OPEN ACCESS
UNIVERSITY OF ARUSHA ACADEMIC JOURNAL
R-ISSN: 2665-0711, E-ISSN: 2685-6645
University of Arusha (UoA), P.O Box 7, Usa River, Arusha.
Tel: +255655487985 +255754487985 Fax : +255272553626
UoAAJ

Vol. 3(2), December 2025 https://uoa.ac.tz/journal/ **E-mail: editorial@uoa.ac.tz, wetengerekkj1@yahoo.com**

University of Arusha Academic Journal (UoAAJ) 3(2), 2025

THE POLITICS OF DEVELOPMENT AID IN AFRICA AND ITS IMPACT ON AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT

Deborah Ebunoluwa Adeyomoye
Babcock University, Ilishan-remo, Ogun State
Adeyomoyed@babcock.edu.ng
DOI: https://doi.org/10.69713/uoaaj2025v03i02.11

Abstract

This paper examines the politics behind development aid in Africa and its impact on the continent's growth. Although aid is often presented by donor nations as a means to combat poverty and promote progress, it is also influenced by the political, economic, and strategic interests of the donor. The study reviews the history of foreign aid in Africa, from the Cold War period to present times, and shows how donor countries often use aid to gain influence, secure resources, or push their own agendas. At the same time, African governments use aid in different ways. Sometimes they use aid to build development, at other times, they use it to strengthen political power or maintain control. The paper notes both positive results of foreign aid in Africa, such as improvements in health, education, and infrastructure, and negative effects like corruption, dependency, and weakened accountability. Using a qualitative approach, data is drawn from academic literature to explore the political dimensions of development aid in Africa and its implications for socioeconomic development. While some African countries have managed to benefit from development aid, other countries with weak institutions, corruption, or political instability often fail to turn aid into lasting development. It concludes that for aid to really help Africa, there must be stronger ownership by African countries, more regional cooperation, and a fairer balance between donors and recipients. At the same time, Africa cannot rely on aid forever. Alternatives include raising resources locally, building strong institutions, encouraging trade and investment within the continent, and supporting private sector growth.

Keywords: African Development, Aid Effectiveness, Aid Politics, Development Aid, Donor-recipient Relations

INTRODUCTION

Since the dawn of independence in the 1950s and 1960s, development aid has been one of the defining features of Africa's relationship with the international community. In the early postcolonial years, donors portrayed aid as an essential instrument for addressing the structural weaknesses inherited from colonial rule. Structural weaknesses such as weak economies, limited infrastructure, and fragile political institutions (Aja-Eke, 2024). From the donor perspective, aid was framed within the modernization paradigm: a short-to medium-term catalyst that would accelerate Africa's transition from "traditional" to "modern" societies, promote stability, and facilitate smoother integration into the global capitalist economy. Many African leaders initially shared this optimism, viewing aid as a pragmatic tool to fill investment gaps and fund state-led development efforts at a time when domestic revenue sources were extremely limited.

Over time, however, the nature and perception of aid evolved dramatically. For donors, aid shifted from a largely economic instrument to a multifaceted tool shaped by geopolitics, ideological competition during the Cold War, and later neoliberal reforms under the Washington Consensus. (Akinola, 2024). For African states, aid gradually became embedded in the political economy, influencing budgetary planning, governance structures, and foreign policy behavior. This evolution has invited vigorous debates among different schools of thought. Dependency theorists argue that prolonged aid created structural dependence, locking African states into unequal relationships that reproduce underdevelopment. Liberal institutionalists, in contrast, maintain that aid- when effectively implemented- strengthens institutions, improves human capital, and can support long-term growth. Post-development scholars go further, suggesting that the very concept of aid reinforces external prescriptions and undermines local agency.

These contrasting perspectives also shape debates on the intended duration of aid. Some analysts contend that aid was originally conceived as a short-term strategy- an interim mechanism to stabilize newly independent states until they achieved self-sustaining growth. Others argue that donor behavior, characterized by recurrent conditionalities and long-term programmatic interventions, reveals an implicit expectation that aid would evolve into a long-term engagement. The persistence of aid flows for more than six decades supports the latter view.

