

The Marshall Myth: Rethinking the Impact of US Foreign Aid

Siya Gupta

If the Marshall Plan is remembered as the moment America helped rebuild a continent, why do so many modern foreign aid recipients remain unable to stand without support? The goal of this paper is to show that US aid to other countries can often lead to dependency and create persisting problems in those societies rather than helping them stand on their own two feet. There is often a discourse that makes us believe that the United States is a savior that needs to intervene in the affairs of other countries. The Marshall Plan is frequently cited as the gold standard for evaluating US foreign aid, but this framing relies on selective memory and ignores the differences between aiding post-World War II Europe and aiding contemporary developing nations. By breaking down the mythology surrounding the Marshall Plan and examining modern USAID efforts, it becomes clear that the celebrated narrative of independence and self-sufficiency obscures continued patterns of dependency and strategic motives that still shape American foreign assistance. The perceived effectiveness of the Marshall Plan in promoting European self-sufficiency is greatly exaggerated; in comparison to contemporary USAID initiatives, it uncovers persistent trends of dependency and the tactical application of soft power that still influence the aims and results of U.S. foreign assistance.

The Marshall Plan, officially known as the European Recovery Program, was implemented from 1948 to 1952 and provided around \$13 billion dollars, or about \$150 billion today, in US assistance to rebuild Western Europe after World War II. It is often celebrated as a success story that helped stabilize Europe, prevent the spread of communism, and strengthen US influence during the early Cold War. This program also set the foundation for later US foreign aid strategies. As CSIS writes, “Following the Marshall Plan, President Truman spearheaded the creation of the Point Four Program, which helped developing countries through technical assistance and greater foreign investment while also encouraging the growth of their own domestic resources” (CSIS). The Point Four Program eventually evolved into the US Agency for International Development (USAID). USAID was established in 1961 during the Kennedy administration at a time when the United States feared that communism would win the “hearts and minds” of people across the decolonizing world. Influenced heavily by The Ugly American and Kennedy’s push for more effective grassroots engagement, USAID became the primary coordination vehicle for US foreign assistance. It expanded the focus of aid beyond economic reconstruction to include agriculture, health, education, and governance. Although its operations changed, many core themes from the Marshall Plan were retained, especially using aid to strengthen alliances and advance US interests abroad. This aligns with Joseph Nye’s definition of soft power, which explains US foreign aid as a tool for shaping the preferences of others through attraction rather than coercion. The recurring humanitarian and moral rhetoric around aid, which frames the United States as a global helper or savior, continues to legitimize these strategic interventions. Since its creation, USAID has provided an average of \$20 billion dollars a year, roughly one percent of the federal budget, and even as spending rises to about 1.2 percent, CSIS notes the United States remains the world’s largest aid donor.

The Marshall Plan is frequently invoked as proof that US foreign aid “works,” and it becomes a powerful rhetorical device used to justify modern USAID missions. In public memory and in many textbooks, the Marshall Plan is framed as a simple story of American generosity producing European success. However, this comparison is misleading because the contexts and structures of the programs are entirely different. Europe after World War II had strong preexisting institutions and industrial foundations, while modern USAID operates in many postcolonial or economically fragile states without comparable capacity. Scholars such as Todd Moss argue that modern US foreign aid is shaped by short-term political goals rather than long-term development, and he explains how USAID’s shifting priorities and bureaucratic fragmentation

“undermine local autonomy and accountability,” often creating dependency instead of empowerment (Moss 4). Even with these differences, policymakers continue to selectively highlight the success of the Marshall Plan to sell contemporary aid initiatives, presenting them as natural extensions of a proven model. This rhetorical strategy builds ethos by framing the United States as a historically effective global helper, while obscuring how modern missions produce very different outcomes. By treating the Marshall Plan as a universal template rather than a unique historical event, modern discourse glosses over the failures and dependency patterns associated with USAID today.

