.[^FOOD-IPC-2025-OCTAPR] A separate IPC acute malnutrition analysis projected that nearly 101,000 children aged 6–59 months would suffer acute malnutrition through mid-October 2026.[^FOOD-IPC-AMN-2026-OCT] The report should not state that Gaza is currently in famine unless the latest IPC/WFP/OCHA source supports that exact date, geographic scope, and classification.

Status tag: PARTIAL PASS / CURRENT FAMINE CLAIM HOLD.

2.8 Communications Pathway Insert

Use this in Part V and Appendix F:

Quoted working language

Communications should be treated as a humanitarian life-support condition where source evidence supports the claim. Reuters reported in June 2025 that the UN described a full internet blackout in Gaza, likely caused by military activity damaging the last cable into the enclave, which paralyzed aid operations and cut lifelines to emergency services, humanitarian coordination, and critical information for civilians.[^COMM-REUTERS-BLACKOUT-2025] This supports the communications pathway as a valid analytic category. Any claim about current communications status must be updated with a current source.

Status tag: PASS AS PATHWAY / CURRENT STATUS HOLD.

2.9 COGAT/OCHA Aid-Access Comparison Insert

Use this in Part V, Part VI, and Appendix E:

Quoted working language

Aid access is a contested control pathway, not a single number. COGAT’s June 2026 FAQ states that Israel, through COGAT, facilitates the daily entry of 600 humanitarian aid trucks into Gaza and denies restricting essential food or medicine.[^AID-COGAT-FAQ-2026] OCHA’s 19 June 2026 situation report describes operational constraints, including Kerem Shalom as the only entry point for humanitarian and commercial cargo after Zikim’s closure, limited fuel-entry conditions, UN-confirmation limits under the 2720 mechanism, and fuel, funding, distribution, and access constraints.[^HUM-OCHA-2026-06-19] AP reporting on ceasefire aid flows also illustrates that COGAT, UN, and other figures can diverge sharply.[^AID-AP-CEASEFIRE-FLOWS-2025] The report should therefore separate aid entry, inspection, offloading, fuel, route safety, distribution, civilian receipt, and source posture.

Status tag: PASS AS SOURCE-CONFLICT METHOD.

2.10 Legal Docket Insert

Use this in Part VIII and Appendix G:

Quoted working language

Legal materials in this report remain posture-controlled. ICJ Case 192 should be described in provisional-measure/procedural posture unless and until a final merits judgment exists.[^LAW-ICJ-CASE192-OFFICIAL][^LAW-ICJ-CASE192-PM-OFFICIAL] ICJ Case 186 and ICJ Case 196 should be described as advisory opinions.[^LAW-ICJ-CASE186-OFFICIAL][^LAW-ICJ-CASE196-OFFICIAL] ICC Palestine materials should be described as pre-trial arrest-warrant/prosecutorial posture, not convictions.[^ICC-PALESTINE-OFFICIAL][^ICC-NETANYAHU-OFFICIAL] UN Commission/OHCHR materials should be described as investigative or institutional findings, not court judgments.[^UNCOI-OHCHR-OFFICIAL]

Status tag: PASS WITH FINAL DOCKET CHECK.

3. Updated Appendix E — Current-Control Dashboard

Dashboard version: v1.7 integrated dashboard Checked: 2026-06-25 Primary current anchor: OCHA Humanitarian Situation Report, 19 June 2026 Publication use: Not publication-ready; update again before circulation.

Control function	Territorial / military control
Current reported status	OCHA reported continued insecurity, displacement, civilian exposure to airstrikes, shelling and gunfire, and damage to civilian infrastructure.
Source/date	OCHA 19 Jun. 2026
Actor(s) to assess	IDF, Hamas armed wing/other armed groups, civilians, aid actors
Confidence	Medium
Contestation	High

Report treatment	Use as insecurity/control-context claim, not full map
Control function	Yellow Line / restricted access
Current reported status	OCHA reported westward encroachment of the “Yellow Line” in eastern Gaza city, marked by yellow cement blocks; OCHA describes the line as marking areas inside Gaza where access is restricted by Israeli forces.
Source/date	OCHA 19 Jun. 2026
Actor(s) to assess	IDF, civilians, humanitarian actors
Confidence	High for OCHA description
Contestation	High
Report treatment	Use as restricted-access mechanism, not neutral border
Control function	Yellow Line displacement
Current reported status	OCHA reported dozens of families displaced after Israeli troops placed yellow cement blocks; many left without tents or belongings.
Source/date	OCHA 19 Jun. 2026
Actor(s) to assess	IDF, displaced families, humanitarian partners
Confidence	High for OCHA report
Contestation	Medium/High
Report treatment	Use in displacement pathway
Control function	Crossings/cargo
Current reported status	OCHA reported Kerem Shalom remained the only entry point for humanitarian and commercial cargo after Zikim closure on 24 May; UN/partners offloaded approx. 23,760 pallets from 1–15 June.
Source/date	OCHA 19 Jun. 2026
Actor(s) to assess	Israeli authorities, UN/partners, commercial actors
Confidence	High for OCHA report
Contestation	High
Report treatment	Use for cargo entry status; compare with COGAT
Control function	Fuel entry
Current reported status	OCHA reported UNOPS took in nearly 900,000 litres diesel and 38,000 litres benzine from 8–16 June, and Israeli authorities allowed fuel imports only through Kerem Shalom during limited operating hours.
Source/date	OCHA 19 Jun. 2026
Actor(s) to assess	Israeli authorities, UNOPS, Egypt-corridor supplier, humanitarian partners
Confidence	High for OCHA report
Contestation	High
Report treatment	Use as fuel condition-control pathway
Control function	Aid-entry confirmation
Current reported status	OCHA stated the UN can only confirm entry of supplies tracked by the UN 2720 mechanism.
Source/date	OCHA 19 Jun. 2026
Actor(s) to assess	UN, Israeli authorities, aid actors
Confidence	High as method
Contestation	Medium
Report treatment	Use to caution against truck-count-only claims
Control function	Food assistance
Current reported status	OCHA reported partners provided general food assistance to more than 420,000 people from 1–13 June; meal production scaled down due to funding and operational costs.
Source/date	OCHA 19 Jun. 2026
Actor(s) to assess	Food-security partners, civilians, donors, access actors
Confidence	High for OCHA report
Contestation	Medium

