

# The Evolution of Foreign Aid in Global Health: From Colonial Legacy to Reimagined Futures

## Introduction

Foreign aid has been a complex and controversial component in global health for decades. While it has contributed to significant health improvements worldwide, its origins, intentions, and impacts merit critical examination. This article traces the historical trajectory of foreign aid in global health, analyzes its successes and failures, and explores pathways toward a more equitable, decolonized global health paradigm that centers the needs, priorities, and leadership of the Global South while maintaining global collective responsibility.

## The Historical Roots of Foreign Aid in Global Health

### Colonial Foundations and Post-Colonial Transitions

Foreign aid as we understand it today did not emerge in a vacuum but evolved from colonial relationships. During the colonial era (late 19th to mid-20th century), European powers established rudimentary health systems in their colonies, primarily to protect colonial administrators and ensure workforce productivity rather than to improve indigenous health (Packard, 2016). These health systems were highly selective, focusing on diseases that threatened colonial economic interests while neglecting broader health needs.

The transition from colonialism to foreign aid was not a clean break but rather a reformation of existing power dynamics. After World War II, as formal colonialism became politically untenable, former colonial powers shifted to new modes of influence. The 1947 Marshall Plan, though focused on European reconstruction, established a template for foreign assistance that would later be adapted for developing nations (Escobar, 1995).

### Cold War Politics and the Instrumentalization of Health Aid

The Cold War period (1947-1991) saw health aid become deeply politicized. Both Western powers and the Soviet bloc used health assistance strategically to expand their spheres of influence. The United States, through programs like President Truman's Point Four Program and later USAID, provided technical assistance and funding to developing nations aligned with Western interests (Birn et al., 2017).

During this period, international health initiatives often reflected donor priorities rather than recipient needs. Vertical disease-specific programs targeting malaria, smallpox, and later HIV/AIDS received substantial funding, while comprehensive health system strengthening received less attention (Mukherjee, 2018).

## The Rise of International Financial Institutions

The 1980s and 1990s marked the increasing influence of international financial institutions like the World Bank and International Monetary Fund in global health. Structural adjustment programs imposed requirements for reduced public spending, including on healthcare, often devastating already fragile health systems (Kim et al., 2000). User fees were introduced in many countries, creating barriers to healthcare access for the poorest populations.

This period reinforced what critics identify as "neocolonial" relationships, where economic dependencies replaced direct political control but maintained historical power imbalances (Fanon, 1963; Rodney, 1972). Health aid often came with conditions that limited recipient countries' policy sovereignty and reinforced dependencies (Kentikelenis et al., 2016).

## Accomplishments and Limitations of Traditional Foreign Aid

### Notable Successes

Despite problematic foundations, foreign aid has contributed to significant health improvements globally:

1. **Disease Eradication and Control:** Global campaigns have successfully eradicated smallpox and nearly eradicated polio, while substantially reducing the burden of diseases like guinea worm and river blindness (Henderson, 2009; Bhutta et al., 2014).
2. **HIV/AIDS Response:** Programs like PEPFAR and the Global Fund have provided life-saving antiretroviral treatment to millions living with HIV/AIDS (Gostin, 2014).
3. **Child Mortality Reduction:** Between 1990 and 2019, global under-five mortality rates dropped by nearly 60%, partly attributable to international health initiatives (UN IGME, 2020).
4. **Vaccine Development and Distribution:** International cooperation has accelerated vaccine development and expanded immunization coverage in low-resource settings (Berkley, 2014).

### Structural Limitations and Failures

Despite these achievements, fundamental problems have limited aid effectiveness:

1. **Donor-Driven Priorities:** Health initiatives frequently reflect donor rather than recipient priorities, creating misalignments with local needs and fragmenting health systems (Sridhar & Batniji, 2008).
2. **Vertical Programming:** Disease-specific programs often operate in parallel to national health systems, sometimes weakening rather than strengthening overall health infrastructure (Shiffman, 2006).
3. **Short-Term Horizons:** Project-based funding cycles prioritize quick, measurable results over sustainable system building (Spicer et al., 2014).
4. **Power Asymmetries:** Decision-making remains concentrated in Global North institutions, with limited meaningful participation from recipient countries (Abimbola, 2019).

5. **Aid Volatility and Dependency:** Unpredictable funding flows make long-term planning difficult and create dependencies that undermine local ownership (Dieleman et al., 2016).

