Foreign Aid Topic Paper

Sitara Mazumdar, David Trigaux, Jay Yoon, Washington D.C.

Summary: Foreign Aid Topic Paper

Foreign Aid sits at the intersection of humanitarian values, national interest, and international stability, providing food for those in need, technical assistance for countries expanding their capacity to govern, and crucial healthcare policies. Yet the Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE) purged an entire industry that had made a notable impact across the globe for almost a century.

One of the major tools of foreign policy was obliterated in a few months, leading to retrenchment of other major providers of aid, massive reductions in NGO support, and rising poverty, child mal-nutrition, and deaths from our change in policy.

We propose the following resolutions for consideration:

1. The United States federal government should substantially increase its provision of foreign technical assistance.

2. The United States federal government should substantially increase its foreign aid.

3. The United States federal government should substantially increase its foreign aid deliveries for programs active in the last ten years.

4. The United States federal government should substantially increase its foreign aid deliveries in one or more of the following areas: humanitarian aid, development aid, military aid, political and economic aid.

5. The United States federal government should substantially increase its provision of foreign technical assistance for humanitarian, military, political, and / or international development.

6. The United States federal government should substantially increase its official development assistance (ODA).

Foreign Assistance isn't just charity - it's diplomacy, leadership, influence, and coercion. The topic will help students learn about how countries relate to one another, shaping alliances and patronage networks, how conflict starts and how global institutions operate.

Educationally, the topic forces students to confront moral complexity. In a black and white, soundbite driven world, foreign aid raises uncomfortable but essential questions, such as the obligations that wealthy nations have to poorer ones, what happens when humanitarianism and national interest are in conflict, and is it ethical to attach conditions to foreign assistance.

In an era of alternative facts, foreign aid is an evidence driven topic, with concrete research available about the efficacy of certain programs - health outcomes, economic growth rates, governance indicators, etc. with studies from dozens of countries.

All topics this year will address issues of global concern, but few will offer an intersectional look at issues from war and peace, international development, climate change, refugees and migration, and post-colonial dynamics. The trade-offs involved are not only good for policy analysis, it is highly debatable, with limited budgets, short versus long term considerations, and divides between civilian and military action.

Affirmative teams will have the chance to be in the thick of one of the biggest intellectual divides in American politics, sorting out if DOGE cuts made with a chainsaw should instead have been made with a scalpel and what foreign assistance looks like in a newly transactional world.

Negative teams will have an array of tools to argue against US interventions overseas, and / or at least against intervention without getting anything in return. A wide range of new literature written about the cuts will provide deep toolboxes of disadvantages, counterplans, and Kritiks with strong, generic case cards for novices and program specific critiques for Varsity debaters.

Narrative

History and Context

The United States has made ad hoc diplomatic and humanitarian gestures for a hundred years based on national interest, often supporting missionary groups, trade delegations, and the occasional loan for an ally around war-time.

The Marshall Plan, launched in 1947 after World War II kicked off modern foreign aid. After World War II, President Truman knew that we needed to re-build the war-torn countries of Europe and Asia, both as markets for American goods, but also as allied countries able to join the United States and other western allies in the emerging Cold War against the Soviet block.

The focus of the Marshall Plan's investments provided massive economic assistance to rebuild Western Europe, revive industrial capacity, and prevent political instability that could open the door to communist influence. It was described in the papers as a humanitarian effort, but in reality, the plan was a geopolitical tool designed to shape the postwar order. Its success cemented the idea that economic assistance could serve both moral and strategic purposes.

As the Cold War unfolded, foreign aid became tightly linked to containment policy, providing incentives for countries to remain allied with the United States instead of the Soviet block. The United States directed funds, technical support, and military assistance to countries seen as vulnerable to communist movements across 6 continents. Aid flowed to regions such as Latin America, the Middle East, and Southeast Asia, often supporting governments aligned with U.S. interests regardless of their democratic credentials. This era expanded the scope of aid beyond reconstruction to include development, security cooperation, and ideological competition.

A major structural shift came with the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, which reorganized scattered programs and created the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). This legislation established long-term development, agriculture, health, and education as formal pillars of U.S. aid. Over time, new priorities emerged: population programs in the 1970s, democracy promotion in the 1980s, and global health initiatives in the 1990s and 2000s.

After the September 11 attacks, foreign aid again took on a strategic edge. Assistance surged to Afghanistan, Iraq, and other regions tied to counterterrorism efforts. At the same time, major global health programs — such as the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) — demonstrated how aid could achieve large-scale humanitarian outcomes while also advancing political stability.

While a miniscule part of the US budget, foreign aid has consistently ranked as a political football. The average American routinely over-estimates how much of the federal budget is dedicated to foreign aid, and its unpopularity is overshadowed by these misconceptions.

Current Action

In 2025, Elon Musk's Department of Government Efficiency worked with Secretary of State Rubio to deconstruct USAID and most of the ways that the United States provided foreign aid. The budget was radically shrunk, and most of the surviving programs moved into the State Department, the Department of Defense, or the Department of Commerce. While the courts have prevented some of the cuts and firings of unionized staff, it was still one of the deepest and sharpest cuts DOGE made in the federal government.

The end result was the firing of thousands of staff and contractors, a freeze in billions of dollars of foreign aid. 83% of USAID programs were targeted for termination, with the rest reshuffled into other agencies. This laid off tens of thousands of federal workers and contractors both in the US and abroad, and functionally eliminated an entire international development industry, since grants to NGOs for non-military purposes have also been severely curtailed.

As a result, NGOs haven't had the budgets to fill in, and allied countries have largely mirrored our cuts instead of filling in, leaving either a vacuum where people suffer, or where other powers have moved in with more conditional, exploitative aid arrangements.

There have been discussions of Congressional restoration of USAID and / or its missions under a new guise. So far, this has not happened, though the robust chatter on the subject drives additional timely literature on the subject. A Democratic victory in the mid-terms is likely to increase the interest (and congressional action in general) in restoring some of these cuts, but with Trump still president for the entire year this would be debated, the progress that would be made would not harm the inherency of the topic (and the impoundments and implementation fights would improve it, frankly).

Aff Ground

While there will be some range based on the exact resolution, the affirmative will offer a rich range of affirmative arguments.

First, the affirmative could restore a program cut by DOGE. These programs have a lot of research that advocates for their efficacy, and lots of critique about their effectiveness as well. The recent, high profile cuts, have resulted in an explosion of literature on the subject.

Second, the affirmative could implement a new program, or restore a program in a new way than it was previously done. The limitation of “in the last decade” in some of the resolutions makes the provision of new programs a hard topicality sell, so how the committee falls on this limitation will be important. Public health programs were the most popular and are the hardest to argue against. We think that these will be at least part of the core of most versions of the resolution.

The United States offers economic aid, public health assistance, technical assistance to help governments improve their capacity, and a number of other (non-military) assistance programs. There will be several areas where affirmatives can develop offense, with some sample advantage areas.

1. The impact of the aid itself
    a. Poverty, terrorism, food prices, climate, economics of a recipient nation, democracy, disease, trade, etc.
2. The impact of the receipt of the aid, or
    a. Relations, economics, politics of another nation (or in the US)
3. The impact of rebuilding the industry of international aid, or
    a. Civil society / populism / democracy / diplomacy / epistemology, disaster response, economics, credibility
4. The benefits of doing the affirmative through a certain agency or actor
    a. Politics, credibility, budget trade-offs, militarism

US Key Warrants - US soft power is at its nadir, and the exodus of support has already happened. Instead, transactional political arrangements are in vogue, creating a new, interesting, and exciting set of reasons why the US might be necessary as part of an aff, forcing the aff to not just write a feel good case about helping people, but to think strategically about why we might need to be involved. Perhaps this is relations-related, or we’ll get something out of the deal in a quid pro quo? Trump has ushered in a new era of foreign policy dealmaking, opening the previously stale toolbox of justifications for US involvement.

Bottom Line: The high school and college debate communities have debated various kinds of foreign aid before (1956-57, 1992-1993, 1995-1996, 1997-1998, 2000-2001, 2003-2004, 2008-2009, 2011-2012 for college, and 1957-1958, 1966-1967, 1992-1993, 2007-2008, 2013-2014 for high school). Affirmative teams didn’t struggle.

Many of these topics mechanistically included military aid, making non-military assistance under-debated, historically, and we should be teaching young people about non-military conflict resolution mechanisms more than we do.

The recent changes from DOGE will only add greater inherency to affirmative advocacy, and new advantage areas to engage.

Neg Ground

Case Debate - The effectiveness of various programs are well documented and debated, allowing robust solvency debates. The effectiveness of different agencies to administer foreign aid is also a hot topic for debate.

There are many solvency take-outs/ways of arguing “aid bad”, such as arguing about aid’s ineffectiveness at creating long-term economic prosperity and growth, or arguments about aid leading to political instability from various actors vying for resource control. There are also arguments to be made about aid creating negative incentives for governments to enact reforms and provide proper implementation/oversight of development projects. There are also take-outs to foreign aid being an effective means of US soft power.

Disadvantages - There are several core disadvantages for this topic, but the one that is most unusual is Dutch Disease. Dutch Disease is an argument about dependence - when a nation becomes dependent on aid and the aid crowds out domestic economic growth and/or causes corruption and undermines democratic institutions. This is a great argument that can turn the case, but also has substantive independent impacts. Tactically, it can be run alongside Kritiks without performative contradiction, which is an added benefit. It also is a great net benefit for a number of counterplans. Other topic specific disadvantages could focus on the effects of aid diversion by elites or armed groups.

Other common disadvantages:
Budget Trade-Offs - budgets are allocated by Congress, and the plan would either require revenue enhancements, or trade-offs within the existing budget. These can be between comparable programs in different geographies or different programs.

Sphere of Influence - President Trump has laid out a foreign policy that divides the world into spheres of influence for regional powers. Where those exact lines are between the US, China, Russia, etc. are not hard and fast lines, however, and the exodus of aid has created a lane for other powers to edge us out. A robust impact debate can be had here if that is good or bad.