Report treatment	Use as operational food-assistance claim
Control function	Food-security classification
Current reported status	IPC confirmed Famine in Gaza Governorate in Aug. 2025; later IPC Oct-Nov 2025 analysis and Dec-Apr 2026 projection reported severe food insecurity but must not be substituted for current famine classification.
Source/date	IPC Aug. 2025; IPC Oct-Nov 2025/Dec-Apr 2026 projection
Actor(s) to assess	IPC, WFP, OCHA
Confidence	High for date/scope
Contestation	High
Report treatment	Do not say “currently famine” without newer source
Control function	Acute malnutrition
Current reported status	IPC projected nearly 101,000 children aged 6–59 months would suffer acute malnutrition through mid-Oct. 2026, including severe cases.
Source/date	IPC acute malnutrition projection
Actor(s) to assess	IPC, WHO, UNICEF, WFP
Confidence	High for date/scope
Contestation	Medium
Report treatment	Use as malnutrition projection, not famine classification
Control function	Water/WASH
Current reported status	OCHA reported Bani Suhaila Mekorot pipeline repaired 7 June after damage affected water for 200,000 people; UNICEF consignment entered 10 June to support drinking-water production.
Source/date	OCHA 19 Jun. 2026
Actor(s) to assess	Palestinian Water Authority, Israeli forces, UNICEF, WASH partners
Confidence	High for OCHA report
Contestation	Medium/High
Report treatment	Use as water pathway example
Control function	Health supplies
Current reported status	OCHA reported over 520 endoscopic/surgical procedures at risk without high-level disinfection agents; dialysis and rehabilitation supply constraints also reported.
Source/date	OCHA 19 Jun. 2026
Actor(s) to assess	Health Cluster, WHO, Israeli authorities, hospitals
Confidence	High for OCHA report
Contestation	Medium/High
Report treatment	Use as medical-supply pathway
Control function	Shelter
Current reported status	OCHA reported nearly 1,370 households received shelter and essential items from 7–13 June despite severe constraints.
Source/date	OCHA 19 Jun. 2026
Actor(s) to assess	Shelter partners, displaced families, access-controlling actors
Confidence	High for OCHA report
Contestation	Medium
Report treatment	Use in displacement/shelter pathway
Control function	Communications
Current reported status	Reuters reported a June 2025 UN-described full internet blackout that paralyzed aid operations; current 2026 status not established here.
Source/date	Reuters 12 Jun. 2025
Actor(s) to assess	Telecom actors, Israeli authorities, aid actors, civilians
Confidence	High for 2025 event
Contestation	Medium/High

Report treatment	Use as pathway support; current status HOLD
Control function	Hamas internal coercion
Current reported status	Reporting on UN Commission/OHCHR findings documents internal repression by Hamas-affiliated forces and other forces; aid theft remains contested separately.
Source/date	AP/Reuters/Le Monde on UNCOI/OHCHR 2026
Actor(s) to assess	Hamas-affiliated forces, other forces, civilians
Confidence	Medium/High
Contestation	High
Report treatment	Use as Commission/investigative posture
Control function	Hamas aid theft/diversion
Current reported status	COGAT alleges theft/interference; Reuters/USAID analysis found no evidence of systematic Hamas theft in U.S.-funded supplies.
Source/date	COGAT FAQ; Reuters/USAID
Actor(s) to assess	COGAT, Hamas, USAID, aid actors
Confidence	Medium
Contestation	High
Report treatment	Treat as contested source conflict
Control function	Legal procedure
Current reported status	ICJ/ICC/UN materials updated as posture categories.
Source/date	ICJ/ICC/UN source set
Actor(s) to assess	ICJ, ICC, UNCOI, parties
Confidence	High for posture
Contestation	High by legal claim
Report treatment	Use legal posture table, not final verdict

4. Updated Appendix F — Humanitarian Pathway Tables

F.1 Water / WASH Pathway

Protected condition	Water access
Source-supported event	OCHA reported the Bani Suhaila Mekorot pipeline was repaired on 7 June after 2 June damage affected water provision for 200,000 people.
Control input	Infrastructure damage; repair access; safety; technical capacity
Service disruption	Water provision reduced until repair
Civilian harm	Unsafe/insufficient water risk
Actor question	Who caused the damage, and who controlled safe repair/access?
Status	PASS as source-dated
Protected condition	Drinking-water production
Source-supported event	OCHA reported UNICEF sodium hypochlorite and spare parts entered on 10 June to support drinking-water production from desalination plants.
Control input	Entry of chemicals and spare parts
Service disruption	Desalination/chlorination capacity depends on permitted inputs
Civilian harm	Unsafe water/disease risk
Actor question	Who controls entry of treatment chemicals/spares?
Status	PASS as source-dated

Protected condition	Sanitation/pest risk
Source-supported event	OCHA reported overcrowding, poor sanitation, unsafe drinking water, pests/rodents, and rising WASH-related disease concerns.
Control input	Shelter density; WASH supplies; chemicals; site management presence
Service disruption	Infestation and disease surveillance gaps
Civilian harm	Disease risk
Actor question	Who conditions sanitation chemicals, site management access, and water safety?
Status	PASS as source-dated

F.2 Fuel Pathway

Fuel-dependent system	Humanitarian operations
Source-supported event	OCHA reported fuel shortages forced partners to prioritize life-saving services and suspend non-critical activities.
Control input	Fuel entry volume, entry route, operating hours, allocation
Service disruption	Reduced operations across non-priority services
Civilian harm	Reduced humanitarian service availability
Actor question	Who controls fuel entry, route, hours, and allocation?
Status	PASS as source-dated

Fuel-dependent system	WASH
Source-supported event	OCHA reported fuel prioritization allowed water production/treatment, water trucking, and limited waste collection, but operations remained below required levels.
Control input	Fuel availability/allocation
Service disruption	Water and sanitation services constrained
Civilian harm	Unsafe water, disease risk, waste accumulation
Actor question	Who conditions fuel for WASH services?
Status	PASS as source-dated

Fuel-dependent system	Generators
Source-supported event	OCHA reported fuel shortages were compounded by lack of lubricant oils, approval for which is difficult to secure.
Control input	Fuel plus lubricant oil approval
Service disruption	Generator capacity reduced even if fuel restored
Civilian harm	Hospitals/WASH/aid systems impaired
Actor question	Who controls approval of generator-related inputs?
Status	PASS as source-dated

F.3 Food Pathway

Food dimension	General food assistance
Source-supported event	OCHA reported partners provided general food assistance to more than 420,000 people from 1-13 June; parcels covered 75% of minimum caloric needs.
Control input	Aid entry, distribution, funding, logistics
Service disruption	Aid partially supports but does not fully cover needs
Civilian harm	Hunger/food insecurity risk
Actor question	Who conditions food assistance scale, adequacy, and access?
Status	PASS as source-dated

Food dimension	Cooked meals
Source-supported event	OCHA reported partners prepared nearly 713,000 meals/day as of 3 June, but at least 400,000 daily meals had been suspended since May due to funding constraints and rising costs.
Control input	Funding, kitchens, fuel, supplies, access

Service disruption	Meal production reduced
Civilian harm	Reduced cooked-food availability
Actor question	Which constraints are financial, access-related, security-related, or policy-related?
Status	PASS as source-dated
Food dimension	Food classification
Source-supported event	IPC confirmed Famine in Gaza Governorate in Aug. 2025; IPC's later analysis reported severe food insecurity through Nov. 2025 and projected conditions through Apr. 2026.
Control input	Conflict, access, food systems, health/WASH
Service disruption	Severe food insecurity and malnutrition risk
Civilian harm	Hunger, destitution, death risk
Actor question	What is the latest IPC classification now?
Status	CURRENT FAMINE CLAIM HOLD
Food dimension	Acute malnutrition
Source-supported event	IPC projected nearly 101,000 children aged 6–59 months would suffer acute malnutrition through mid-Oct. 2026.
Control input	Food, disease, WASH, health access
Service disruption	Child malnutrition treatment needs
Civilian harm	Child morbidity/mortality risk
Actor question	Who conditions nutrition treatment, food, water, and health access?
Status	PASS as projection