## The Collapse of Traditional Aid Models and Emerging Crises

The traditional foreign aid model is showing significant signs of strain. Donor fatigue, shifting geopolitical priorities, and increasing nationalism in traditional donor countries have led to stagnating or decreasing aid budgets (Kharas, 2018). The COVID-19 pandemic exposed and exacerbated these tensions, with vaccine nationalism and inadequate global cooperation revealing the limitations of existing global health governance structures (Yamey et al., 2020).

Climate change further threatens to undermine health gains, with its impacts disproportionately affecting Global South populations who contributed least to the problem (Patz et al., 2007). Meanwhile, rising authoritarianism and democratic backsliding in various regions complicate international cooperation on health (Gostin et al., 2021).

These converging crises mark what may be the end of the post-World War II global health order. Yet rather than cause for despair, this moment offers an opportunity to reimagine global health relationships on more equitable terms.

## Reimagining Global Health for the Future

### Decolonizing Global Health: From Rhetoric to Praxis

Decolonizing global health requires moving beyond cosmetic reforms to address fundamental power imbalances. Key aspects include:

1. **Knowledge Production and Expertise Recognition:** Valuing diverse knowledge systems and expertise from the Global South rather than privileging Western academic institutions and paradigms (Büyüm et al., 2020).
2. **Governance Reform:** Restructuring international health organizations to ensure meaningful participation and decision-making power for Global South representatives (Abimbola & Pai, 2020).
3. **Funding Mechanisms:** Developing financing approaches that prioritize unrestricted, long-term funding controlled by recipient countries and communities (Erondy et al., 2021).
4. **Language and Framing:** Moving away from paternalistic narratives of "helping" or "saving" toward recognizing historical injustices and centering equity (Richardson, 2020).

## Global South Leadership and Health System Sovereignty

For the Global South, this transition moment demands:

1. **Domestic Resource Mobilization:** Increasing public health spending through progressive taxation and reduced illicit financial flows (Meghani & Eckenwiler, 2015).
2. **Regional Cooperation:** Strengthening South-South collaboration through mechanisms like the African Union's Africa CDC or the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (Otu et al., 2021).
3. **Local Priority Setting:** Developing health agendas based on community needs rather than external funding opportunities (Ouma & Nabyonga-Orem, 2018).
4. **Human Resources Investment:** Building capacity through education, decent working conditions, and mechanisms to limit brain drain (Aluttis et al., 2014).

## Global Collective Responsibility and Restructured Partnerships

While emphasizing Global South leadership, global health remains a collective responsibility requiring transformed partnerships:

1. **Reparative Justice:** Acknowledging historical harms and establishing mechanisms for reparative action, including technology transfer, intellectual property reforms, and climate justice provisions (Bhakuni & Abimbola, 2021).
2. **Global Public Goods:** Strengthening frameworks for shared investment in global public goods like pandemic preparedness, antimicrobial resistance containment, and climate adaptation (Moon et al., 2017).
3. **Mutual Accountability:** Developing bidirectional accountability mechanisms where both donors and recipients hold each other responsible for commitments (Clinton & Sridhar, 2017).
4. **Democratic Global Health Governance:** Creating more inclusive governance structures that incorporate civil society, affected communities, and historically marginalized populations (Kickbusch & Szabo, 2014).

## The Way Forward: Uncomfortable Conversations and Radical Reimagination

Progress toward a decolonized, equitable global health system requires confronting uncomfortable realities that have long been sidestepped in polite global health discourse:

1. **Historical Injustices:** Openly discussing how colonialism, racism, and exploitation have shaped current global health inequities (Hirsch, 2020).
2. **Power and Privilege:** Examining how privilege operates in global health institutions, from who speaks at conferences to who receives research funding (Abimbola, 2019).

3. **Economic Models:** Questioning whether market-based approaches can deliver health equity or if alternative economic frameworks are needed (Sanders et al., 2019).
4. **Accountability for Impact:** Moving beyond measuring activities and outputs to holding all actors accountable for meaningful health improvements (Storeng & Palmer, 2019).

## Conclusion

The apparent collapse of traditional foreign aid models in global health represents not only a crisis but also an opportunity. By critically examining the colonial roots and structural limitations of conventional approaches, we can begin to envision and construct more equitable alternatives. This requires the Global South asserting leadership in defining priorities and building sovereign health systems, while the Global North contributes through transformed partnerships based on justice and shared responsibility.