Relations Disadvantages - Giving countries things increases our relationship with them. Those who don’t get things feel left out. You’ll get all the best Russia, China, North Korea, Iran, etc. scenarios depending on the geographic restrictions in the resolution.

Politics Disadvantages - Foreign aid is very unpopular, election, base, and legislative scenarios are very much in play and are core negative ground.

Moral Hazard - Foreign Aid as a safety net encourages risky behavior if countries believe that we’ll bail them out.

Economics - There are a lot of economic implications of aid, including inflation and employment that are substantive drivers of economic growth or decline, depending on the scenario.

Counterplans
There are lots of good counterplan options here.

Agent - The Trump reforms have made agency counterplans great, with Commerce, Defense, and State all taking slices of the former foreign aid programs. Normal Means is up for grabs, and once the aff agrees (either in CX, or in their solvency advocates) to a mechanism, there are several alternative agencies newly empowered, practically and/or politically, that could do the aff, with various repercussions. Think State v DoD CPs on the Arm Sales Topic, but on steroids, and with more variety.

Various NGOs such as the Peace Corp, Oxfam, private sector organizations like the Hewlett Foundation, and IGOs like the UN and IMF, all have the capacities for aid in some way, and might be better positioned to understand the needs of certain areas, and thus, deliver more targeted aid that avoids the pitfalls of corruption.

Additionally, there are lots of international actors that could step in and test the US key warrants. This would be a great strategy to accompany a sphere of influence / relations argument.

Process - There are a myriad of ways to help other nations with formal foreign aid. Military assistance, loans, or other tools can help, as can domestic policy changes in the host countries. Different mechanisms of engagement would avoid budget trade-offs, political ramifications, mission creep, or any manner of net benefits.

Conditions - This is the rare topic where quid pro quo counterplans are heavily supported by the literature, predictable, and core of the topic. Conditioning foreign aid on democratic reforms, counter-terrorism cooperation, or other issues is heavily reflected in the literature.

Kritiks
The kritik ground on this topic is also broad and deep.

The Cap K links to foreign aid, as aid can be seen as a means of increasing capitalist hegemonic control, where recipients are expected to conform to said standards.

The Colonialism K also links, since aid imposes a notion of subservience and dependency upon the receiving country, while simultaneously acting as a band-aid solution to a lasting legacy of colonial exploitation.

The Security K links where aid can be given in order to protect the strategic security interests of the donor country, rather than for the betterment of the industries of the recipient country. In this way, aid is given to address perceived threats, combining development and security efforts that may not actually address the key issues that a country is facing.

Topicality
This will be a rich topic for topicality. Strong evidence exists (with intent to define, from federal sources that shape literature) to define the types of aid that the topic committee could put in the resolution, creating strong delineation and strong good debates.

The “last ten years” question is a pretty clear standard that can be researched - did a program get funded in a budget, and allows a clear “increase” brightline. It can also be phrased in the resolution in many ways, such as from a set date / budget.

List of Resolutions

1. The United States federal government should substantially increase its provision of foreign technical assistance.

2. The United States federal government should substantially increase its foreign aid.

3. The United States federal government should substantially increase its foreign aid deliveries for programs active in the last ten years.

4. The United States federal government should substantially increase its foreign aid deliveries in one or more of the following areas: humanitarian aid, development aid, military aid, political and economic aid.

5. The United States federal government should substantially increase its provision of foreign technical assistance for humanitarian, military, political, and / or international development.

6. The United States federal government should substantially increase its official development assistance (ODA).

Discussion:

There are several divides that the topic committee should weigh in on.

The first is between foreign aid, and technical assistance. Aid is a broader, more generic term that makes the topic very large, and relies on other modifiers (see below) to prevent it from being too large. Technical assistance is the supply of expertise, technology, training, etc. in a much more invested, direct way that has been provided in a much more limited manner.

For example - as we learned a few years ago, the US sells arms to a lot of nations each year, but the number of nations that we provide military technical assistance to (training, advisors on the ground, etc. is MUCH smaller and more temporary).

The second is modifiers to limit the topic temporally. After a review of the literature, we believe a time limit to restrict folks to recent aid projects could be a good way to prevent things like obscure 1950s aid to Greece vastly expanding the research burden of the debaters. We realize that there aren't a lot of resolutions with this mechanism, but believe in this instance, it is easily justified (or could be modified to specific budget years, presidencies, etc.

The third is the type of aid provision. The literature has a number of categories that can be used, but the ones that seemed most attractive to us were development and political (capacity building for civil society, etc.) and potentially military assistance, if we are going with the technical assistance route, which would have really neat cases about potential military advisors in Ukraine, Qatar, etc. in addition to the public health cases that will be a core of many of these resolutions.

Fourth: There are good ways to limit the topic geographically, but those mechanisms are built into several other papers (Humanitarian Aid, North Africa, Latin America, etc.), so we didn't want to re-invent the wheel here. Also, functionally, some mechanisms like technical assistance or different types of aid are only provided to a very narrow list of nations anyway, so you'll functionally end up with a list of nations that qualify.

Key Terms

Foreign aid (also described interchangeably in sources as foreign assistance) is the first key term that serves to distinguish itself from domestic aid provided by the federal government to other state/local governments and/or constituents.

Delivery/ies is the term that follows as aid is provided to recipient countries as opposed to the process being an explicit economic transaction, thus making terms such as sales or exports imprecise.

A list of aid categories is provided. The categories: humanitarian, development, military, political and economic are those most often seen in our searches and are effectively terms of art given their usage by Congress and other entities within the federal government.

The clause “for programs active in the last ten years” is included in light of the current administration’s unprecedented overhaul of foreign aid agencies and programs, most notably the US Agency for International Development (USAID) and its wide range of humanitarian, development, and political/economic aid programs. It also serves to prevent affirmatives that would create new aid programs (or resurrect those that previously existed outside the aforementioned decade-long timeframe) within the aforementioned categories, thereby limiting the topic.

Foreign aid (also described interchangeably in sources as foreign assistance or official development assistance) is the first key term that serves to distinguish itself from domestic aid provided by the federal government to other state/local governments and/or constituents. Development aid and official development assistance are used as each are the respective terms of art in the US and international contexts respectively. These terms have been used to limit the topic to (mostly) questions of foreign assistance that helps economically develop a country over longer periods of time and to distinguish from shorter term forms of aid, such as humanitarian following a disaster.

Foreign aid is used as the term in resolution 4 given that resources and money are distributed, or transferred from higher-income to lower-income countries. As the cards below illustrate, the term “development aid” as used in the US-specific context, as well as “official development assistance” (ODA).
While multilateral institutions have historically played a role, country-to-country aid is the focus for all four topic wordings (Witter n.pag). International aid and global aid are informal synonyms, however, “official development assistance” or ODA is the term used by international entities, most notably the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). This term is used in place of foreign aid in resolution 3 given they are interchangeable

Foreign technical assistance.
Technical assistance is the key term, which refers to non-monetary support, generally in the form of knowledge, skills, and/or technology (Nastaste et al. n.pag.). Sources such as Clauson (n.pag.) serve to explicitly exclude monetary assistance while others simply do not mention it when describing the types of support, implicitly ruling out monetary assistance as being part of the support provided.
The modifier “foreign” is present as an adjective in front of the term because technical

assistance is not inherently international and can refer to domestic uses, such as roads and infrastructure development and in education.

Official development assistance.
This term of art is used by international organizations such as the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD n.pag.). Such assistance is designed to aid in the recipient country's economic development.
While ODA statistically includes military involvement if they are involved in delivering and/or providing aid, this area is not significant enough to un-limit the topic for the negative and there is no significant aff ground gained even if affirmatives included such actions as a mechanism within their advocacy based on a review of the literature.

Foreign development aid.
Similar to technical assistance, there is some literature suggesting that development aid could be used in a domestic context (although not as much compared to sources discussing technical assistance). Thus, the modifier foreign is used to prevent affirmatives that advocate for domestic economic development.

Timeliness and Durability

A foreign aid topic is exceptionally timely and durable. Global assistance is a constantly evolving policy arena that remains central to U.S. foreign policy debates year after year, even as efforts to abolish it capture headlines.

Foreign aid appears regularly in public discourse—whether in discussions of humanitarian crises, great-power competition, global health funding, or debates over the federal budget—ensuring that students will encounter fresh arguments and new evidence throughout the season.

It is also durable: the underlying questions about how, why, and when the United States should provide aid are structural, not tied to a single administration or fleeting event, which means the topic will remain meaningful even two years after selection. As previous years debating this topic have shown, foreign aid is complex enough to sustain months of competition, offering rich ground for clash over economics, ethics, geopolitics, development theory, and national security. As global conditions shift—conflicts, climate impacts, migration pressures, and technological changes—new controversies will naturally emerge, giving students opportunities to refine and deepen their arguments across multiple tournaments.

Accessibility

This topic is presented by a staff member, a student, and a coach in an Urban Debate League precisely due to the accessibility and ease of debate.

It offers a huge body of publicly available research while still being intuitive enough for novices to grasp. Students already encounter foreign aid in news coverage of disasters, global health, and international conflicts, so the basic concepts feel familiar rather than abstract. At the same time, the topic is supported by an enormous range of accessible sources such as major newspapers, think-tank reports, government documents, NGO publications, and expert commentary, all of which are free or easy to obtain without specialized databases.

This ensures that well-resourced programs and small, first-year programs alike can build competitive cases and disadvantages. Foreign aid also naturally encourages students to explore diverse types of evidence, from economics and political science to ethics and international relations, helping new debaters learn how to research while giving advanced debaters enough depth to develop sophisticated strategies. Because the material is abundant, varied, and widely accessible, foreign aid avoids creating barriers to entry and supports equitable participation across the debate community.

Non-text-based sources, that is, audio-visual materials, are another novice friendly avenue for exploring foreign aid and identifying potential cards. An example is the documentary *Poverty Inc* (2014), which examines how foreign aid has become industrialized, resulting in an aid industrial complex, in locations including Haiti and countries throughout the African continent in the Global South. Humanitarian aid in the context of the 2010 Haitian earthquake provides a segue into how NGOs came to run the country.