Although both the Marshall Plan and USAID serve US strategic interests, they are presented to the public in very different ways. The Marshall Plan is openly remembered as a soft power tool designed to strengthen alliances and win the geopolitical struggle against the Soviet Union. Joseph Nye describes soft power as the ability to “shape the preferences of others through attraction” (Nye 10), and this describes exactly how postwar Europe became a strong, independent partner the United States could rely on. In contrast, modern USAID missions are framed primarily through humanitarian rhetoric that emphasizes poverty relief, health, and development. Carol Lancaster says that even though humanitarian goals are emphasized, aid programs often operate according to “broader US geopolitical and economic interests” (Lancaster 22). This shift in rhetoric creates a false narrative of altruism that hides the fact that USAID rarely invests in the deep economic rebuilding that made the Marshall Plan successful. The recent dismantling of USAID under the Trump administration further exposes how unstable and politically dependent modern aid structures are. Over 80 percent of USAID programs were terminated following a 2025 executive order pausing foreign assistance, resulting in more than 5,000 program cancellations and leaving many countries suddenly without essential services (Kates, KFF). In global health, stop-work orders forced programs to halt HIV treatment, maternal care, and vaccination campaigns, demonstrating what KFF describes as the “severe disruptions” caused by aid freezes (Kates, KFF). In Somalia, where much of the health system depended on external funding, more than 6,000 health workers lost their jobs and over 2,000 facilities faced closure after donor withdrawal (AP News, PBS NewsHour). These outcomes contradict the popular Marshall Plan narrative of American aid as steady, principled, and transformative. Instead, they show that when humanitarian rhetoric is not backed by strategic interest, aid becomes fragile, easily reversed, and ultimately harmful. Rather than cultivating long-term partners as the Marshall Plan once did, modern USAID often produces paternalistic relationships that collapse the moment political priorities shift. Mark Berger supports this pattern by showing that US development programs frequently use humanitarian language to “legitimize political control and economic dependency” (Berger 390). The gap between alliance-building in Europe and the volatility of contemporary aid reveals a broader shift from constructing strong partners to managing global dependency under the guise of moral obligation.

This difference becomes clearer when comparing how the United States treats strategic regions versus areas where it does not expect long-term partnerships. CSIS reports that “USAID has significantly increased spending in these target areas around Russia’s periphery, the so-called frontline states such as Ukraine, Moldova, and Georgia,” and Congress has consistently protected this funding even when the Trump administration proposed major cuts, illustrating how geopolitical value shapes aid priorities (CSIS). In these cases, aid resembles the logic of the Marshall Plan, supporting countries the US wants to strengthen for political and security reasons. When aid aligns with strategic interests, it becomes consistent, generous, and protected from partisan disruption. In contrast, aid to Haiti and many Global South states is framed purely in humanitarian terms and tends to be fragmented, short-term, and paternalistic. The difference in treatment mirrors what Dambisa Moyo argues: that decades of Western aid in African and postcolonial nations have “discouraged self-sufficiency” and entrenched dependency (Moyo 20). Besharati similarly shows that Western donors maintain “donor leverage” rather than building equal partnerships (Besharati, South African Institute of International Affairs). The contrast

becomes even sharper after examining Trump-era cuts. While funding to Ukraine and Moldova survived because of their strategic role against Russia, foreign aid to non-strategic regions was eliminated or rescinded, with Congress approving an \$8.3-billion-dollar rollback in global humanitarian and development aid (Collinson, Center for Global Development Blog). Countries like Somalia faced immediate health system collapse after the withdrawal of US support, demonstrating how humanitarian-framed aid creates reliance on a donor whose commitment is inconsistent. This selective application of Marshall Plan logic reveals a dual structure in US foreign aid. When the United States seeks strong allies, aid resembles the postwar reconstruction model, but when no such alliance is needed, aid becomes a moral performance that reinforces dependency. As Mark Berger shows, US development strategies vary widely depending on geopolitical value, even though the public rhetoric of humanitarianism stays the same (Berger 390). Rhetorically, aid to Ukraine is framed as protecting democracy, while aid to Haiti is framed as rescuing a struggling nation. The first builds alliances while the second builds dependent countries. This contrast shows how the United States applies very different aid models depending on whether it seeks strategic allies or merely humanitarian visibility.