Achieving the health-related Sustainable Development Goals depends not on doing more of the same but on fundamentally reimagining global health relationships. The path forward demands uncomfortable conversations, radical thinking, and a willingness to dismantle entrenched power structures. Only through such transformative change can we build a global health system that truly serves everyone, especially those historically marginalized by existing arrangements.

## References

1. Abimbola, S. (2019). The foreign gaze: Authorship in academic global health. *BMJ Global Health*, 4(5), e002068.
2. Abimbola, S., & Pai, M. (2020). Will global health survive its decolonisation? *The Lancet*, 396(10263), 1627-1628.
3. Aluttis, C., Bishaw, T., & Frank, M. W. (2014). The workforce for health in a globalized context – global shortages and international migration. *Global Health Action*, 7(1), 23611.
4. Berkley, S. (2014). Improving access to vaccines through tiered pricing. *The Lancet*, 383(9936), 2265-2267.
5. Bhakuni, H., & Abimbola, S. (2021). Epistemic injustice in academic global health. *The Lancet Global Health*, 9(10), e1465-e1470.
6. Bhutta, Z. A., et al. (2014). Evidence-based interventions for improvement of maternal and child nutrition: What can be done and at what cost? *The Lancet*, 382(9890), 452-477.
7. Birn, A. E., Pillay, Y., & Holtz, T. H. (2017). *Textbook of global health* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
8. Büyüm, A. M., et al. (2020). Decolonising global health: If not now, when? *BMJ Global Health*, 5(8), e003394.
9. Clinton, C., & Sridhar, D. (2017). *Governing global health: Who runs the world and why?* Oxford University Press.
10. Dieleman, J. L., et al. (2016). Development assistance for health: Past trends, associations, and the future of international financial flows for health. *The Lancet*, 387(10037), 2536-2544.

11. Erondy, N. A., et al. (2021). Open letter to international funders of science and development in Africa. *Nature Medicine*, 27(5), 742-744.
12. Escobar, A. (1995). *Encountering development: The making and unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton University Press.
13. Fanon, F. (1963). *The wretched of the earth*. Grove Press.
14. Gostin, L. O. (2014). *Global health law*. Harvard University Press.
15. Gostin, L. O., et al. (2021). The legal determinants of health: Harnessing the power of law for global health and sustainable development. *The Lancet*, 393(10183), 1857-1910.
16. Henderson, D. A. (2009). *Smallpox: The death of a disease*. Prometheus Books.
17. Hirsch, L. A. (2020). Is it possible to decolonise global health institutions? *The Lancet*, 395(10238), 1673-1674.
18. Kentikelenis, A., et al. (2016). IMF conditionality and development policy space, 1985–2014. *Review of International Political Economy*, 23(4), 543-582.
19. Kharas, H. (2018). *Trends and issues in development aid*. Brookings Institution.
20. Kickbusch, I., & Szabo, M. M. C. (2014). A new governance space for health. *Global Health Action*, 7(1), 23507.
21. Kim, J. Y., et al. (2000). *Dying for growth: Global inequality and the health of the poor*. Common Courage Press.
22. Meghani, Z., & Eckenwiler, L. (2015). Care for the caregivers? Transnational justice and undocumented non-citizen care workers. *International Journal of Feminist Approaches to Bioethics*, 8(1), 30-56.
23. Moon, S., et al. (2017). Global public goods for health: Weaknesses and opportunities in the global health system. *Health Economics, Policy and Law*, 12(2), 195-205.
24. Mukherjee, J. S. (2018). *An introduction to global health delivery: Practice, equity, human rights*. Oxford University Press.
25. Otu, A., et al. (2021). Africa needs to prioritize One Health approaches that focus on the environment, animal health and human health. *Nature Medicine*, 27(6), 943-946.
26. Ouma, P. O., & Nabyonga-Orem, J. (2018). Universal health coverage: A continuum of health service delivery for achieving essential package of health interventions and strengthening priority disease programmes in tropical Africa. *African Journal of Primary Health Care & Family Medicine*, 10(1), e1-e3.
27. Packard, R. M. (2016). *A history of global health: Interventions into the lives of other peoples*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
28. Patz, J. A., et al. (2007). Climate change and global health: Quantifying a growing ethical crisis. *EcoHealth*, 4(4), 397-405.
29. Richardson, E. T. (2020). *Epidemic illusions: On the coloniality of global public health*. MIT Press.
30. Rodney, W. (1972). *How Europe underdeveloped Africa*. Bogle-L'Ouverture Publications.