The film offers a particularly scathing criticism of development aid as it empirically crowded out local industries and businesses that attempted to develop in recipient countries. Embedded in such criticism is opposition to political aid as well. The desirability of humanitarian aid is notably also mixed, with Haiti contrasting with Kenya and Ghana, where individuals interviewed defended humanitarian aid for when natural disasters inevitably occur.

A novice packet that chooses aid to a specific country, with public health or environmental advantages and a Dutch Disease or Relations Disadvantage on the negative would be highly accessible. Expansions to a packet could include an international actor CP, another disadvantage, and a Colonialism or Security K.

Novice Packet Suggestions:

We would recommend the following for an accessible, easy to engage novice packet:

- Aff One: Substantially increase public health assistance for HIV
    - Disease and poverty advantages, soft left framework
- Aff Two: Substantially increase technical assistance to Ukraine
    - Advantages about drones and the future of conflict, hegemony, extinction framework
- Aff Three: Substantially increase technical assistance to Mexico to combat cartels
    - Potential mix of military and state capacity assistance, advantages are drugs / terrorism / violence, economics, immigration

Off Case Positions:

- Dutch Disease Disadvantage
- Sphere of Influence Disadvantage
- China Counterplan
- Condition Aid Counterplan
- Colonialism Kritiks

Student Interest

Washington Urban Debate took the available topics and surveyed our students, which we do every year. The most popular topics were a rough tie between Foreign Aid (this paper), Latin America (authored by Mosie Burke) and Africa (authored by McAlister Clabaugh).

The topic sits at the intersection of issues they already care about and problems they're eager to understand more deeply. It connects directly to global challenges—climate change, humanitarian crises, global health, migration, and inequality—that show up constantly in their news feeds and social media spaces. Foreign policy topics are always a struggle with debaters who aren't already invested because they lack tangibility and seem far away, but foreign aid turns that on its head, feeling relevant rather than abstract.

At the same time, foreign aid raises big, foundational questions about ethics, responsibility, and power: What do wealthy countries owe the rest of the world? When does helping actually hurt? How should the U.S. balance humanitarian values with strategic interests? These are the kinds of questions young people naturally gravitate toward because they invite moral reasoning and critical thinking.

Foreign aid is also popular because it gives students a sense of agency. Debating it lets them imagine how policy choices ripple outward to affect millions of people, which can be energizing for students who want to understand how the world works and how it might be improved. And unlike highly technical policy areas, foreign aid is accessible—students can quickly grasp the stakes, find compelling stories, and build arguments using widely available sources. The combination of moral depth, global relevance, and approachable research makes foreign aid a topic that consistently resonates with young debaters.

We believe that the adult community should coach and listen to debates about foreign aid because of the proliferation of misinformation in this space. Many people think that foreign aid is a notable part of the budget, when it isn't. They also have very little concept of what the aid is actually spent on, so debating this topic for a year would be a meaningful civic intervention against perpetual misconceptions.

Educational Quality

The educational quality of foreign aid as a debate topic is high. It successfully balances complex, real-world issues we *want* young people to grapple with and issues they can access quickly and actually care about.

It forces debaters to confront competing values—humanitarian responsibility, national interest, economic development, and global security—while analyzing how policy choices ripple across borders. The topic naturally generates divergent viewpoints: some argue aid promotes stability and saves lives, while others warn about dependency, corruption, or geopolitical backlash. This built-in clash encourages students to evaluate evidence, weigh trade-offs, and think critically about how governments solve problems.

Foreign aid also mirrors the kinds of debates happening in Congress, international organizations, and academic research, giving students practice engaging with authentic policy controversies. Because it blends ethics, economics, international relations, and public policy, the topic pushes students to develop analytical reasoning, strategic thinking, and problem-solving skills that extend far beyond the debate round.

Balance

Foreign aid offers exceptionally balanced ground for both affirmatives and negatives. In the real world, strong advocacy and competing interests has the budget for foreign aid and its strategic goals seesaw back and forth, suggesting strong arguments and vested interests to write lots of literature on both sides.

The affirmative has clear, well-defined advantages—humanitarian impact, global health improvements, economic development, climate resilience, and strategic benefits such as strengthening alliances or countering rival influence.

At the same time, the negative has equally robust and diverse ground: arguments about dependency, corruption, geopolitical backlash, budget tradeoffs, domestic political costs, and unintended economic distortions. Both sides can access a wide range of case studies, theoretical frameworks, and policy models, ensuring neither team is locked into a narrow or predictable set of arguments.

The topic also naturally supports multiple types of negative strategies—disadvantages, counterplans, kritiks, and topicality—while still giving affirmatives room to innovate with different aid mechanisms, regions, and issue areas. Because the controversy contains genuine trade-offs and no side has an inherent structural advantage, foreign aid produces fair, competitive, and educationally rich debates across the entire season.

Bibliography

Andargie, Lidet. “THE EFFECT of POLITICAL INSTABILITY on FOREIGN AID: THE CASE of SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRIES.” Repository.smuc.edu.et, 1 June 2023, repository.smuc.edu.et/handle/123456789/7706.

Brown, Nick M, and Emily M Morgenstern. “Foreign Assistance: An Introduction to U.S. Programs and Policy.” Congress.gov, 2025, www.congress.gov/crs-product/R40213.

Brown, Stephen, and Jörn Grävingholt. “Security, Development and the Securitization of Foreign Aid.” The Securitization of Foreign Aid, 2016, pp. 1–17, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-56882-3_1.

Dadusc, Deanna, and Pierpaolo Mudu. “Care without Control: The Humanitarian Industrial Complex and the Criminalisation of Solidarity.” Geopolitics, vol. 27, no. 4, 17 Apr. 2020, pp. 1–26, https://doi.org/10.1080/14650045.2020.1749839.

“Foreign Aid” Debating for Everyone , 2025, www.debatingforeveryone.com/resources/think-like-a-debater/foreign-aid.

Fentahun, Getachew. “Foreign Aid in the Post-Colonial Africa: Means for Building Democracy or Ensuring Western Domination?” Cogent Social Sciences, vol. 9, no. 1, 1 Dec. 2023, pp. 1–15, https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2023.2241257.

Hattori, Tomohisa. “Giving as a Mechanism of Consent: International Aid Organizations and the Ethical Hegemony of Capitalism.” International Relations, vol. 17, no. 2, June 2003, pp. 153–173, https://doi.org/10.1177/00471178030172003.

Konig, Alice. “Foreign Aid, Neocolonialism and Peacebuilding – the Visualising Peace Library.” St-Andrews.ac.uk, 2024, visualisingpeace.wp.st-andrews.ac.uk/2024/04/18/foreign-aid-neocolonialism-and-peacebuilding/.

Mouneer, Salma, Rana Ejaz Ali Khan, and Noreen Safdar. "Does corruption invade the effectiveness of foreign aid on income inequality in developing economies." Pakistan Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences 10.1 (2022): 332-344.

“To Fight Corruption, Localize Aid: How US Foreign Assistance Can Support a Locally Driven Fight against Corruption.” Oxfam Policy & Practice, policy-practice.oxfam.org/resources/to-fight-corruption-localize-aid-how-us-foreign-assistance-can-support-a-locall-621399/.

Doherty-Bigara, Jennifer. “Understanding the Foreign Aid Debate.” Georgetown Public Policy Review, 27 Jan. 2014, gppreview.com/2014/01/26/understanding-the-foreign-aid-debate/.

Veltmeyer, Henry, and James Petras. “Foreign Aid, Neoliberalism, and US Imperialism.” Neoliberalism: A Critical Reader, by Alfredo Saad-Filho and Deborah Johnston, 20 Feb. 2005.

Cheeseman, Nic, University of Birmingham, Swedlund, Haley, Radboud University, and O’Brien-Udry, Cleo, Browne Center for International Relations, UPenn, “Foreign Aid withdrawals and suspensions, Why, when, and are they effective? Feb. 20, 2024, World Development. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0305750X2400041X#s0005

Clauson, Gerard. “What is technical assistance.” Unasylva, vol. 4, no. 4, 1950. Food and Agriculture Organization, https://www.fao.org/4/x5357e/x5357e00.htm#Contents. Accessed 15 June 2026.

Nastase, Alexandra, et al. “Technical assistance: a practical account of the challenges in design and implementation.” Gates Open Research, 2021. PubMed Central, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8920999/#sec8. Accessed 15 June 2026.

Appendixes

Foreign aid includes humanitarian, development, military, and political/economic aid

CFR 25 – independent, nonpartisan member organization, think tank, and publisher.
Council on Foreign Relations, What is U.S. Foreign Aid?," 04-24-2025, https://education.cfr.org/learn/reading/what-us-foreign-aid

Foreign aid typically falls into four general categories:

Humanitarian aid: Humanitarian aid consists of **materials or other forms of assistance for people in need due to manmade or natural disasters** such as war, famine, and extreme weather. This type of aid often aims to address the immediate needs of a population in crisis. In 2020, for example, the United States committed $4 billion in humanitarian assistance to an international partnership aiming to provide COVID-19 vaccines to ninety-two low- and middle-income countries.

Development aid: Development aid **includes investments in the long-term economic development of a country or community**. This type of aid aims to give people the building blocks to develop their own businesses and continued sources of income into the future. For instance, in 2016, USAID focused on providing economic development aid to Bangladesh by partnering with local banks to give loans to low-income farmers to build their businesses.

Military aid: Military aid includes **arms, training, money, or other forms of assistance** for the explicit purpose of defense. For example, the United States has provided more than $100 billion worth of military equipment to Ukraine since Russia's full-scale invasion of the country in 2022.

Political and economic aid: Political and economic aid **supports political stability, economic policy reforms, and democratic institutions**. It can provide general budget support in countries where the United States has strategic interests; it can also support activities such as peace talks, human rights organizing, political and criminal justice reforms, and treaty implementation. Following years of accusations of election corruption in Georgia in 2014, for example, USAID sent targeted political development aid to local organizations there to train and deploy election monitors.

Foreign aid is money, services, and goods.