F.4 Health / Hospital Pathway

Hospital function	Endoscopic/surgical procedures
Source-supported event	OCHA reported over 520 procedures might be suspended without urgent entry of high-level disinfection agents.
Control input	Medical-supply entry/approval
Service disruption	Procedures at risk of suspension
Civilian harm	Treatment delay, infection risk, preventable harm
Actor question	Who controls entry/approval of disinfectant agents?
Status	PASS as source-dated
Hospital function	Dialysis
Source-supported event	OCHA reported dialysis services continue in named hospitals/field unit, but medicine shortages require many patients to need blood transfusions, straining supplies/capacity.
Control input	Medicine availability; supply entry; hospital capacity
Service disruption	Dialysis support weakened
Civilian harm	Death/deterioration risk
Actor question	Who conditions dialysis medicines and blood-supply capacity?
Status	PASS as source-dated
Hospital function	Rehabilitation
Source-supported event	OCHA reported rehabilitation needs exceed capacity and import requests for equipment/artificial limbs continue being denied.
Control input	Equipment approval/import
Service disruption	Rehabilitation capacity constrained
Civilian harm	Long-term disability burden
Actor question	Who denies/conditions rehab equipment entry?
Status	PASS as source-dated

F.5 Displacement / Shelter Pathway

Displacement condition	Yellow Line displacement
Source-supported event	OCHA reported dozens of families displaced after yellow cement blocks signalled westward Yellow Line expansion; many left without tents/belongings.
Control input	Restricted-access line; military movement/insecurity
Service disruption	Sudden displacement
Civilian harm	Shelter loss, insecurity, family disruption
Actor question	Who defined/enforced the restricted-access area?
Status	PASS as source-dated
Displacement condition	Emergency shelter
Source-supported event	OCHA reported partners supported 428 households from 8–14 June after shelter/belongings loss due to fire, collapse, or forced displacement.
Control input	Shelter aid; rapid response; site access
Service disruption	Emergency response needed
Civilian harm	Exposure and survival risks
Actor question	Who conditions shelter response and site access?
Status	PASS as source-dated
Displacement condition	Shelter assistance
Source-supported event	OCHA reported nearly 1,370 households received shelter/essential items from 7–13 June despite severe constraints.
Control input	Supplies, funding, access, site conditions
Service disruption	Limited shelter response
Civilian harm	Exposure, overcrowding
Actor question	Which constraints limit shelter support?
Status	PASS as source-dated

F.6 Communications Pathway

Communication function	Internet/mobile access
Source-supported event	Reuters reported a June 2025 UN-described full internet blackout that paralyzed aid operations and cut emergency/humanitarian coordination.
Control input	Cable damage, military activity, network infrastructure
Service disruption	Internet and mobile services disabled or barely functioning
Civilian harm	Emergency services, coordination, and civilian information disrupted
Actor question	Who damaged, controlled, repaired, or conditioned communication infrastructure?
Status	PASS as 2025 pathway
Communication function	Current communications
Source-supported event	Not established by this pass.
Control input	Current network status
Service disruption	Current outage/availability unknown
Civilian harm	Unknown current civilian effect
Actor question	What is current communications status?
Status	HOLD

5. Updated Appendix G — Legal Posture / Docket Table

Source	Status	Allowed wording	Disallowed wording
ICJ Case 192	Contentious case / provisional-measure materials located	"The ICJ ordered provisional measures..."	"The ICJ issued a final genocide judgment..."
ICJ Case 186	Advisory opinion, 19 July 2024	"The ICJ concluded in an advisory opinion..."	"The ICJ convicted..."
ICJ Case 196	Advisory opinion, 22 Oct. 2025	"The ICJ advised/concluded in advisory posture..."	"The ICJ entered a criminal judgment..."
ICC Palestine	Arrest warrants issued by Pre-Trial Chamber	"The ICC issued arrest warrants alleging..."	"The ICC convicted..."
UN Commission/OHCHR	Investigative/commission findings	"The Commission found/concluded..."	"A court held..."
HRW/Amnesty	NGO investigative/legal assessments	"HRW/Amnesty concluded..."	"A court held..."
COGAT/Israeli official sources	Party-source posture	"COGAT stated/denied/alleged..."	"It is established that..." unless independently supported

6. Updated Appendix H — Finkelstein / Underlying Source Trail

Finkelstein trail	Underlying source(s)	Integration decision
Cast Lead / Goldstone	UN Fact-Finding Mission / Goldstone Report; Amnesty; HRW	Optional Appendix I only
Cast Lead / white phosphorus	HRW *Rain of Fire*	Incident/source-method evidence only
Cast Lead / civilian killings	HRW *White Flag Deaths*	Incident/source-method evidence only
Mavi Marmara	UN HRC Fact-Finding Mission; Palmer Report; Turkel Commission	Optional Appendix J only
Protective Edge	UNHRC Commission materials	Optional Appendix K only
Post-2005 control/occupation	HRW, Gisha, ICJ advisory materials	Appendix L + narrowed main-body claim
Current humanitarian conditions	OCHA, IPC, WHO, COGAT, Reuters/AP	Must be current-source led, not Finkelstein-led

The governing rule remains:

Quoted working language

Finkelstein identifies trails. The underlying sources carry claims.

7. Findings Status Table for v1.7

Finding	Label	v1.7 status	Reason
1	Function-specific control analysis	PASS	Source architecture supports function-specific control
2	Long-running protected-condition damage	PASS WITH SOURCE COMPLETION	OCHA/IPC/WHO support humanitarian systems; Roy/UNCTAD still needed for deeper historical baseline
3	2005 disengagement changed control question	PASS WITH CONTESTATION	HRW/Gisha and counter-position support debate framing
4	Palestinian agency is real, plural, condition-constrained	PASS	Actor framework + humanitarian pathways support
5	Hamas is distinct governing/coercive/military actor	PASS WITH SPLIT	October 7/armed role sourced; internal coercion partly sourced; aid theft contested
6	Humanitarian harm as life-support pathway failure	PASS	OCHA/IPC/WHO/Reuters support water/fuel/food/health/comms pathways
7	Aid access as control pathway	PASS	COGAT/OCHA/AP comparison supports chain method
8	Current-control claims must be date-stamped	PASS	Dashboard and source conflict require date control
9	Prior-war clusters are method evidence only	PASS	Underlying source trails identified
10	Human-shields claims require separated treatment	PASS AS PROTOCOL	Incident-specific claims still require incident sources
11	Legal-risk findings must be posture-controlled	PASS WITH FINAL DOCKET CHECK	ICJ/ICC/UN posture table updated
12	Secondary scholarship may guide but not carry claims	PASS	Finkelstein source-trail system remains intact