The question of whether Africa "needs" aid remains contentious. Proponents assert that, given ongoing challenges- ranging from infrastructural deficits to environmental vulnerabilities and humanitarian emergencies- aid remains a necessary supplement to domestic resources. Critics counter that the continent's development has been impeded precisely because aid reduces incentives for domestic revenue generation, distorts governance, and entrenches elite capture. Contemporary analyses now suggest a more balanced interpretation: while Africa may benefit from specific forms of targeted, accountable, and non-intrusive assistance, long-term sustainable development ultimately depends on strengthening local capacity, enhancing regional integration, and expanding internally generated resources (Akinola, 2024). In this sense, the real issue is not simply whether Africa needs aid, but what kind of aid, under what conditions, and towards what ultimate developmental objectives.

Yet, aid in Africa has always carried a paradox. While it has funded projects that improved access to education, healthcare, and infrastructure, it has also entrenched new forms of dependency and external control (Asongu and Nwachukwu, 2015). The Cold War years illustrated this most clearly, as aid became a tool of ideological competition between the United States and the Soviet Union. Later, in the 1980s and 1990s, Structural Adjustment Programs tied aid to neoliberal reforms, often at the expense of social welfare and political autonomy. In the 21st century, aid continues to be shaped by donor interests, whether in relation to security, counter-terrorism, migration control, or access to Africa's abundant natural resources (Harchaoui, Maseland, and Watkinson, 2021). At the same time, project fragmentation and symbolic interventions often weaken the long-term developmental impact of aid (Voluntas, 2024).

When viewed through concrete African examples, aid emerges as both a success and a failure strategy. On one hand, there have been notable successes-such as Rwanda's remarkable improvements in health indicators, Ethiopia's Productive Safety Net Programme, which reduced chronic food insecurity, and the coordinated aid-driven response to the Ebola crisis in West Africa that prevented a continental catastrophe. These cases suggest that under the right governance conditions, aid can contribute meaningfully to development outcomes. On the other hand, persistent failures reveal the limitations of the aid model. The Structural Adjustment era produced deep economic hardship in countries like Ghana, Zambia, and Nigeria, while decades of heavy donor dependence in Mozambique illustrate how external financing can undermine domestic resource mobilization and long-term autonomy. Similarly, the Democratic Republic of Congo continues to receive large volumes of aid with minimal developmental transformation, highlighting how corruption, conflict, and weak institutions can neutralize aid's potential benefits.

Taken together, these outcomes complicate the question of whether aid is truly "aiding" Africa. The mixed record suggests that aid can support Africa's development, but only when it strengthens rather than substitutes domestic capacity, aligns with local priorities, and avoids reinforcing dependency. Thus, aid has never been a politically neutral enterprise, and its ultimate value depends on the intersection between donor intentions, recipient governance, and the broader political economy within which it operates.

The central problem, therefore, lies in the dual character of aid: it is both a tool for development and an instrument of politics. Importantly, aid has not only recently become political; it was a political tool from the very beginning of Africa's post-independence engagement with external powers. In the early 1960s, as newly independent African states sought resources to address colonial legacies, donors simultaneously sought influence in a rapidly changing global order. The United States, for example, extended substantial aid to countries such as Liberia, Kenya, and Ethiopia to secure ideological allies during the Cold War, while the Soviet Union provided military and technical assistance to states like Angola and Mozambique to expand socialist influence. These early patterns demonstrate that development concerns were intertwined with geopolitical calculations from the start.

Donor governments and institutions frequently frame aid in humanitarian language, yet their actions are guided by strategic, economic, and geopolitical considerations. This became especially evident in the 1980s and 1990s when the World Bank and IMF introduced Structural Adjustment Programs, using aid as leverage to enforce neoliberal reforms across Ghana, Nigeria, Zambia, and Tanzania. These reforms-privatization, austerity, and market liberalization- were driven by global economic ideology rather than domestic priorities, illustrating how aid could reshape national policy decisions.