Brown and McCabe 22 – Analyst in Foreign Assistance and Foreign Policy at the Congressional Research Service; Analyst in Foreign Assistance and Foreign Policy at the Congressional Research Service

Nick M. Brown, and Emily M. McCabe (Morgenstern), "Foreign Assistance: An Introduction to U.S. Programs and Policy," Congressional Research Service, 01-10-2022, https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/R40213

What is foreign aid?

Foreign aid is the money, services, or physical goods that a country sends to another to help it in some way. Foreign aid **might support the recipient country's economic growth, strengthen its social programs, respond to a crisis, or improve its defense capabilities**. For example, **during a health crisis, a country might send money to fund local hospitals**,

services in the form of doctors to administer medication, and goods in the form of those medicines themselves.
The United States has consistently been the largest single provider of foreign aid worldwide in total dollars. Since World War II, the United States has **distributed** almost $4 trillion (adjusted for inflation) in foreign aid. But **most developed countries spend a higher percentage of their GDP on foreign aid** than the United States does.

Foreign aid is substantial.
Brown and McCabe 22 – Analyst in Foreign Assistance and Foreign Policy at the Congressional Research Service; Analyst in Foreign Assistance and Foreign Policy at the Congressional Research Service
Nick M. Brown, and Emily M. McCabe (Morgenstern), "Foreign Assistance: An Introduction to U.S. Programs and Policy," Congressional Research Service, 01-10-2022, https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/R40213
Foreign assistance is the largest component of the international affairs budget and is viewed by many Members of Congress as **an essential instrument of U.S. foreign policy**. On **the basis of national security, commercial, and humanitarian rationales**, U.S. assistance flows **through many federal agencies and supports myriad objectives**. These objectives include **promoting economic growth, reducing poverty, improving governance, expanding** access to **health care and education**, **promoting stability** in conflict regions, countering terrorism, promoting human rights, strengthening allies, and curbing illicit drug production and trafficking. Since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, foreign aid has increasingly been associated with national security policy. At the same time, **some** Americans and **Members of Congress view foreign aid as an expense that the United States cannot afford given current budget deficits and** competing **budget priorities**.

Foreign aid takes many forms: expertise, training, grants, and goods.
Brown and McCabe 22 – Analyst in Foreign Assistance and Foreign Policy at the Congressional Research Service; Analyst in Foreign Assistance and Foreign Policy at the Congressional Research Service
Nick M. Brown, and Emily M. McCabe (Morgenstern), "Foreign Assistance: An Introduction to U.S. Programs and Policy," Congressional Research Service, 01-10-2022, https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/R40213
What Are the Different Forms in Which U.S. Assistance Is Provided?
Most U.S. assistance is now provided as a grant rather than a loan, so as not to increase the debt burden carried by many developing countries. However, **the forms a grant may take are diverse**. **The most common type** of U.S. development aid **is project-based assistance** (77% in FY2019), in which aid is channeled through an implementing partner, most often a contractor, multilateral organization, or nongovernmental organization, to complete a specific project. Aid is also provided in the form of core contributions to international organizations such as the United Nations, technical assistance, and direct budget support (cash transfer) to governments. Some assistance funds are also spent on administrative costs (see Figure 3).
Within these categories, aid may take many forms, as described below.
Expertise
Many assistance programs provide expert advice to government and private sector organizations. For example, the Department of **the Treasury**, **USAID**, **and U.S.-funded multilateral banks all place specialists in host government ministries** to make recommendations on policy reforms in a wide variety of sectors. USAID has often placed experts in private sector business and civic organizations to help strengthen them in their

formative years or while indigenous staff are being trained. **Such expert advice may come from U.S. nationals**, **but may also include** country nationals **employed by USAID** projects to offer policy options to that government or otherwise coordinate project efforts.

Training

Knowledge and skill transfer is a significant **part of most assistance programs**. The International Military Education and Training Program (IMET), for example, provides training to officers of the armed forces of allied and friendly nations. Tens of thousands of citizens of aid recipient countries receive technical training annually under USAID programs. Similarly, more than one-quarter of Peace Corps volunteers are English, math, and science teachers. Other aid programs provide law enforcement personnel with anti-narcotics or anti-terrorism training.

Grants

USAID, **the Inter-American Foundation**, and the African Development Foundation often provide aid in the form of grants directly to local organizations to foster economic and social development and to encourage civic engagement in their communities. Grants are sometimes provided to credit institutions, such as village-level women's savings groups, which in turn provide loans to microentrepreneurs. Small grants may also address specific community needs. Recent IAF grants, for example, have supported organizations that help resettle Salvadoran migrants deported from the United States and youth programs in Central America aimed at gang prevention. Large grants are often provided directly by USAID, but small-scale grants are most frequently administered under an implementing partner contract.

In-Kind Goods

Assistance may be provided in the form of food commodities, **weapons systems, or equipment such as generators** or computers. Food aid may be **provided directly to meet humanitarian needs or to encourage** attendance at a **maternal/child health care** program. Technical assistance may accompany goods provided, such as training for use of weapons supplied as military assistance. **Under development assistance**, **equipment and commodities** provided **are usually integrated with other forms of aid to meet objectives in a particular social or economic sector**. For instance, **textbooks have been provided in** both **Afghanistan and Iraq alongside a broader teacher training and educational reform effort**. Computers may be offered in conjunction with training and expertise to fledgling microcredit institutions. **Since PEPFAR** was first authorized in 2004, antiretroviral drugs (ARVs) provided to individuals living with HIV/AIDS have been a significant component of global health assistance.

Economic Infrastructure

Although once a significant portion of U.S. assistance programs, **direct construction of economic infrastructure**—roads, irrigation systems, electric power facilities, etc.—**has been a relatively small component of aid efforts since the 1970s**. Because of the substantial expense of these projects, they were to be found only in large bilateral assistance programs, such as that for Egypt in the 1980s and 1990s, where the United States constructed major urban water and sanitation systems. The aid programs implemented in support of post-U.S. invasion reconstruction in Iraq and Afghanistan were an exception, supporting the building of schools, health clinics, roads, power plants, and irrigation systems. In Iraq alone, more than $10 billion went to economic infrastructure. The Millennium Challenge Corporation funds much of the direct construction of economic infrastructure supported by U.S. assistance, using a competitive selection process to direct such programs toward well-governed countries in which these investments may be more sustainable. MDBs also continue to support infrastructure projects in developing countries, mostly by providing large-scale loans. With the growth of private direct investment in developing countries, U.S. efforts have shifted toward facilitation of private investments in infrastructure investments, including through the Power Africa initiative, the U.S. International Development Finance Corporation, and the International Transaction Advisory Network, among others.

Development assistance excludes military aid.
OECD ND – an international organization of 38 market-economy countries
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, “Peace and security expenditures in official development assistance (ODA),” No Date, https://www.oecd.org/en/topics/sub-issues/oda-eligibility-and-conditions/peace-and-security-expenditures-in-official-development-assistance-oda.htmlIn relation to the military
When assessing the ODA eligibility of activities involving engagement **with the military, specific rules and exclusions apply.**
Reportable as ODA
Using military personnel as a last resort to deliver humanitarian aid or perform development services. Only additional costs are eligible, i.e. those in excess over what the personnel or equipment would have cost to maintain, had they not been assigned to the development activity concerned. Neither regular salaries and expenses, nor regular equipment costs (e.g. maintenance costs) are eligible.
Excluded from ODA
Supply or financing of military equipment or services to strengthen military capabilities.
The use of military personnel to control civil disobedience.
Activities to protect the security of persons or property through the use or display of force.
Exceptions
Provider **engagement with partner country's military forces is excluded** from ODA **except for support for civilian oversight and democratic control of the military** system.
Training of the partner country military **is excluded from ODA** (including in non-military matters), **except when under civilian oversight and with a clear developmental purpose** for the benefit of civilians **in the following areas**:

- **human rights**,
- **protection of women in conflict and prevention of sexual and gender-based violence**,
- **international humanitarian law**,
- **humanitarian response and disaster relief** preparedness,
- **prevention and treatment of communicable diseases**,
- **anti-corruption, including prevention of predatory behaviour against civilians, and**
- **transparency, respect of civilian oversight and democratic control.**

ODA is the formal name for foreign aid.
Stanhope and Duke 24 – Research Associate in the Lowy Institute’s Indo-Pacific Development Centre; Research Fellow at the Lowy Institute and lead author of the Institute's Pacific Aid Map, holds a Master of International Relations from the University of Sydney
Grace Stanhope, and Riley Duke, “The Translator: The nomenclature of foreign aid,” The Interpreter, 05-15-2024, https://www.lowyinstitute.org/the-interpreter/translator-nomenclature-foreign-aid
Note: Edited for clarity. Edits in brackets [ ].
What is Official Development Assistance?
Official Development Assistance or **ODA is the formal name for** what is more commonly known as **foreign aid. The term covers flows of humanitarian and development-focused support given to developing countries**.
ODA can be **in the form of grants** – gifted money, supplies and equipment – **or discounted** (known as “concessional”) **loans** with interest rates far below market prices. **Military, security**

and commercially-driven support is excluded **from ODA. Only** low and middle-income countries **[LMICs] are eligible to receive ODA**, **and it** must be provided **by official government agencies or through multilateral institutions**.
Aid flows are reported as either commitments or disbursements, two categories often confused. Commitments are **signed deals**. Disbursements are the **actual transactions** where money is spent on the ground. There can be significant lags between commitments and disbursements, and some commitments are never followed through at all, so it's important to keep track of both.

-ODF/ODA.
Mahembe and Odhiambo 19 – Chief Executive Officer and Development Economist at Underhill Corporate Solutions, holds a Ph.D. in Development Economics and a M.Com. (Commerce) in Economics from the University of South Africa; Professor of Economics and Head of the Macroeconomic Policy Analysis Research Flagship Programme at the University of South Africa, Fellow of the African Academy of Sciences, holds a Ph.D. in Economics from Stellenbosch University (South Africa), and a M.A. in Economics from University of Dar es Salaam (Tanzania)
Edmore Mahembe, Nicholas M. Odhiambo, "Foreign aid and poverty reduction: A review of international literature," 2019, Cogent Social Sciences, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/23311886.2019.1625741,
2.2. Definition of foreign aid
The disbursement of official development assistance (ODA) or foreign aid as it is known today started soon after the World War II (McGillivray, Feeny, Hermes, & Lensink, 2006; World Bank, 1998). The donors' main motives for aid allocation are diverse; they include (i) assist in meeting humanitarian or emergence needs, (ii) assist developing countries achieve developmental (growth and poverty reduction) goals, (iii) show solidarity, (iv) secure political and strategic interest, (v) further commercial interest, (v) strengthen historical ties, and more recently (vi) fighting war on terror and (vii) promoting human rights (Riddell, 2008, pp. 91–92).