8. Remaining HOLD List After v1.7

Item	Status	Reason
Latest food-security classification after 15 Apr. 2026	HOLD	IPC acute food insecurity projection found through 15 Apr. 2026; latest post-April source still needed
Current communications status as of June 2026	HOLD	Reuters 2025 source supports pathway, not current 2026 status
Primary Israeli official legal source on post-2005 occupation obligations	HOLD	Gisha documents Israel's position; primary source still preferable
Roy/UNCTAD de-development source completion	HOLD	Needed for stronger historical protected-condition baseline
Egypt/Rafah current role	HOLD	Still needs current source
Exact Yellow Line map/route	HOLD	OCHA text supports function; map needed if visualized
Final ICJ/ICC/UN docket check immediately before circulation	HOLD BY DESIGN	Must be repeated close to circulation
Full pinpoint citations/page numbers for historical cluster appendices	HOLD	Needed only if Appendices I-K are sent to cluster reviewers

9. v1.7 Footnote Additions

Add these to the footnote bank if not already present:

[^FOOD-IPC-2025-OCTAPR]: IPC, "Gaza Strip: Acute Food Insecurity Situation for 16 October–30 November 2025 and Projection for 1 December 2025–15 April 2026," <https://www.ipcinfo.org/ipc-country-analysis/details-map/en/c/1159820/>.

[^FOOD-IPC-AMN-2026-OCT]: IPC, "Gaza Strip: Acute Malnutrition Situation for 16 October–30 November 2025 and Projection for 1 December 2025–15 April 2026," <https://www.ipcinfo.org/ipc-country-analysis/details-map/en/c/1159821/>.

[^HAMAS-UNCOI-2026-ABUSES-AP]: Associated Press, "Militants and police executed and maimed dozens of Palestinians in Gaza, UN report says," June 2026, <https://apnews.com/article/f7d63d25c91556ad6c02fd9b76040b21>.

[^HAMAS-UNCOI-2026-ABUSES-REUTERS]: Reuters, "UN inquiry finds Israeli forces shield settlers during attacks on Palestinians," June 2026, <https://www.reuters.com/world/middle-east/un-inquiry-finds-israeli-forces-shield-settlers-during-attacks-palestinians-2026-06-09/>.

[^HAMAS-UNCOI-2026-ABUSES-LEMONDE]: Le Monde, "In Gaza, UN inquiry reports Hamas abuses against Palestinians," 11 June 2026, https://www.lemonde.fr/en/international/article/2026/06/11/in-gaza-un-investigative-commission-reports-hamas-abuses-against-palestinians_6754346_4.html.

[^AID-REUTERS-USAID-HAMAS-THEFT]: Reuters, "USAID analysis found no evidence of massive Hamas theft of Gaza aid," 25 July 2025, <https://www.reuters.com/world/middle-east/usaid-analysis-found-no-evidence-massive-hamas-theft-gaza-aid-2025-07-25/>.

[^COMM-REUTERS-BLACKOUT-2025]: Reuters, "UN says full internet blackout in Gaza, paralyzing aid operations," 12 June 2025, <https://www.reuters.com/world/middle-east/un-says-full-internet-blackout-gaza-paralyzing-aid-operations-2025-06-12/>.

[^AID-COGAT-FAQ-2026]: COGAT / State of Israel Ministry of Defense, "FAQ — Humanitarian efforts into Gaza — June 2026," <https://gaza-aid-data.gov.il/media/j5lmmgfg/faq-humanitarian-efforts-into-gaza-june-2026.pdf>.

[^AID-AP-CEASEFIRE-FLOWS-2025]: Associated Press, "Aid flow into Gaza falls short of ceasefire terms," December 2025, <https://apnews.com/article/gaza-food-aid-trucks-ceasefire-7e6ea6dd3ef32928f791af0f690b7d88>.

[^CTRL-GISHA-ISRAEL-POSITION]: Gisha, "Disengaged Occupiers: The Legal Status of Gaza," 17 January 2007, https://www.gisha.org/UserFiles/File/publications_english/Publications_and_Reports_English/Disengaged_Occupiers_en.pdf.

[^CTRL-BRITANNICA-DISENGAGEMENT]: Encyclopaedia Britannica, "Israel's disengagement from Gaza," <https://www.britannica.com/event/Israels-disengagement-from-Gaza>.

[^LAW-ICJ-CASE192-OFFICIAL]: International Court of Justice, Case No. 192, "Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide in the Gaza Strip (South Africa v. Israel)," <https://www.icj-cij.org/case/192>.

[^LAW-ICJ-CASE192-PM-OFFICIAL]: International Court of Justice, Case No. 192, "Provisional Measures," <https://www.icj-cij.org/case/192/provisional-measures>.

[^LAW-ICJ-CASE186-OFFICIAL]: International Court of Justice, Case No. 186, "Legal Consequences arising from the Policies and Practices of Israel in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem," <https://www.icj-cij.org/case/186>.

[^LAW-ICJ-CASE196-OFFICIAL]: International Court of Justice, Case No. 196, "Obligations of Israel in relation to the Presence and Activities of the United Nations, Other International Organizations and Third States in and in relation to the Occupied Palestinian Territory," <https://www.icj-cij.org/case/196>.

[^ICC-PALESTINE-OFFICIAL]: International Criminal Court, "State of Palestine," <https://www.icc-cpi.int/palestine>.

[^ICC-NETANYAHU-OFFICIAL]: International Criminal Court, "Netanyahu," <https://www.icc-cpi.int/defendant/netanyahu>.

[^UNCOI-OHCHR-OFFICIAL]: OHCHR, "Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and Israel," <https://www.ohchr.org/en/hr-bodies/hrc/co-israel/index>.

Fractured Authority and Condition-Control in Gaza

Compressed Source Bibliography

Version: v1.8 compressed bibliography Status: Working bibliography for review packet; not final Bluebook/Chicago formatting.

Courts and Legal Institutions

- International Court of Justice, Case No. 192, *Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide in the Gaza Strip (South Africa v. Israel)*, <https://www.icj-cij.org/case/192>.
- International Court of Justice, Case No. 192, "Provisional Measures," <https://www.icj-cij.org/case/192/provisional-measures>.
- International Court of Justice, Case No. 186, *Legal Consequences arising from the Policies and Practices of Israel in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem*, Advisory Opinion, 19 July 2024, <https://www.icj-cij.org/case/186>.
- International Court of Justice, Case No. 196, *Obligations of Israel in relation to the Presence and Activities of the United Nations, Other International Organizations and Third States in and in relation to the Occupied Palestinian Territory*, Advisory Opinion, 22 October 2025, <https://www.icj-cij.org/case/196>.
- International Criminal Court, "State of Palestine," <https://www.icc-cpi.int/palestine>.
- International Criminal Court, "Netanyahu," <https://www.icc-cpi.int/defendant/netanyahu>.
- OHCHR, Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and Israel, <https://www.ohchr.org/en/hr-bodies/hrc/co-israel/index>.