A growing challenge to the US foreign aid model is China's Belt and Road Initiative, a global infrastructure and investment program that offers an alternative to USAID's humanitarian-style development approach. The BRI finances large-scale projects such as ports, railways, energy grids, and industrial zones using state-backed loans rather than conditional aid. Although Western commentators often describe it as exploitative, claiming that it creates "debt-trap diplomacy," recent analyses show that this narrative is frequently overstated and politically motivated (Jones, Chatham House). For many developing nations, BRI financing is attractive precisely because it comes with fewer governance requirements and invests in tangible infrastructure, which is something USAID rarely does (Rana, RSIS Commentary). As a Chatham House study states, Chinese development lending "responds to a gap left by Western donors, who have shifted away from funding major infrastructure" (Jones, Chatham House). This model in some ways resembles what made the Marshall Plan successful, including large structural investments tied to long-term strategic goals. In contrast, USAID's modern emphasis on short-term humanitarian relief and technical programs often fails to build the economic foundations necessary for self-sufficiency. Rhetorically, the rise of the BRI exposes the contradictions in how Western media and policymakers depict foreign aid. Reporting on the BRI often applies negative sentiment, with journalists highlighting concerns about "debt," "risk," and governance problems even when describing routine development projects (Moritsugu, AP News). This contrasts sharply with the positive moral framing surrounding USAID, which is consistently described as helping or supporting vulnerable nations despite its mixed developmental impact. Such rhetorical choices reinforce the idea that Western aid is benevolent while Chinese investment is predatory, even though many recipient governments view BRI financing as more predictable, more respectful of their autonomy, and more aligned with their development needs (Rana, RSIS Commentary). As the Wilson Center observes, BRI projects often fill "critical infrastructure gaps at times when Western aid is inconsistent or politically constrained" (Green, Wilson Center). The fact that China's approach mirrors the Marshall Plan more closely than current US aid highlights a central paradox of American foreign assistance, where the United States celebrates the Marshall Plan as proof of successful development aid yet its contemporary programs rarely replicate the very structural investments that made that success possible.

A discourse analysis shows how the legacy of the Marshall Plan and the structure of modern USAID shape the way Americans perceive other countries, creating distinct narratives about who deserves partnership and who requires rescue. Because of the Marshall Plan, aid to Europe or Israel is still framed as strengthening democratic allies and "standing firm against Soviet, and now Russian, influence," a framing grounded in how postwar assistance was explicitly designed to build strategic partners (Nye 10). Media and policy institutions reinforce the idea of Europe as wealthy, peaceful, and progressive, even though European defense spending continues to depend

heavily on American military protection. CSIS says that the US support “underwrites the security environment that allows European governments to prioritize social spending” (CSIS). At the same time, many European economies face stagnation and demographic strain, but US discourse continues to portray them as stable and successful because they fit the narrative of long-standing allies strengthened by American aid, which is an extension of the Marshall Plan myth. In contrast, Africa is often represented through paternalistic frames that emphasize poverty, disorder, and dependency. Dambisa Moyo argues that Western aid has entrenched the perception of Africa as “perpetually unable to support itself,” promoting an image of the continent as uniformly poor and crisis ridden (Moyo 20). These narratives flatten Africa’s diversity, treating its fifty-four nations as interchangeable, and portraying them as a “single story” (Adichie). USAID and media coverage frequently reinforce this view by highlighting crises rather than the continent’s economic growth, biodiversity, or cultural variation. AP News reporting proves that headlines often focus on famine or conflict, and donor withdrawal, such as describing Somalia’s health system collapse after funding cuts (AP News, PBS NewsHour).

Scholars like Besharati further show that donor countries maintain “leverage over recipients through problem-focused narratives,” which has the rhetorical effect of depicting African nations as perpetual subjects rather than partners (Besharati, South African Institute of International Affairs). Thus, while Europe is framed as a partner whose success validates US policy, Africa is framed as a site of suffering that requires American intervention. This discursive contrast is reinforced by the logic of US foreign aid. As Moss explains, modern USAID often operates according to short-term political interests rather than long-term development, which encourages narrative frames that highlight “fragility” in countries considered non-strategic (Moss 4). When US involvement increases, the accompanying media narrative tends to emphasize crisis and dysfunction, making American assistance appear essential. Conversely, US aid to strategic allies is framed as investment in shared prosperity and democratic stability. In both cases, discourse surrounding foreign aid becomes a tool for shaping American public perceptions by elevating some nations as valuable partners while reducing others to symbols of need or failure. This pattern reveals how US engagement not only delivers resources but also constructs the narratives through which Americans understand the world. The history of US foreign aid reveals that the Marshall Plan was not a universal blueprint for development but a unique geopolitical project whose success cannot be easily replicated.