Broadly defined, foreign aid comprises all resources; physical goods, skills and technical knowhow, financial grants (gifts) or concessional loans, which are transferred by donors to recipient countries (Riddell, 2008). There are two broad types of foreign aid: official development finance (ODF) and official development assistance (ODA). ODA is sometimes used interchangeably with official aid (OA). ODA and OA cover (i) grants and (ii) concessional loans that have at least a 25% grant component (World Bank, 1998, p. 6). Both ODA and OA derive from the official sources and are given principally for promoting economic development and welfare of developing countries (OECD, 2009, p. 50). The only difference between ODA and OA is that OA is the payments to "transitional countries" and some "advanced" developing countries while ODA covers the rest of the developing countries (Clunies-Ross et al., 2009, p. 618).

Furthermore, ODA is a subset of ODF. ODF also includes non-concessional multilateral and bilateral developmental loans with a less than 25% grant element (OECD, 2006). Foreign aid can be classified into two broad groups, bilateral (two-sided) and multilateral (many-sided) aid. The former refers to aid given by one donor government directly to a recipient government. The latter is aid given by an international institution representing a number of government donors. In some cases, however, a donor can contract with a multilateral agency to deliver a programme or project on its behalf in a recipient country. Such cases are typically counted as bilateral flows and are often referred to as Bi/Multi (OECD, 2018). International institutions which administer multilateral aid include the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the World Bank (WB). Furthermore, bilateral aid is administered by agencies of the donor governments.

According to OECD (2009) more than two-thirds of total ODA from DAC member countries is provided bilaterally, mostly in the form of grants. Some of the aid funds are from private organisations such as “nongovernmental organisations” (NGOs).

Lastly, foreign aid can be classified according to its intended use. Project aid is granted solely to finance a specific project, such as the construction of a dam or road. Programme aid, on the other hand, is less restrictive. The recipient government has some discretion over the use of programme aid within a sector (for sectoral aid) or for general government support (Clunies-Ross et al., 2009). Figure 1, shows the percentage composition of total sectoral aid in constant 2016 prices.

Foreign aid includes legislative action

Brown and McCabe 22 – Analyst in Foreign Assistance and Foreign Policy at the Congressional Research Service; Analyst in Foreign Assistance and Foreign Policy at the Congressional Research Service

Nick M. Brown, and Emily M. McCabe (Morgenstern), “Foreign Assistance: An Introduction to U.S. Programs and Policy,” Congressional Research Service, 01-10-2022, https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/R40213

What Are the Major Foreign Aid Legislative Vehicles?

The most significant permanent foreign aid authorization laws include

the **Foreign Assistance Act** of 1961, as amended, covering most bilateral economic and security assistance programs (P.L. 87-195; 22 U.S.C. 2151);

the **Arms Export Control Act** (1976), authorizing military sales and financing (P.L. 90-629; 22 U.S.C. 2751);

the **Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act** of 1954 (P.L. 480), covering food aid (P.L. 83-480; 7 U.S.C. 1691); and

the Bretton Woods Agreement Act (1945), authorizing U.S. participation in multilateral development banks (P.L. 79-171; 22 U.S.C. 286).62

In the past, Congress usually scheduled debates every two years on omnibus foreign aid legislation that amended these permanent authorization measures. Congress has not enacted into law a comprehensive foreign assistance authorization measure since 1985, although foreign aid authorizing bills have passed the House or Senate, or both, on numerous occasions. Foreign aid bills have frequently stalled at some point in the debate because of controversial issues, a tight legislative calendar, or executive-legislative foreign policy disputes.63 In contrast, DOD assistance is authorized in annual National Defense Authorization legislation.

In lieu of approving comprehensive foreign assistance authorization bills on a regular basis, Congress has on occasion authorized major foreign assistance initiatives for specific regions, countries, or aid sectors in stand-alone legislation or within an appropriation bill, often involving amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to authorize a new initiative. Among these are the following:

the SEED Act of 1989 (P.L. 101-179; 22 U.S.C. 5401);

the FREEDOM Support Act of 1992 (P.L. 102-511; 22 U.S.C. 5801);

the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 (P.L. 108-25; 22 U.S.C. 7601);

the Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization **Act** of 2008 (P.L. 110-293);

the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003 (Division D, Title VI of P.L. 108-199);

the Enhanced Partnership With Pakistan Act of 2009 (P.L. 111-73; 22 U.S.C. 8401);

the Global Food Security Act of 2016 (P.L. 114-195; 22 U.S.C. 9306); and

the Better Utilizing Results Leading to Development Act of 2018 (P.L. 115-254).

In the absence of regular enactment of foreign aid authorization bills, **appropriation measures considered annually** within the SFOPS spending bill **have assumed greater significance for Congress in influencing U.S. foreign aid policy**. Not only do appropriations bills set spending levels each year for nearly every foreign assistance account, SFOPS appropriations also incorporate new policy initiatives that would otherwise be debated and enacted as part of authorizing legislation.

Development assistance excludes military aid and migration activities.

OECD No Date – an international organisation that works to build better policies for better lives
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, "Official development assistance – definition and coverage," Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, No Date, https://www.oecd.org/en/topics/sub-issues/oda-eligibility-and-conditions/official-development-assistance--definition-and-coverage.html, Accessed 05-30-2026

DAC = Development Assistance Committee

ODA excludes:

Over the years the DAC has continuously refined the detailed ODA reporting rules to ensure fidelity to the definition and the greatest possible consistency among donors. **The boundary of ODA has been carefully delineated in many fields**, including:

- **Military aid**: **No military equipment or services are reportable as ODA**. **Anti-terrorism activities are also excluded**. However, the cost of using donors' armed forces to deliver humanitarian aid is eligible.
- **Peacekeeping**: **Most peacekeeping expenditures are excluded** in line with the exclusion of military costs. However, some closely-defined developmentally relevant activities within peacekeeping operations are included.
- Nuclear energy: Reportable as ODA, provided it is for civilian purposes.
- **Migration-related activities**: As for all ODA, the reporting of migration-related activities is guided by the general rule that the main objective of ODA is the promotion of the economic development and welfare of developing countries. **Activities that** intercept and return migrants with the main objective to **restrict migration to provider countries are excluded from ODA.**
- Cultural programmes: Eligible as ODA if they build the cultural capacities of recipient countries, activities to promote the donors' image, are excluded.

Development aid is ODA.

Rosenkranz 11 – Global Editor for Devex
Rolf Rosenkranz, "Development aid: What you need to know," Devex, 05-18-2011, https://www.devex.com/news/development-aid-what-you-need-to-know-74725, Accessed 06-04-2026

It may go by many names, but one thing is clear: Development aid has become a key tool to boost economic growth and advance security interests in our globalized world.

While **development aid** is meant to **ensure** a **country's sustainable growth** over the long run, **humanitarian aid** usually refers to **short-term relief** provided after a natural disaster, refugee crisis or other emergencies. Better coordinating emergency relief, rehabilitation, reconstruction and prevention is seen as key to improving aid effectiveness.

Traditionally, **development aid referred to what is known as "official development assistance**" – the **international transfer of public funds** either **directly** from one government to another **through bilateral aid**, **or indirectly through non-governmental organizations or a multilateral agency**.

But with the emergence of corporate philanthropy and private donors such as the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, development aid has turned into somewhat of a catchall phrase. Other commonly used terms include international aid, foreign aid, overseas aid and development assistance.

Also, while "traditional" donors such as the United States and Japan have created a host of standards over the past 20 years – such as the DAC principles, Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, Monterrey Consensus, Millennium Development Goals and Accra Agenda for

Action – the emergence of donors from China, Brazil and India have complicated the streamlining of aid standards around the globe.
Official development assistance must meet three criteria, according to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development's Development Assistance Committee, which tracks ODA:
1. Funding must be provided by a government agency or its executing agencies.
2. The main objective must be the promotion of the economic development and welfare of developing countries.
3. Funding must be concessional in character, with a grant element of at least 25 percent (using a fixed 10 percent rate of discount).
OECD-DAC's list of ODA recipients is composed mainly of the least-developed countries and lower-middle-income countries. Assistance for more advanced countries and territories in transition, including many former Soviet republics, is called official aid and not counted as ODA.

ODA flows from high-income to low-income countries.
Witter 25 – Social Media Lead at The ONE Campaign
Arielle Witter, "The real-world impacts of foreign aid," ONE, 02-19-2025, https://www.one.org/stories/foreign-official-development-assistance-explained/, Accessed 06-04-2026What is foreign aid?
Foreign aid, international aid, **ODA**, or "global aid," **refers to the transfer of resources and money from mostly high-income countries to low- and middle-income countries**. **Aid can either be given by richer countries directly to countries in need or to a multilateral institution** (like the UN or World Bank) to pass the aid onto countries or projects. **The money and resources provided are used to support economic development and help fight poverty.**

ODA serves economic interests through grants and/or loans and excludes military aid.
OECD 25 – an international organisation that works to build better policies for better lives
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, "Foreign aid given – Net disbursements," Our World in Data, https://ourworldindata.org/grapher/foreign-aid-given-net, Accessed 06-04-2026
What you should know about this indicator
Official development assistance (**ODA**) **is aid given to countries and territories on the OECD Development Assistance Committee** (DAC) **list of recipients and multilateral development institutions**. To qualify as ODA, the **aid has to serve the economic development and welfare of recipient countries and be either a grant or a loan with favorable terms**.
DAC country recipients are all low- and middle-income countries as defined by the World Bank, or least-developed countries as defined by the United Nations. All recipients are listed on the OECD website.
Most ODA is provided by DAC members, **which are major aid donors in the OECD plus the European Union**. However, **some non-DAC countries**, such as **Turkey or Saudi Arabia**, **also give aid that follows ODA guidelines.**
ODA does not include military aid, except for **the cost of using armed forces to deliver humanitarian aid**. **It also excludes spending on peacekeeping unless it is** closely related **to development**.
The private sector comprises private corporations, households and non-profit institutions serving households. **Development funding from the private sector is becoming more significant. This includes** civil society organizations**, which play an increasing role in funding**

development and in finding innovative ways to promote it; non-government organizations; and the for-profit private sector.