Humanitarian and Operational Sources

- OCHA oPt, "Humanitarian Situation Report | 19 June 2026," published 20 June 2026, <https://www.ochaopt.org/content/humanitarian-situation-report-19-june-2026>.
- OCHA oPt, "Humanitarian Situation Report | 12 June 2026," published 13 June 2026, <https://www.ochaopt.org/content/humanitarian-situation-report-12-june-2026>.
- OCHA oPt, "Humanitarian Situation Report | 5 June 2026," published 6 June 2026, <https://www.ochaopt.org/content/humanitarian-situation-report-5-june-2026>.
- IPC, "Gaza Strip: Acute Food Insecurity Situation for 1 July–15 August 2025 and Projection for 16 August–30 September 2025," released 22 August 2025, <https://www.ipcinfo.org/ipc-country-analysis/details-map/en/c/1159696/>.

- IPC, “Gaza Strip: Acute Food Insecurity Situation for 16 October–30 November 2025 and Projection for 1 December 2025–15 April 2026,” <https://www.ipcinfo.org/ipc-country-analysis/details-map/en/c/1159820/>.
- IPC, “Gaza Strip: Acute Malnutrition Situation for 16 October–30 November 2025 and Projection for 1 December 2025–15 April 2026,” <https://www.ipcinfo.org/ipc-country-analysis/details-map/en/c/1159821/>.
- WHO EMRO, “Gaza Hostilities Emergency Situation Reports,” <https://www.emro.who.int/opt/information-resources/emergency-situation-reports.html>.
- WHO, “Conflict in Israel and the occupied Palestinian territory,” <https://www.who.int/emergencies/situations/conflict-in-Israel-and-oPt>.

Human-Rights and Investigative Sources

- Human Rights Watch, “Israel: ‘Disengagement’ Will Not End Gaza Occupation,” 28 October 2004, <https://www.hrw.org/news/2004/10/28/israel-disengagement-will-not-end-gaza-occupation>.
- Gisha, “Disengaged Occupiers: The Legal Status of Gaza,” 17 January 2007, <https://gisha.org/en/disengaged-occupiers-the-legal-status-of-gaza/>.
- Human Rights Watch, “October 7 Crimes Against Humanity, War Crimes by Hamas-led Groups,” 17 July 2024, <https://www.hrw.org/news/2024/07/17/october-7-crimes-against-humanity-war-crimes-hamas-led-groups>.
- Human Rights Watch, “‘I Can’t Erase All the Blood from My Mind’: Palestinian Armed Groups’ October 7 Assault on Israel,” 17 July 2024, <https://www.hrw.org/report/2024/07/17/i-cant-erase-all-the-blood-from-my-mind/palestinian-armed-groups-october-7>.
- Amnesty International, “Targeting Civilians and Other Violations by Hamas and Other Armed Groups,” 2025, <https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/mde15/0282/2025/en/>.
- Associated Press, “Militants and police executed and maimed dozens of Palestinians in Gaza, UN report says,” June 2026, <https://apnews.com/article/f7d63d25c91556ad6c02fd9b76040b21>.
- Reuters, “UN inquiry finds Israeli forces shield settlers during attacks on Palestinians,” June 2026, <https://www.reuters.com/world/middle-east/un-inquiry-finds-israeli-forces-shield-settlers-during-attacks-palestinians-2026-06-09/>.
- Le Monde, “In Gaza, UN inquiry reports Hamas abuses against Palestinians,” 11 June 2026, https://www.lemonde.fr/en/international/article/2026/06/11/in-gaza-un-investigative-commission-reports-hamas-abuses-against-palestinians_6754346_4.html.

Party / Official Sources

- COGAT / State of Israel Ministry of Defense, “FAQ — Humanitarian efforts into Gaza — June 2026,” <https://gaza-aid-data.gov.il/media/j5lmmgfg/faq-humanitarian-efforts-into-gaza-june-2026.pdf>.

Current Reporting

- Reuters, “USAID analysis found no evidence of massive Hamas theft of Gaza aid,” 25 July 2025, <https://www.reuters.com/world/middle-east/usaaid-analysis-found-no-evidence-massive-hamas-theft-gaza-aid-2025-07-25/>.
- Reuters, “UN says full internet blackout in Gaza, paralyzing aid operations,” 12 June 2025, <https://www.reuters.com/world/middle-east/un-says-full-internet-blackout-gaza-paralyzing-aid-operations-2025-06-12/>.
- Associated Press, “Aid flow into Gaza falls short of ceasefire terms,” December 2025, <https://apnews.com/article/gaza-food-aid-trucks-ceasefire-7e6ea6dd3ef32928f791af0f690b7d88>.

Background and Historical Sources

- CFR Education, "Israeli-Palestinian Conflict Timeline," last updated 24 June 2025, <https://education.cfr.org/learn/timeline/israeli-palestinian-conflict-timeline>.
- Council on Foreign Relations, "Israeli-Palestinian Conflict," Global Conflict Tracker, updated 28 May 2026, <https://www.cfr.org/global-conflict-tracker/conflict/israeli-palestinian-conflict>.
- United Nations, UNISPAL, "History of the Question of Palestine," <https://www.un.org/unispal/history/>.
- Encyclopaedia Britannica, "Israel's disengagement from Gaza," <https://www.britannica.com/event/Israels-disengagement-from-Gaza>.

Secondary / Source-Trail Sources

- Norman G. Finkelstein, *Gaza: An Inquest into Its Martyrdom*, University of California Press, 2018.
- Sara Roy, de-development work. Status: source completion still needed.
- UNCTAD Gaza economic/development materials. Status: source completion still needed.

Historical-Cluster Sources

- United Nations Fact-Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict, "Human Rights in Palestine and Other Occupied Arab Territories," A/HRC/12/48, 25 September 2009, <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/666096?ln=en>.
- Amnesty International, "Operation 'Cast Lead': 22 Days of Death and Destruction," 2009, <https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/mde15/015/2009/en/>.
- Human Rights Watch, "Rain of Fire: Israel's Unlawful Use of White Phosphorus in Gaza," 25 March 2009, <https://www.hrw.org/report/2009/03/25/rain-fire/israels-unlawful-use-white-phosphorus-gaza>.
- Human Rights Watch, "White Flag Deaths: Killings of Palestinian Civilians during Operation Cast Lead," 13 August 2009, <https://www.hrw.org/report/2009/08/13/white-flag-deaths/killings-palestinian-civilians-during-operation-cast-lead>.
- UN Human Rights Council Fact-Finding Mission, A/HRC/15/21, 2010, <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/691164?ln=en>.
- Report of the Secretary-General's Panel of Inquiry on the 31 May 2010 Flotilla Incident, 2011, <https://unispal.un.org/pdfs/GazaFlotillaPanelReport.pdf>.
- Turkel Commission, "The Public Commission to Examine the Maritime Incident of 31 May 2010," Part One, January 2011, https://www.gov.il/blobfolder/generalpage/downloads_eng1/en/eng_turkel_eng_a.pdf.
- UN Human Rights Council, "Report of the independent commission of inquiry established pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution S-21/1," 2015, <https://www.ohchr.org/en/hr-bodies/hrc/co-i-gaza-conflict/report-co-i-gaza>.