Modern USAID continues to invoke that legacy, yet its programs frequently operate in contexts shaped by colonial histories, fragile institutions, and shifting domestic politics in the United States. As a result, contemporary aid often reinforces dependency rather than building durable self-sufficiency. The contrast between how the United States frames aid to Europe and aid to the Global South further demonstrates that foreign assistance is as much about shaping narratives as shaping outcomes. When aid aligns with American strategic interests, it is portrayed as partnership-building and when it does not, it becomes paternalistic and crisis-oriented. Understanding these differing discourses makes clear that US foreign aid is not simply a humanitarian endeavor but a tool of influence that continues to construct hierarchies of power. Rethinking aid requires moving beyond the mythology of the Marshall Plan and confronting the ways current policies reproduce dependency rather than supporting genuine autonomy.

Works Cited

- Adichie, Chimamanda Ngozi. “The Danger of a Single Story.” TED, July 2009, https://www.ted.com/talks/chimamanda_ngozi_adichie_the_danger_of_a_single_story
- AP News. “U.N. Food Agency to Cut Food Assistance for Thousands in Somalia Due to Funding Shortfalls.” PBS NewsHour, <https://www.pbs.org/newshour/world/u-n-food-agency-to-cut-food-assistance-for-thousands-in-somali-due-to-funding-shortfalls>.
- Berger, Mark T. “From Nation-Building to State-Building: The Geopolitics of Development and the Reconstruction of Postwar Japan and Iraq.” *Third World Quarterly*, vol. 26, no. 3, 2005, pp.

387–404.

Besharati, Neissan Alessandro. Common Goals and Differential Commitments: The Role of Emerging Economies in Development Cooperation. South African Institute of International Affairs, Report No. 121, 2013. JSTOR.

Center for Strategic and International Studies. “US Foreign Assistance in an Age of Strategic Competition.” CSIS, 2023, <https://www.csis.org/analysis/us-foreign-assistance-age-strategic-competition>.

Collinson, Erin, and Jocilyn Estes. “The Pocket Rescission Gambit: Trump’s Strategy to Cut Foreign Aid Without Congressional Approval.” Center for Global Development Blog, <https://www.cgdev.org/blog/pocket-rescission-gambit-trumps-strategy-cut-foreign-aid-without-congressional-approval>.

Green, Mark A. “Debt Distress on the Road to Belt and Road.” Wilson Center, 16 Jan. 2024, <https://www.wilsoncenter.org/blog-post/debt-distress-road-belt-and-road>.

Jones, Lee, and Shahar Hameiri. “Debunking the Myth of Debt-Trap Diplomacy.”

Chatham House, Aug. 2020, <https://www.chathamhouse.org/2020/08/debunking-myth-debt-trap-diplomacy>.

Kates, Jennifer, et al. “The Trump Administration’s Foreign Aid Freeze and Global Health: The Biggest Gaps Left on the Donor Landscape.” KFF, <https://www.kff.org/global-health-policy/the-trump-administrations-foreign-aid-freeze-and-global-health-the-biggest-gaps-left-on-the-donor-landscape/>.

Lancaster, Carol. Foreign Aid: Diplomacy, Development, Domestic Politics. University of Chicago Press, 2007.

Moritsugu, Ken. “China’s Belt and Road Reaches New Countries, but Some Major Partners Are Scaling Back.” AP News, 17 Oct. 2023, <https://apnews.com/article/china-belt-road-development-africa-69d6a22fba05a168746d257938c6b0e4>.

Moss, Todd J. US Foreign Aid and the Weakening of Development. Center for Global Development, 2007. JSTOR, Research Report 12162.

Moyo, Dambisa. Dead Aid: Why Aid Is Not Working and How There Is a Better Way for Africa. Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2009.

Nye, Joseph S. Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics. PublicAffairs, 2004. Rana, Pradumna B., and Ji Xianbai. “BRI’s Debt Trap Diplomacy: Reality or Myth.” RSIS

Commentary, 4 Nov. 2020, <https://rsis.edu.sg/rsis-publication/cms/bris-debt-trap-diplomacy-reality-or-myth/>.