Technical assistance is non-financial.

Nastase et al. 21 – Senior Public Sector Governance Specialist at Oxford Policy Management, Global Lead of the Policy Execution Hub, holds a M.P.P. from the University of Oxford and a Masters' in International Security from the University of Bucharest; State Capacity and Public Finance Program Officer at the Gates Foundation, former Public Sector Governance Global Portfolio Leader at Oxford Policy Management, holds a M.P.A. in Economic and Political Development from Columbia University and a M.B.A. in Finance from Symbiosis Institute of Business Management, Pune; former Director of Consulting at Oxford Policy Management, holds a M.Sc. in Development Management from the London School of Economics and Political Science and a M.B.A. from the University of Bath; Senior Program Officer and Lead for State Health Systems at the Gates Foundation, holds a M.Sc. in Finance and Economic Policy from the University of London, and a M.B.A. in Marketing and Operations from the Indian School of Business

Alexandra Nastase, with Alok Rajan, Ben French, and Debarshi Bhattacharya, "Technical assistance: a practical account of the challenges in design and implementation," Gates Open Research, 11-19-2021, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8920999/#sec8

Technical assistance is generally referred to as non-financial support, usually **knowledge-based**, contracted by and/or prov**ided to governments by local or international experts to support policymaking and/or strengthen state capability**.

The World Bank defines technical assistance as 'the transfer or adaptation of ideas, knowledge, practices, technologies, or skills to foster economic development for policy development, institutional development, capacity building, and project or programme support' (World Bank, 1997). OECD DAC refers to technical assistance as technical cooperation provided in the form of: (i) grants to nationals of aid recipient countries receiving education or training at home or abroad, and (ii) payments to consultants, advisers and similar personnel as well as teachers and administrators serving in recipient countries, including the cost of associated equipment (OECD DAC).

Technical assistance **includes various practices**, such as **hands-on support, training, peer to peer learning, coaching, facilitation, embedding externals in the government, or South-South cooperation**. In our complimentary paper on technical assistance (Nastase et al., 2020), we refer to technical advisors providing support as DOERS, PARTNERS and/or FACILITATORS. We also refer to supply or demand-driven technical assistance. This article reviews the challenges of technical assistance provided to governments by external experts, using external funding.

Technical assistance helps other countries but excludes giving money.

Clauson 50 — Assistant Under-Secretary of State in the Colonial Office of the United Kingdom Gerard Clauson, "What is technical assistance?," 1950, Unasylva, Volume 4, Number 4 - Technical assistance, https://www.fao.org/4/x5357e/x5357e00.htm#Contents

Technical Assistance is not a new concept; it is one of the oldest things in the world. Probably the first time it occurred was when Eve, with her superior sense of dress, helped Adam fix his fig leaf. "Technical assistance," in the sense in which the words are used in the phrase, "**An expanded program of technical assistance to underdeveloped countries**," is merely one application of a primordial human activity, but an application which is not as well understood as it should be, even in the underdeveloped countries to which this new prospect of help in solving their problems is held out.

Just as there is nothing new in the concept of technical assistance, so also there is nothing new in the concept of technical assistance to underdeveloped countries. **Most countries in the**

world have received technical assistance from other countries at some period in the course of their history; and for centuries now individuals or corporations from the more advanced countries have deliberately gone to less advanced countries to help them in their development. Indeed for a good many years the governments of the more advanced countries, as well as the citizens, have taken a hand in the process. But until recently it never occurred to any government that its obligation to give technical assistance extended beyond dependent territories for which, in the modern phrase, it had international responsibility. What is new in the expanded program launched under President Truman's inspiration is that, for the first time in history, most nations in the world have publicly accepted a financial obligation to take part in a co-operative program of technical assistance to the underdeveloped countries and bound themselves to do all that they can to make it a success.

The course of events since President Truman included Point Four in his famous inaugural address is too well known to need description, but particular attention should be given to the statement of principles annexed to the Economic and Social Council's resolution of August 1949, which has since been approved by the Assembly of the United Nations and the Technical Assistance Conference at Lake Success as governing the implementation of the program.

It would take more space than is available here to discuss these principles at length; the purpose of this article is merely to discuss their application within the field of forestry; but one preliminary observation is important. **"Technical assistance" has limits which are clearly defined, and it is not worth giving it unless it is known in advance that certain conditions exist which will make it useful**. To take a simple analogy**, if a man's automobile has broken down and he asks for help to get it going again**, technical assistance, in the form approved by the ECOSOC principles, **would extend to looking at the automobile and telling the owner what had gone wrong and how it could be put right**; it would not, however, extend to doing the repair job for him, or giving him the spare part necessary to put it right. That he must do for himself at his own expense, that is with his own money or a loan, if anyone will give him one. So it is no use giving a man technical assistance in such a case if he is obviously as broke as his automobile, and it is known that no one will lend him the money to mend it. **Technical assistance, in short, is a procedure for helping underdeveloped countries to help themselves; it is not a procedure for giving or lending them money to be spent on actual development.**

Technical assistance is expertise.

Britannica n.d. — encyclopedia

Britannica, “technical assistance,” Britannica Money, No Date, https://www.britannica.com/money/technical-assistance

technical assistance, **form of aid given to less-developed countries by international organizations** such as the United Nations (UN) and its agencies, **individual governments, foundations, and philanthropic institutions**. **Its object is to provide those countries with the expertise needed to promote development**. Most technical-assistance programs began after World War II, when much of Europe and Southeast Asia lay in ruins and the countries of Africa and Central and South America were attempting to improve their standards of living. The U.S. president Harry Truman’s Point Four Program (q.v.), announced in 1949, was a notable early example. Technical assistance may involve sending experts into the field to teach skills and to help solve problems in their areas of specialization, such as irrigation, agriculture, fisheries, education, public health, or forestry. Conversely, scholarships, study tours, or seminars in developed countries may be offered, giving individuals from less-developed nations the opportunity to learn special skills that they can apply when they return home. Vocational guidance, management development, business administration, home economics, mathematics,

science, accounting, trade skills, urban planning, and legal services are a few of the many areas in which technical assistance has been provided.

Many governments furnish technical assistance to depressed urban or rural localities or needy groups within their borders. For example, the United States provides technical assistance for migrant workers, Indian reservations, run-down urban neighbourhoods, and small farmers.

The largest technical-assistance programs are those administered by the UN and its agencies. They are financed by voluntary contributions from members and concentrate on four major areas: agricultural production, basic-resource surveys and administrative services, health services, and education.

Humanitarian Aid

Humanitarian aid is consistent with principles.

RCC 17 – an all-inclusive, regionally owned and led cooperation framework
Regional Cooperation Council (RCC), "THE LIST OF CRS PURPOSE CODES AND VOLUNTARY BUDGET IDENTIFIER CODES," July 2017, https://www.rcc.int/seedad/files/user/docs/2016_CRS_purpose_codes.pdf
700 – HUMANITARIAN AID
(Within the overall definition of ODA, **humanitarian aid is assistance designed to save lives, alleviate suffering and maintain and protect human dignity during and in the aftermath of emergencies**. To be classified as humanitarian, aid should be consistent with the humanitarian principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality and independence.)

DAC 5 CODE	CRS CODE	Voluntary code	DESCRIPTION	Clarifications / Additional notes on coverage
720			Emergency Response	An emergency is a situation which results from man-made crises and/or natural disasters.
	72010		Material relief assistance and services	Shelter, water, sanitation and health services, supply of medicines and other non-food relief items for the benefit of affected people and to facilitate the return to normal lives and livelihoods; assistance to refugees and internally displaced people in developing countries other than for food (72040) or protection (72050).
	72040		Emergency food aid	Food aid normally for general free distribution or special supplementary feeding programmes; short-term relief to targeted population groups affected by emergency situations. Excludes nonemergency food security assistance programmes/food aid (52010).

	72050		Relief co-ordination; protection and support services	Measures to co-ordinate delivery of humanitarian aid, including logistics and communications systems; measures to promote and protect the safety, well-being, dignity and integrity of civilians and those no longer taking part in hostilities. (Activities designed to protect the security of persons or property through the use or display of force are not reportable as ODA.
730			Reconstruction relief and rehabilitation	This relates to activities during and in the aftermath of an emergency situation. Longer-term activities to improve the level of infrastructure or social services should be reported under the relevant economic and social sector codes. See also guideline on distinguishing humanitarian from sector-allocable aid.
	73010		Reconstruction relief and rehabilitation	Short-term reconstruction work after emergency or conflict limited to restoring pre-existing infrastructure (e.g. repair or construction of roads, bridges and ports, restoration of essential facilities, such as water and sanitation, shelter, health care services); social and economic rehabilitation in the aftermath of emergencies to facilitate

				transition and enable populations to return to their previous livelihood or develop a new livelihood in the wake of an emergency situation (e.g. trauma counselling and treatment, employment programmes).
740			Disaster prevention and preparedness	See codes 41050 and 15220 for prevention of floods and conflicts.
	74010		Disaster prevention and preparedness	Disaster risk reduction activities (e.g. developing knowledge, natural risks cartography, legal norms for construction); early warning systems; emergency contingency stocks and contingency planning including preparations for forced displacement.