Part IV - Source Dossier and Historical Clusters

Bibliography, historical-cluster appendices, correction notes, and dispatch rules.

v1.8 Compressed Source Bibliography

Included source file

gaza_paper_v1_8_compressed_source_bibliography.md. Bibliography for review packet, not final Bluebook or Chicago formatting.

Fractured Authority and Condition-Control in Gaza

Compressed Source Bibliography

Version: v1.8 compressed bibliography Status: Working bibliography for review packet; not final Bluebook/Chicago formatting.

Courts and Legal Institutions

- International Court of Justice, Case No. 192, *Application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide in the Gaza Strip (South Africa v. Israel)*, <https://www.icj-cij.org/case/192>.
- International Court of Justice, Case No. 192, "Provisional Measures," <https://www.icj-cij.org/case/192/provisional-measures>.
- International Court of Justice, Case No. 186, *Legal Consequences arising from the Policies and Practices of Israel in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem*, Advisory Opinion, 19 July 2024, <https://www.icj-cij.org/case/186>.
- International Court of Justice, Case No. 196, *Obligations of Israel in relation to the Presence and Activities of the United Nations, Other International Organizations and Third States in and in relation to the Occupied Palestinian Territory*, Advisory Opinion, 22 October 2025, <https://www.icj-cij.org/case/196>.
- International Criminal Court, "State of Palestine," <https://www.icc-cpi.int/palestine>.
- International Criminal Court, "Netanyahu," <https://www.icc-cpi.int/defendant/netanyahu>.
- OHCHR, Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and Israel, <https://www.ohchr.org/en/hr-bodies/hrc/co-israel/index>.

Humanitarian and Operational Sources

- OCHA oPt, "Humanitarian Situation Report | 19 June 2026," published 20 June 2026, <https://www.ochaopt.org/content/humanitarian-situation-report-19-june-2026>.
- OCHA oPt, "Humanitarian Situation Report | 12 June 2026," published 13 June 2026, <https://www.ochaopt.org/content/humanitarian-situation-report-12-june-2026>.
- OCHA oPt, "Humanitarian Situation Report | 5 June 2026," published 6 June 2026, <https://www.ochaopt.org/content/humanitarian-situation-report-5-june-2026>.
- IPC, "Gaza Strip: Acute Food Insecurity Situation for 1 July–15 August 2025 and Projection for 16 August–30 September 2025," released 22 August 2025, <https://www.ipcinfo.org/ipc-country-analysis/details-map/en/c/1159696/>.
- IPC, "Gaza Strip: Acute Food Insecurity Situation for 16 October–30 November 2025 and Projection for 1 December 2025–15 April 2026," <https://www.ipcinfo.org/ipc-country-analysis/details-map/en/c/1159820/>.

- IPC, “Gaza Strip: Acute Malnutrition Situation for 16 October–30 November 2025 and Projection for 1 December 2025–15 April 2026,” <https://www.ipcinfo.org/ipc-country-analysis/details-map/en/c/1159821/>.
- WHO EMRO, “Gaza Hostilities Emergency Situation Reports,” <https://www.emro.who.int/opt/information-resources/emergency-situation-reports.html>.
- WHO, “Conflict in Israel and the occupied Palestinian territory,” <https://www.who.int/emergencies/situations/conflict-in-Israel-and-oPt>.

Human-Rights and Investigative Sources

- Human Rights Watch, “Israel: ‘Disengagement’ Will Not End Gaza Occupation,” 28 October 2004, <https://www.hrw.org/news/2004/10/28/israel-disengagement-will-not-end-gaza-occupation>.
- Gisha, “Disengaged Occupiers: The Legal Status of Gaza,” 17 January 2007, <https://gisha.org/en/disengaged-occupiers-the-legal-status-of-gaza/>.
- Human Rights Watch, “October 7 Crimes Against Humanity, War Crimes by Hamas-led Groups,” 17 July 2024, <https://www.hrw.org/news/2024/07/17/october-7-crimes-against-humanity-war-crimes-hamas-led-groups>.
- Human Rights Watch, “‘I Can’t Erase All the Blood from My Mind’: Palestinian Armed Groups’ October 7 Assault on Israel,” 17 July 2024, <https://www.hrw.org/report/2024/07/17/i-cant-erase-all-the-blood-from-my-mind/palestinian-armed-groups-october-7>.
- Amnesty International, “Targeting Civilians and Other Violations by Hamas and Other Armed Groups,” 2025, <https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/mde15/0282/2025/en/>.
- Associated Press, “Militants and police executed and maimed dozens of Palestinians in Gaza, UN report says,” June 2026, <https://apnews.com/article/f7d63d25c91556ad6c02fd9b76040b21>.
- Reuters, “UN inquiry finds Israeli forces shield settlers during attacks on Palestinians,” June 2026, <https://www.reuters.com/world/middle-east/un-inquiry-finds-israeli-forces-shield-settlers-during-attacks-palestinians-2026-06-09/>.
- Le Monde, “In Gaza, UN inquiry reports Hamas abuses against Palestinians,” 11 June 2026, https://www.lemonde.fr/en/international/article/2026/06/11/in-gaza-un-investigative-commission-reports-hamas-abuses-against-palestinians_6754346_4.html.

Party / Official Sources

- COGAT / State of Israel Ministry of Defense, “FAQ — Humanitarian efforts into Gaza — June 2026,” <https://gaza-aid-data.gov.il/media/j5lmmgfg/faq-humanitarian-efforts-into-gaza-june-2026.pdf>.

Current Reporting

- Reuters, “USAID analysis found no evidence of massive Hamas theft of Gaza aid,” 25 July 2025, <https://www.reuters.com/world/middle-east/usaaid-analysis-found-no-evidence-massive-hamas-theft-gaza-aid-2025-07-25/>.
- Reuters, “UN says full internet blackout in Gaza, paralyzing aid operations,” 12 June 2025, <https://www.reuters.com/world/middle-east/un-says-full-internet-blackout-gaza-paralyzing-aid-operations-2025-06-12/>.
- Associated Press, “Aid flow into Gaza falls short of ceasefire terms,” December 2025, <https://apnews.com/article/gaza-food-aid-trucks-ceasefire-7e6ea6dd3ef32928f791af0f690b7d88>.

Background and Historical Sources

- CFR Education, "Israeli-Palestinian Conflict Timeline," last updated 24 June 2025, <https://education.cfr.org/learn/timeline/israeli-palestinian-conflict-timeline>.
- Council on Foreign Relations, "Israeli-Palestinian Conflict," Global Conflict Tracker, updated 28 May 2026, <https://www.cfr.org/global-conflict-tracker/conflict/israeli-palestinian-conflict>.
- United Nations, UNISPAL, "History of the Question of Palestine," <https://www.un.org/unispal/history/>.
- Encyclopaedia Britannica, "Israel's disengagement from Gaza," <https://www.britannica.com/event/Israels-disengagement-from-Gaza>.