African governments, in turn, negotiate these dynamics in ways that may either advance national development goals or reinforce elite power structures. For example, Rwanda strategically aligned donor assistance with its national development plans, using aid to strengthen health systems and governance reforms. Conversely, in Zimbabwe, political elites manipulated external assistance and sanctions narratives to consolidate domestic power, illustrating how internal agency can redirect the purpose of aid for political survival rather than development. These examples highlight why the politics of aid remains a critical subject of study. Aid has always carried both developmental intentions and political calculations, and its impact depends on the complex interplay between external influence and internal agency. Understanding this dual character is essential to explaining Africa's uneven development outcomes and the persistent tensions surrounding external assistance.

The purpose of this paper is to examine the politics of development aid in Africa by analyzing the motivations of donors, the strategies of recipient governments, and the broader outcomes for governance and development. The paper argues that development aid in Africa is shaped less by purely altruistic goals than by a complex mix of political, economic, and strategic interests. These interests profoundly influence the effectiveness, sustainability, and long-term implications of aid for the continent. Ultimately, understanding the politics of aid is essential not only for evaluating its past and present impact but also for rethinking its role in Africa's future development.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Development aid, often referred to as foreign aid, broadly describes the financial, technical, or material assistance provided by external actors to promote economic growth, reduce poverty, and strengthen governance in developing countries. In Africa, this aid comes from bilateral donors, such as individual states, and multilateral donors, such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and regional development banks. Beyond financial transfers, aid also includes technical expertise, humanitarian relief, and capacity-building programs (Akinola and Magam-Chaka, 2024). Scholars further distinguish between traditional donors (mostly Western governments and multilateral institutions) and emerging donors such as China, India, and Turkey, whose approaches are often less tied to conditionality and more focused on trade, infrastructure, and investment partnerships (Harchaoui, Maseland, and Watkinson, 2021).

The study of development aid has been shaped by several theoretical frameworks, each offering distinct explanations for how and why aid operates in Africa. Modernization theory, grounded in Rostow's Stages of Economic Growth, views aid as a means to help less developed countries follow the trajectory of industrialized nations, with external assistance facilitating economic and institutional transformation. According to this model, external assistance provides the necessary financial and technical inputs for countries to break out of the poverty cycle- a condition in which low income leads to low savings, low investment, and consequently low productivity, trapping nations in perpetual underdevelopment. In contrast, dependency theory argues that aid reinforces unequal global relations by keeping African states reliant on donor resources, thus perpetuating the very poverty and structural weaknesses it claims to solve (Aja-Eke, 2024). From this perspective, aid is not a pathway out of the poverty cycle but a mechanism that deepens it by limiting local capacity, distorting domestic markets, and empowering elites aligned with external interests.

Neoliberal approaches, prominent during the 1980s and 1990s, emphasized structural reforms, fiscal discipline, and liberalization as conditions for aid, reflecting the view that market-oriented policies were necessary for sustainable growth (Oluwadara, 2022). Under this model, aid was used as leverage to reshape African economies in accordance with global capitalist norms. More recent critiques, however, stress the political nature of aid, showing that donors use assistance not only to promote development but also to advance their own strategic, economic, and security interests. Whether through counter-terrorism partnerships, migration management, or access to natural resources. In this framing, aid becomes a part of a broader system of global power relations, raising critical questions about who benefits most and whether it genuinely helps African societies escape the poverty cycle or perpetuates new forms of dependency.