Distinguishing humanitarian from sector–allocable aid
Humanitarian aid will usually be funded from appropriations dedicated to emergencies and their immediate aftermath
and/or the prevention thereof or preparedness therefor, and funding from such appropriations is the main criterion for
reporting expenditure as humanitarian aid. If the humanitarian nature of expenditure cannot be determined by its
funding appropriation, members may for statistical reporting purposes have reference to situation reports by the United
Nations and/or the International Movement of the Red Cross/Red Crescent (ICRC/IFRC). These are normally issued
throughout an emergency to identify continuing humanitarian needs. If no UN or ICRC/IFRC situation report has been
issued for six months, this could indicate that the situation is no longer perceived as an emergency, though international
support could nevertheless be needed to address continuing humanitarian needs.

Military Aid

No single definition/broad.
ICIJ 7 – coalition of investigative journalists
International Consortium of Investigative Journalists, "A citizen's guide to understanding U.S. foreign military aid," 05-22-2007, https://www.icij.org/investigations/collateraldamage/citizens-guide-understanding-us-foreign-military-aid/
There is no single, accepted definition of the terms "foreign aid" or even **"foreign military aid"** or "military assistance." For a government as large as that of the United States, it's virtually impossible **to track all of the various federal agencies' programs across countries and sectors** to arrive at a single number that captures the true amount of U.S. taxpayer dollars going to foreign governments, or even just their militaries.
For the "Collateral Damage" investigative study, the International Consortium of Investigative Journalists created a database that tracks a subset of those financial flows: taxpayer-funded programs or assistance that contribute to a nation's offensive military capabilities. The database does not include certain large nuclear non-proliferation programs or expenditures such as Foreign Military Sales or Direct Commercial Sales, which are not supported directly with taxpayer dollars. The database is also limited to tracking funds appropriated to either the Defense Department or the State Department. For this report, these are the criteria for "foreign military assistance" or "foreign military aid."
Funds appropriated to the **State** Department **and Defense** Department **represent the vast majority of unclassified military aid and assistance**. This report does not attempt to track smaller overseas programs where funding is appropriated to the Justice Department, Drug Enforcement Agency, or Department of Homeland Security. The public does not have any way of tracking classified programs administered by the U.S. intelligence community. These classified programs likely command large amounts of funding, especially after the 9/11 attacks, and oversight is limited to members of congressional intelligence committees.
Programs included in the ICIJ's database:
Coalition Support Funds (CSF): created after 9/11 to reimburse key allied countries for providing assistance to the U.S. in the global war on terror.
Regional Defense Counterterrorism Fellowship Program (CTFP): created after 9/11 to give the Defense Department its own funding to train and educate foreign military officers in counterterrorism techniques. In practice, CTFP has evolved into a program very similar to IMET (see definition below).
Department of Defense Counterdrug Funding: assists foreign militaries and security forces to combat drug trafficking around the world; also known as Section 1004 appropriations.
Economic Support Fund (ESF): provides grants to foreign governments to support economic stability. ESF is often used for non-military purposes, but the grants are commonly viewed as a way to help offset military expenditures. They have historically been earmarked for key security allies of the United States. Israel and Egypt are the two largest recipients of ESF.
Foreign Military Financing (FMF): **finances foreign governments' acquisition of U.S. military articles, services and training.**
International Military Education and Training (IMET): educates foreign military personnel on issues ranging from democracy and human rights to technical military techniques and training on U.S. weapons systems.
International Narcotics and Law Enforcement/Andean Counterdrug Initiative (ACI): the primary State Department funding effort for countering drugs, including the large Colombian initiatives.
Military Assistance Program (MAP): provides military material and services to foreign countries; the U.S. government is not reimbursed. MAP includes "emergency drawdowns,"

which are emergency transfers authorized by the president for weapons, ammunition, parts and military equipment to foreign governments.
Nonproliferation, Anti-Terrorism, **De-mining and Related Activities** (NADR): supports de-mining, anti-terrorism, and nonproliferation training and assistance.
Peacekeeping Operations (PKO): supports programs that improve foreign militaries' peacekeeping capabilities.

Political Aid

Political aid supports political stability and democracy.
Mcbride 18 – Deputy Managing Editor at the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), holds a M.A. in in Latin American Studies from Georgetown University
James Mcbride, "How Does the U.S. Spend Its Foreign Aid?," Council on Foreign Relations, 10-01-2018, https://www.cfr.org/backgrounders/how-does-us-spend-its-foreign-aid
How is the money spent?
U.S. aid policy seeks to achieve its aims through a diverse array of programs, which can be organized into several major categories. According to CRS calculations, foreign aid spending as of 2016 can be broken down as follows:
Long-term development aid (42 percent) provides ongoing funding for projects to promote broad-based economic growth and general prosperity in the world's poorest countries. More than half of this goes to bilateral health programs, including treatment of HIV/AIDS, maternal and family health, and support for government health-care systems, mostly in Africa. This also includes funding to multilateral institutions such as the World Bank and the UN Development Program.
Military and security aid (33 percent) primarily goes toward helping allies purchase U.S. military equipment, training foreign military personnel, and funding peacekeeping missions. A smaller slice goes to "non-military security assistance," which includes counternarcotics programs in Afghanistan, Colombia, Peru, and elsewhere, as well as nonproliferation and counterterrorism efforts.
Humanitarian aid (14 percent) is spent to alleviate short-term humanitarian crises, such as those resulting from famine, earthquakes, war, state failure, or other natural or man-made disasters. This includes State Department and Defense Department disaster relief efforts, as well as purchases of U.S. agricultural goods and funding for organizations such as the International Red Cross and the UN High Commissioner for Refugees.
Political aid (11 percent) **is intended to support political stability, free-market economic reforms, and democratic institutions. Programs include governance and justice system reforms, backing for human rights organizations, and support for peace talks and treaty implementation.**

Aff vs Politics

Foreign aid is bipartisan.
Ingram 24 — Senior Fellow Emeritus of Global Economy and Development, Center for Sustainable Development, former Deputy Assistant Administrator at USAID, holds a Ph.D. from the University of Michigan and a M.A. in International Relations from Johns Hopkins University George Ingram, "What is US foreign assistance?," Brookings, 09-12-2024. https://www.brookings.edu/articles/what-is-us-foreign-assistance/

Is support for international engagement and foreign aid partisan or bipartisan?
BIPARTISAN. This may seem surprising given recent political divisiveness.

Over the past 50 years a majority of Americans—Democrats, Republicans, and Independents—**have supported U.S. active engagement in world affairs**. Up until the past decade, Republicans were somewhat more supportive than Democrats and Independents. But, as shown in the chart below, since 2016 the positions of those who identify as Democrats and Republicans have flipped, with Democratic support increasing and Republican support declining (see chart below from the Chicago Council on Global Affairs).
[Figure D omitted]
But **looking at foreign assistance, historically, Democratic policymakers** (administrations and Congress) **have been more supportive than Republicans policymakers**. **Take** the **Truman** administration, **which initiated the Marshall Plan**. Or, in the 1990s, when votes in Congress on foreign aid spending were close, appropriations bills garnered more Democratic than Republican votes. **Yet every president, Democratic and Republican, apart from Donald Trump, has been a strong proponent of foreign aid.**
In fact, **some of the most rapid increases in foreign aid have come during Republican presidencies**. For instance, **despite** George W. **Bush being a skeptic of foreign aid before** entering the White House, **the budget for foreign assistance double from $16 billion in 2001 to $33 billion in 2004**. Since the creation in the early 2000s of President Bush's well-regarded signature programs—the **Millennium Challenge Corporation**, the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (**PEPFAR**), **and the President's Malaria Initiative**—foreign aid carries a Republican as well as a Democratic brand and has received congressional support from both parties.
There was bipartisan rejection of proposals by the Trump administration to cut the U.S. international affairs budget by one-third, and, although in 2024 a small number of congressional opponents succeeded in delaying congressional consideration of supplemental foreign aid legislation, the bill passed the Congress with bipartisan support. On June 28, 2024, **80% of the members of the** U.S. **House** of Representatives **on a bipartisan vote rejected an amendment to eliminate foreign assistance from the Fiscal Year 2025 federal budget.**

-CP vs Restore Humanitarian Aid

3.1 Implement a phased and coordinated transition strategy

A structured phased withdrawal is essential to minimize the disruptive impact of U.S. disengagement. The U.S. government should:
Allocate bridging grants to support critical ongoing health initiatives, particularly in HIV/AIDS treatment, TB control, maternal and child health, and nutrition programs. This funding will help smooth the transition by keeping essential programs running while new funding mechanisms are secured.
Establish collaborative transition task forces involving USAID, WHO, and local stakeholders. These task forces should design tailored transition plans that prioritize knowledge transfer, capacity building, and stakeholder alignment, ensuring that regional partners can assume leadership roles.
Ensure the continuation of multi-year commitments, particularly in emergency health response, immunization campaigns, and epidemic control. These programs often span several years, and premature discontinuation can have devastating consequences.
Create multi-donor trust funds that pool resources from a wide range of global partners to sustain funding for high-impact programs. These funds should be transparent and have clear reporting mechanisms to guarantee accountability.
Third-party performance audits must be conducted regularly during the transition phase to evaluate the program handovers' effectiveness and maintain the integrity of ongoing operations.
By adopting this structured approach, the U.S. can ensure that health and development programs do not collapse after its withdrawal. Moreover, this will help build trust with other international donors and ensure a smooth shift to regional leadership.
3.2 Strengthen regional health institutions and technical capacity

Given the global health risks posed by U.S. disengagement, the need for strong, independent regional health institutions has never been greater. The U.S. should:
Provide targeted financial and technical support to regional organizations like Africa CDC, the ASEAN Health Cluster, and the Pan American Health Organization (PAHO). These bodies should be empowered to lead on health security issues like disease surveillance, emergency response, and vaccine distribution.
Fund capacity-building initiatives that enhance laboratory infrastructure, surveillance systems, and epidemiological modeling. This will increase the regions' ability to swiftly and effectively identify, monitor, and respond to emerging diseases.
Support regional vaccine production hubs, such as the Institut Pasteur de Dakar in Senegal, to reduce dependency on global supply chains and ensure equitable access to vaccines, particularly for low- and middle-income countries (LMICs). This investment is essential in the fight against diseases like COVID-19, malaria, and TB, where access to vaccines and treatments remains uneven.
Facilitate inter-regional cooperation on health research and innovation, particularly in infectious disease surveillance, medical diagnostics, and low-cost treatment development.
By strengthening regional institutions and health infrastructures, the U.S. can help ensure that the global health system remains resilient despite geopolitical and financial challenges. Empowering regional leadership in health can also prevent larger powers from monopolizing health responses and ensure that solutions stay equitable and locally relevant.
3.3 Leverage public-private partnerships for innovation and funding

The future of global health lies in the collaboration between governments, the private sector, and civil society organizations. To fill the funding gap left by the U.S. withdrawal, the U.S. should:

Facilitate strategic public-private partnerships (PPPs) that leverage the strengths of both sectors. For example, the U.S. can work with global health organizations, pharmaceutical companies, and local governments to scale up the development and distribution of affordable vaccines, diagnostic tools, and treatments.