Secondary / Source-Trail Sources

- Norman G. Finkelstein, *Gaza: An Inquest into Its Martyrdom*, University of California Press, 2018.
- Sara Roy, de-development work. Status: source completion still needed.
- UNCTAD Gaza economic/development materials. Status: source completion still needed.

Historical-Cluster Sources

- United Nations Fact-Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict, "Human Rights in Palestine and Other Occupied Arab Territories," A/HRC/12/48, 25 September 2009, <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/666096?ln=en>.
- Amnesty International, "Operation 'Cast Lead': 22 Days of Death and Destruction," 2009, <https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/mde15/015/2009/en/>.
- Human Rights Watch, "Rain of Fire: Israel's Unlawful Use of White Phosphorus in Gaza," 25 March 2009, <https://www.hrw.org/report/2009/03/25/rain-fire/israels-unlawful-use-white-phosphorus-gaza>.
- Human Rights Watch, "White Flag Deaths: Killings of Palestinian Civilians during Operation Cast Lead," 13 August 2009, <https://www.hrw.org/report/2009/08/13/white-flag-deaths/killings-palestinian-civilians-during-operation-cast-lead>.
- UN Human Rights Council Fact-Finding Mission, A/HRC/15/21, 2010, <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/691164?ln=en>.
- Report of the Secretary-General's Panel of Inquiry on the 31 May 2010 Flotilla Incident, 2011, <https://unispal.un.org/pdfs/GazaFlotillaPanelReport.pdf>.
- Turkel Commission, "The Public Commission to Examine the Maritime Incident of 31 May 2010," Part One, January 2011, https://www.gov.il/blobfolder/generalpage/downloads_eng1/en/eng_turkel_eng_a.pdf.
- UN Human Rights Council, "Report of the independent commission of inquiry established pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution S-21/1," 2015, <https://www.ohchr.org/en/hr-bodies/hrc/co-i-gaza-conflict/report-co-i-gaza>.

Optional Historical-Cluster Review File

Included source file

fractured_authority_condition_control_gaza_v1_8_optional_historical_clusters.md. Cast Lead/Goldstone, Mavi Marmara, Protective Edge/Black Friday, and Finkelstein source-trail audit notes.

Fractured Authority and Condition-Control in Gaza

Optional Historical-Cluster Review File

Version: v1.8 optional appendix file Status: Optional — send only to reviewers assessing historical source clusters, source-drift, Finkelstein trails, or prior-war report use.

Use Rule

Appendices I-K should not be required for every reviewer.

They are useful for reviewers assessing:

- Cast Lead / Goldstone source posture;
- Mavi Marmara / blockade-law source conflict;
- Protective Edge / Black Friday source reconstruction;
- Finkelstein source-trail audit;
- whether prior-war evidence is being used too strongly.

They should not be used to prove current intent, current facts, current humanitarian conditions, or current legal responsibility.

The governing rule is:

Quoted working language

Prior-war clusters generate current-event questions. Current claims require current evidence.

Appendix I — Cast Lead and Goldstone Cluster

I.0 Purpose

Appendix I preserves the Cast Lead and Goldstone materials as historical, evidentiary, and source-posture material.

This appendix does not use Cast Lead to prove present-day intent, legality, or responsibility. It uses Cast Lead to show how prior Gaza conflicts generated dense disputes over:

- civilian harm;
- casualty classification;
- infrastructure destruction;

- white phosphorus;
- property destruction;
- human-shields claims;
- official responses;
- legal characterization;
- later source drift.

I.1 Main Use Rule

Cast Lead may be used for:

- historical background;
- source-method evidence;
- question generation.

Cast Lead may not be used to prove:

- current intent;
- current legal responsibility;
- current battlefield facts;
- current humanitarian conditions;
- current actor conduct.

I.2 Cast Lead Source Cluster Map

Source	Source class	Likely use	Main caution
Goldstone Report	Class 1 / 3	Institutional fact-finding and legal-risk analysis	Later controversy requires source-posture note
Amnesty Cast Lead report	Class 3	Civilian harm, legal analysis, incident evidence	Compare with other investigations
HRW white phosphorus report	Class 3	Specific weapon/incident family	Incident-specific use
HRW property destruction report	Class 3	Civilian property and infrastructure destruction	Incident-specific use
HRW White Flag Deaths	Class 3	Civilian killings incident cluster	Incident-specific use
B'Tselem materials	Class 3 / 7	Casualty classification and incident documentation	Compare methodology
PCHR materials	Class 7	Local documentation and casualty data	Corroborate
Al Mezan materials	Class 7	Local documentation and casualty data	Corroborate
Breaking the Silence testimony	Class 7	Soldier testimony and operational practice	Corroborate and classify as testimony
Israeli official responses	Class 4	Party position and denial/justification	Treat as adversarial source

I.3 Goldstone Source-Posture Note

The Goldstone Report should be treated as a source-posture and source-drift case. The report should compare the original findings, later public statements, responses by other commissioners, and later commentary rather than compressing the issue into a slogan.

Avoid:

Quoted working language

Goldstone proves everything.

Avoid:

Quoted working language

Goldstone recanted, so nothing remains.

Use:

Quoted working language

The Goldstone Report and later controversy should be treated as a source-posture and source-drift case.

Appendix J — Mavi Marmara and Blockade-Law Cluster

J.0 Purpose

Appendix J treats Mavi Marmara as a blockade-law, humanitarian-access, and source-comparison case.

It is not a main-body centerpiece. It is useful because it shows how different institutional and official sources may reach different conclusions about the same event, the same blockade context, and the same legal questions.

J.1 Main Use Rule

Mavi Marmara may be used to analyze:

- blockade legality disputes;
- humanitarian-access arguments;
- official Israeli investigation posture;
- UN fact-finding posture;
- UN Panel / Palmer posture;
- state and party claims;
- source conflict.

Mavi Marmara should not be used to prove current aid conditions or current humanitarian access facts.

J.2 Mavi Marmara Source Comparison Table

Source	Source class	Posture	Likely use	Main caution
UN Fact-Finding Mission	Class 1 / 3	Investigative institutional source	Incident findings; legal-risk analysis	Compare with other official/institutional sources
Turkel Report	Class 4 / official investigation	Israeli official or state-linked investigation	Israeli legal/factual position	Treat as official source, not neutral resolution
UN Panel / Palmer Report	Class 1 / institutional/political-legal review	International panel report	Source comparison; blockade-law posture	Do not treat as final court judgment
Amnesty commentary	Class 3	NGO critique/assessment	Investigation-quality critique	Not binding adjudication
UNSC 1860	Class 1	Security Council resolution	Humanitarian access and ceasefire background	Use for legal/political posture only

J.3 Working Conclusion

Mavi Marmara is a source-comparison and blockade-law cluster. It helps show why legal posture matters, but it does not establish current humanitarian access facts.