This paper adopts a political economy perspective that combines insights from these approaches. Aid is conceptualized not as a neutral transfer of resources but as a contested arena where donor agendas and recipient strategies interact. It is both a development tool and a political instrument, shaping and shaped by global power relations, domestic governance structures, and Africa's pursuit of sustainable development. By situating aid within its broader framework, the paper highlights the need to analyze not only the technical effectiveness of aid but also its political implications.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF DEVELOPMENT AID IN AFRICA

The roots of development aid in Africa can be traced to the colonial era, when European powers justified their economic and political domination partly in terms of a so-called "civilizing mission". Infrastructure projects such as railways, ports, and administrative buildings were financed not to stimulate long-term African development but rather to facilitate resource extraction and consolidate colonial control. By the time independence swept across the continent in the late 1950s and 1960s, most African countries inherited economies highly dependent on the export of primary commodities, fragile governance institutions, and limited industrial capacity. This structural vulnerability created the conditions under which aid assumed a central role in post-colonial development planning (Asongu & Nwachukwu, 2015).

However, this narrative reflects the donor perspective primarily. From the African point of view, aid was not merely accepted passively; it was often viewed as a strategic resource to support nation-building, address capacity deficits, and stabilize fragile economies. Many African leaders saw aid as a vehicle for financing ambitious development plans, expanding social services, and asserting autonomy in a global system still marked by unequal power relations. At the same time, African scholars and policymakers voiced concerns about the conditionalities attached to aid, the perpetuation of dependency, and the limited alignment of donor priorities with local needs.

In the immediate post-independence decades, development aid was closely tied to the geopolitical rivalry of the Cold War. Western donors, led by the United States and Western Europe, sought to strengthen their influence in Africa by providing large-scale aid packages to allied governments. In contrast, the Soviet Union extended assistance to socialist-leaning regimes such as Mozambique, Angola, and later, Ethiopia. Aid in this period was not merely humanitarian but also deeply political, designed to secure strategic alliances in a continent seen as central to global ideological competition. African leaders, for their part, often leveraged this rivalry to maximize resource flows by skillfully balancing relationships with most Western and Eastern blocs (Aja-Eke, 2024).

The 1970s also marked an era of ambitious development visions, with aid financing mega-infrastructure projects, industrialization schemes, and agricultural modernization. However, the optimism of this period gave way to a crisis in the 1980s. A global recession, falling commodity prices, and rising external debts pushed many African economies into severe fiscal distress. In response, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the

World Bank introduced Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs), which tied aid and debt relief liberalization to fiscal austerity. While donors argued that SAPs were essential to restore macroeconomic stability, critics contend that they dismantled social safety nets, widened inequality, and undermined state capacity to foster home-grown development, leaving long-lasting scars on African development trajectories (Harchaoui, Maseland & Watkinson, 2021).

The 1990s ushered in another transformation of aid, as the Cold War ended and donor rhetoric shifted toward governance, democracy, and human rights. With geopolitical rivalry diminished, donors emphasized "good governance" as a central condition for receiving aid. This included demands for multi-party elections, judicial reforms, anti-corruption measures, and respect for human rights. While these conditions aimed to strengthen accountability and institutions, they also reinforced external influence over African policymaking, raising questions about sovereignty and ownership of development strategies (Oluwadara, 2022).

In the twenty-first century, development aid in Africa has been shaped by two major dynamics. First, traditional Western donors have reframed aid around poverty reduction, as reflected in initiatives like the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and later the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). These frameworks emphasized sectors such as education, health, and gender equality, often linking aid to measurable outcomes. Second, the rise of emerging donors (most prominently China, but also India, Brazil, and Turkey) has significantly altered the aid landscape. Unlike Western aid, which is often tied to conditionality, Chinese aid emphasizes infrastructure development, trade, and investment, framed under the principle of "non-interference". This has created new opportunities for African states to diversify their partnerships, but also generated debates about debt dependency and the geopolitical implications of China's presence (Harchaoui, Maseland, and Watkinson, 2021).

Overall, the historical trajectory of aid in Africa demonstrates that development assistance has never been politically neutral. From the colonial era to the present, aid has functioned simultaneously as a mechanism of support for socioeconomic progress and as an instrument of geopolitical strategy. This duality underscores the central argument of this paper: aid in Africa must be understood not only as a tool of development but also as a deeply political practice shaped by shifting global and domestic power relations.