Invest in technological innovations that can transform health delivery in LMICs, such as mobile health platforms, AI-driven diagnostics, and telemedicine solutions. This will allow for more cost-effective healthcare delivery in resource-limited settings.

Development Impact Bonds (DIBs) should be innovative financing mechanisms. Investors provide upfront capital to fund health programs in exchange for repayment based on achieving measurable health outcomes. This approach aligns private investment with public health goals and efficiently allocates resources.

Promote the local manufacturing of health technologies through partnerships with local businesses. This will reduce dependence on international supply chains and improve self-reliance in health systems.

By expanding PPPs, the U.S. can help stimulate local innovation, provide sustainable financing for health programs, and ensure that global health solutions are both scalable and accessible to the communities that need them most.

3.4 Continue investing in global health security and public goods

Despite the reduced U.S. role, maintaining strategic investments in global health security remains paramount. The U.S. should:

Reaffirm its commitment to global health security initiatives, including Gavi, the Global Fund, and CEPI. These organizations have been instrumental in global vaccination efforts, and continued U.S. support is vital to maintaining the momentum of global health programs.

Invest in pandemic preparedness by supporting the International Health Regulations (IHR) and investing in global disease surveillance systems. Strengthening these systems ensures that the world remains better prepared for the next global health crisis.

Support global research efforts on issues like antimicrobial resistance, zoonotic diseases, and climate-related health impacts, which will require collective action to address effectively. These investments will help safeguard global health security and maintain U.S. influence in shaping international health norms.

Engage in bilateral agreements with key health partners to address specific health challenges in vulnerable regions, ensuring that critical initiatives continue even if U.S. involvement in multilateral platforms is reduced.

These sustained investments will ensure that global health systems remain robust, resilient, and ready to respond to emerging health threats. Continued U.S. participation will be essential in maintaining a coordinated and effective international response to health crises.

3.5 Promote inclusive and transparent global health governance

Rather than withdrawing from global health platforms, the U.S. should advocate for reforming institutions like WHO to ensure they are more inclusive and effective. The U.S. should:

Advocate for greater representation of low and middle-income countries (LMICs) in decision-making processes within WHO and other global health organizations. This will ensure that health solutions are tailored to the needs of the most vulnerable populations.

Push for greater transparency and accountability in global health governance by supporting independent oversight bodies like the Independent Oversight and Advisory Committee (IOAC), which evaluates the performance of WHO and other international health initiatives.

Support South-South cooperation, encouraging knowledge-sharing and collaboration between countries facing similar health challenges. This will foster peer learning and enhance the effectiveness of health interventions in LMICs.
Reform global health financing mechanisms to ensure that funding is allocated more equitably and transparently, prioritizing health programs in countries most at risk of emerging diseases.
By advocating for inclusive governance, the U.S. can ensure that global health systems remain responsive to the needs of all countries, particularly those most vulnerable to health crises.

CSOs CP vs Restore Aid

Elhert et al. 06/17 – program manager at Pharos Global Health Advisors, holds a M.P.H. in Epidemiology from Yale University; President of Pharos Global Health and a Professor of Microbial Diseases at the Yale University School of Public Health, President and CEO of Friends of the Global Fight Against AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, former Chief of the Community Mobilization Division at UNAIDS, holds a M.P.P. from Harvard University
Michael Elhert, Robert Hecht, Chris Collins, "Securing Sustainable Funding for Civil Society Organizations," Think Global Health, 06-17-2026,,
https://www.thinkglobalhealth.org/article/securing-sustainable-funding-for-civil-society-organizations

According to a new analysis from the Kaiser Family Foundation (KFF), 29 countries with signed bilateral agreements with the United States face a 24% drop in health funding from the United States and the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (Global Fund) through 2029.

These cuts threaten the local civil society organizations (CSOs) delivering critical HIV and tuberculosis (TB) services—including nongovernmental organizations, faith-based groups, and community-based providers—that still depend almost entirely on international donors. International aid accounts for 80% of all funding [PDF] for HIV prevention programs in low- or middle-income countries (LMICs), the majority channeled through CSOs. Research [PDF] finds that CSOs are not an optional component of national HIV and TB programs: They are their backbone.

As donor funding shifts toward greater country ownership, the United States and the Global Fund need to plan for CSO continuity and growth, including to incentivize national governments to sign contracts and fund CSOs for the services they deliver so effectively. LMIC governments also need to channel their domestic financing to CSOs.

Two questions will help determine whether decades of progress against HIV and TB survive or unravel as the United States and the Global Fund reshape how they deliver global health assistance: What will happen to the CSOs that deliver essential services on the frontlines? How will funding for CSOs transition from donors to LMIC governments?

The Evidence Is Clear
Community organizations fill gaps that governments often cannot. They build trust with key populations: groups at higher risk of HIV or TB acquisition who often face stigma, criminalization, or other barriers to care, including men who have sex with men, sex workers, transgender people, and people who inject drugs. CSOs run peer outreach programs that allow individuals from these groups to feel safe to seek care, offer HIV and TB testing and counseling, refer cases for treatment and provide medications, work with patients to ensure that they take their medication on time, and offer legal support and other social services such as advice on housing and employment. In many countries, CSOs have spent decades developing the relationships needed to reach marginalized communities with lifesaving interventions.

Local CSOs managed nearly 20% [PDF] of all Global Fund grant money between 2017 and 2022. These grants, totaling $5.26 billion, were used to deliver everything from mobile TB testing to HIV treatment adherence support. In Nigeria, nongovernmental providers accounted for nearly 80% of outpatient visits in 2018. In the same year, faith-based organizations in rural Zambia provided more than half of all formal health care, including HIV and TB services.

Reach matters for outcomes. A 2024 study found that community-based organizations in the United States, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands were able to link a higher proportion of newly diagnosed members of key populations to HIV care within 30 days—the U.S. national target time frame [PDF]—than government-led programs were. That kind of rapid linkage is what keeps epidemics from rebounding.

As the global health funding landscape shifts, and in certain areas shrinks or entirely disappears, HIV and TB infections and deaths could likely rise unless support for CSOs is maintained. After U.S. foreign aid was suspended in Latin America in early 2025, 87% of community-based organizations surveyed across the region reported funding freezes that disrupted care for more than 156,000 people. This shows how exposed most CSOs currently are to sudden shifts in donor funding and why sustainable financing for these organizations needs to be built into donor transition plans and national budgets.

A Model That Works

In the face of reduced donor support, LMIC governments can fill the gaps. Botswana and North Macedonia are clear examples.

Anticipating future reductions in support from the Global Fund and the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR), Botswana proactively commissioned a sustainability roadmap in 2024. Slumber Tsogwane, the country's vice president and head of the National AIDS Council, stated that his government would fill any emerging funding gaps, including by financing the CSOs considered essential to reaching key populations. At that time the government was already spending nearly $7 million a year in contracts with CSOs for HIV outreach, prevention, and treatment—exceeding the Global Fund's $2.8 million to $5.2 million annually [PDF] from 2018 to 2023.

As support from the U.S. government and Global Fund progressively winds down, Botswana's government is picking up a larger share of the costs to sustain CSOs by using a special unit in the National AIDS and Health Promotion Agency to manage contracts and monitor their performance. The government's commitment to increasing domestic financing for these contracts has helped protect the work of organizations such as Tebelopepe, an operator of voluntary nongovernmental testing centers that conducts about one-third of HIV testing in Botswana.

In North Macedonia, when the Global Fund's primary country grant closed in 2017, the Ministry of Health made a commitment [PDF] to take over financing for the HIV response. This commitment covered CSO-delivered prevention and testing services for key populations, including people who inject drugs. By 2019, domestic resources fully replaced what the Global Fund had been providing to CSOs. The government diversified its funding sources, drawing 75% from the state budget and 25% from excise taxes on tobacco and alcohol to insulate CSO funding from shocks to specific government budget areas.

Botswana and North Macedonia succeeded because they had the three ingredients that matter most: political commitment at the highest levels, a legal and policy environment that allowed government contracting with CSOs, and budget lines dedicated to this paying the CSOs for the services they deliver.

What Needs to Happen Now

The current wave of U.S. bilateral health agreements with partner countries focuses on commodities such as drugs and diagnostic tests and data systems but largely ignores how CSO-delivered services will be financed after donors pull back. Three actions are recommended to address this issue:

The U.S. government should report on the transition readiness of CSO-delivered services in priority countries to identify which organizations deliver essential services, what those services cost, and where the money currently comes from.
The State Department should make CSO contracting an explicit element of country implementation plans under recently negotiated bilateral agreements, and Congress should direct the administration to keep it updated on efforts to ensure continued support for CSOs. If governments fail to provide adequate support to CSOs, Washington should identify other ways to sustain these organizations.
To prepare for aid transition, the Global Fund should require countries to document their CSO landscape, specify whether current CSO contracts will continue under domestic funding, and present quantified plans for increasing domestic cofinancing of these services.
By taking these actions, the United States and the Global Fund have a better chance of achieving a smooth transition to strong HIV and TB programs in LMICs and can preserve their legacy of success in saving millions of lives over the past three decades. At the same time, LMIC governments can sustain important health gains, helping build healthier communities and stronger economic outcomes for their citizens. Sustaining CSOs is good public policy, good public health practice, and good politics.

The organizations closest to the communities hardest hit by HIV, TB, and malaria deserve a central role in fighting these epidemics and a significant line in future budgets.