Appendix K — Protective Edge and Black Friday Cluster

K.0 Purpose

Appendix K preserves the Protective Edge and Black Friday source clusters as prior-war method evidence.

This appendix is relevant because Protective Edge generated extensive institutional, NGO, forensic, official, and local documentation on:

- civilian harm;
- residential destruction;
- warnings;
- evacuation feasibility;
- proportionality;
- safe zones;
- infrastructure destruction;
- human-shields claims;
- Rafah / Black Friday;
- official responses;
- legal characterization.

K.1 Main Use Rule

Protective Edge may be used to:

- identify recurring source questions;
- compare UN, NGO, forensic, local, and official source posture;
- generate current-event questions about warnings, safe routes, safe zones, infrastructure, and proportionality;

- inspect how legal claims are built from incident evidence;
- evaluate source drift or NGO critique.

Protective Edge may not be used to prove:

- current intent;
- current legality;
- current battlefield facts;
- current humanitarian conditions;
- current proportionality;
- current warnings or evacuation feasibility.

K.2 Protective Edge Source Cluster Map

Source	Source class	Likely use	Main caution
UNHRC Protective Edge report	Class 1 / 3	Institutional findings, legal-risk analysis	Not a court judgment
Amnesty Protective Edge reports	Class 3	Incident evidence, residential destruction, legal assessment	Compare with UN/HRW/local sources
Amnesty / Forensic Architecture Black Friday	Class 3 / 7	Forensic reconstruction, Rafah timeline, incident analysis	Inspect directly; do not rely on summaries
HRW materials	Class 3	Incident evidence and legal assessment	Compare source claims
B'Tselem materials	Class 3 / 7	Casualty and incident data	Compare methodology
PCHR materials	Class 7	Local documentation	Corroborate
Al Mezan materials	Class 7	Local documentation	Corroborate
Breaking the Silence testimony	Class 7	Soldier testimony and operational practice	Corroborate
Israeli official responses	Class 4	Party position, legal/factual denials or justifications	Attribute; do not treat as neutral fact
Finkelstein critique	Class 6	Audit prompt and source-trail guide	Not load-bearing

K.3 Warning / Evacuation / Safe-Zone Questions

For any warning, evacuation, or safe-zone claim, ask:

- Was a warning issued?
- Was the warning specific?
- Was there enough time to comply?
- Could civilians physically leave?
- Was the route safe?
- Was the destination safe?
- Were children, elders, disabled people, and hospital patients able to comply?
- Did civilians have communications access?
- Was return possible?

K.4 Working Conclusion

Protective Edge and Black Friday provide source-method lessons about warnings, safe zones, proportionality, infrastructure, and forensic reconstruction. They do not prove current claims.

Historical-Cluster Sources

- United Nations Fact-Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict, “Human Rights in Palestine and Other Occupied Arab Territories,” A/HRC/12/48, 25 September 2009, <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/666096?ln=en>.
- Amnesty International, “Operation ‘Cast Lead’: 22 Days of Death and Destruction,” 2009, <https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/mde15/015/2009/en/>.
- Human Rights Watch, “Rain of Fire: Israel’s Unlawful Use of White Phosphorus in Gaza,” 25 March 2009, <https://www.hrw.org/report/2009/03/25/rain-fire/israels-unlawful-use-white-phosphorus-gaza>.
- Human Rights Watch, “White Flag Deaths: Killings of Palestinian Civilians during Operation Cast Lead,” 13 August 2009, <https://www.hrw.org/report/2009/08/13/white-flag-deaths/killings-palestinian-civilians-during-operation-cast-lead>.
- UN Human Rights Council Fact-Finding Mission, A/HRC/15/21, 2010, <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/691164?ln=en>.
- Report of the Secretary-General’s Panel of Inquiry on the 31 May 2010 Flotilla Incident, 2011, <https://unispal.un.org/pdfs/GazaFlotillaPanelReport.pdf>.
- Turkel Commission, “The Public Commission to Examine the Maritime Incident of 31 May 2010,” Part One, January 2011, https://www.gov.il/blobfolder/generalpage/downloads_eng1/en/eng_turkel_eng_a.pdf.
- UN Human Rights Council, “Report of the independent commission of inquiry established pursuant to Human Rights Council resolution S-21/1,” 2015, <https://www.ohchr.org/en/hr-bodies/hrc/co-i-gaza-conflict/report-co-i-gaza>.

Source Correction Note

Included source file

gaza_v3_0_source_correction_note.md. Preserves a correction to a later OCHA source anchor.

v3.0 Source Correction Note

OCHA 26 June 2026 correction

v2.9 treated OCHA's "Humanitarian Situation Report | 26 June 2026" as the current humanitarian anchor.

During the v3.0 source check, the direct URL for a 26 June 2026 report did not resolve to usable report text. The latest OCHA humanitarian situation report verified in this pass was:

Quoted working language

OCHA oPt, "Humanitarian Situation Report | 19 June 2026," published 20 June 2026.

Therefore v3.0 uses OCHA 19 June 2026 as the current verified humanitarian anchor until a later OCHA report is confirmed.

Why this matters

This correction protects the paper's source discipline. The framework cannot claim source posture as a strength while relying on an unverified current anchor.

Repair applied

- OCHA 26 June references were removed or downgraded.
- OCHA 19 June 2026 is now the verified humanitarian anchor.
- The draft includes a current-fact warning.
- The source ledger flags future source refresh as required before circulation or publication.

Dispatch Memo

Included source file

gaza_v3_2_dispatch_memo.md. Practical memo explaining what to send and what not to claim.

v3.2 Dispatch Memo

What to send

Send these files together:

- `fractured\_authority\_condition\_control\_gaza\_v3\_2\_final\_pre\_dispatch\_repair\_draft.md`
- `gaza\_v3\_1\_external\_use\_test\_dispatch\_packet.md`
- `gaza\_v3\_1\_reviewer\_tracker.md`
- `gaza\_v3\_0\_source\_correction\_note.md`

How to frame it

This is a use-test request, not an endorsement request.

Recommended framing:

Quoted working language

I'm sending this as a working draft for pressure-testing. The project began as my interpretation of Gaza's fractured-authority problem and developed into a possible public-facing answerability method. I need to know whether condition-control adds useful discrimination or merely renames what your field already does.

What not to claim

Do not say:

- the method is validated;
- the method is new in all respects;
- the draft is publication-ready;
- condition-control replaces functional occupation or humanitarian logistics;
- the paper proves legal or moral responsibility.

What to ask

Ask reviewers to test:

- whether the medical-evacuation pathway is accurate;
- whether condition-control adds anything beyond their field's ordinary method;
- whether the paper overclaims;
- whether the map-not-verdict rule holds;
- whether the paper should narrow to an audit protocol.

Closing Note

Fullness over elegance

This edition intentionally preserves repetition where it shows project development, source discipline, guardrails, review posture, or repair history. It is a complete original-root dossier, not a compressed publication article.

The controlling rule remains: the original Gaza case study is the root document. The later method, tool, audit, review, and source materials show development around that root and should be read as development layers, not replacements.