TRADITIONAL AND EMERGING DONORS IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY

The pattern of development aid to Africa in the twenty-first century reflects two distinct yet interrelated trends. The first concerns the traditional Western donors, who have continued to frame aid within the context of poverty reduction and human development. Global initiatives such as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and later the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) placed renewed emphasis on education, health care, gender equity, and environmental sustainability. During this period, Western aid remained largely conditional, with assistance tied to governance reforms, fiscal discipline, and transparency measures (Kato & Lee, 2020). This approach sought to promote accountability but also maintained a significant level of external influence over domestic policy priorities.

The second trend highlights the growing involvement of emerging donors, notably China, India, Brazil, and Turkey, whose entry has altered the structure and politics of Africa's aid environment. Unlike Western assistance, which is often accompanied by political or economic conditions, the engagement of these power partners is generally built on principles of mutual benefit and non-interference (Mawdsley, 2019). Their aid and investments have focused heavily on infrastructure, trade, expansion, and industrial growth. China's Belt and Road Initiative (BRI), for instance, has made it one of Africa's largest bilateral financiers, supporting major projects in transportation, energy, and manufacturing (Parody and Hampwaye, 2022; Dreher et al., 2022).

While these evolving partnerships have provided African governments with alternative sources of funding and greater room for policy choice, they have also generated important debates about long-term debt sustainability and the risks associated with what critics term "debt trap diplomacy" (Dreher et al., 2022). In this context, debt-trap diplomacy refers to situations where countries accumulate high levels of external debt from a particular donor, often on terms that are opaque or based on collateralized agreements, thereby increasing their vulnerability to political or economic pressure. In Africa, concerns have emerged that some large infrastructure loans, particularly those tied to strategic assets such as ports, railways, and energy facilities, could lead to a scenario in which the inability to service debts grants creditors undue leverage. Although empirical evidence of intentional manipulation remains contested, the structural risk is nonetheless significant: heavy borrowing for capital-intensive projects can strain national budgets, reduce fiscal flexibility, and expose states to renegotiation processes that may entail concessions over natural resources, policy decisions, or strategic access (Aregbeshola, 2024; Brautigam, 2020).

Taken together, these developments show that the history of aid to Africa has never been devoid of politics. From the colonial period to contemporary times, external assistance has operated as both a means of promoting socioeconomic development and a vehicle for advancing strategic interests. The interplay between these purposes reinforces the argument that development aid in Africa must be viewed not only as a tool for progress but also as a deeply political process, continually shaped by changing global and regional power relations (Munyi and Warmerdam, 2021; Foster & Rena, 2024).

DONOR MOTIVATIONS AND INTERESTS

Foreign aid to Africa is rarely given for neutral or purely humanitarian reasons. Behind the official rhetoric of poverty reduction, health, and education lies a complex mix of strategic, economic, and political calculations. Donors have long used aid to advance their own national interests, whether by shaping political alliances, securing access to resources, or addressing security and migration concerns. To understand the politics of aid in Africa, it is important to look at what drives honors and how these motivations influence both the scale and the direction of assistance, and ultimately, who gains from the aid relationship.

One of the strongest motivations for aid is strategic advantage. During the Cold War, Africa was a major site of competition between the Western and Eastern blocs, and aid was used to secure political allies. Today, while ideological battles have faded, strategic concerns remain strong. The United States, for example, channels large sums of aid to countries in the Horn of Africa and the Sahel, regions considered vital in the fight against terrorism. Beyond health programs such as PEPFAR (President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief), much of U.S. assistance is tied to military cooperation, counter terrorism training, and intelligence sharing (Akinola & Magam-Chaka, 2024). While African governments benefit from security partnerships and financial inflows, the primary beneficiaries are often donor governments that gain expanded military presence, influence over security operations, and improved global counter-terrorism coordination.

The European Union also uses aid as a strategic tool, particularly in connection with migration. Since the mid-2010s, the EU has prioritized curbing irregular migration from Africa into Europe by outsourcing border control through partnerships and agreements with African countries. Through instruments like the EU Emergency Trust Fund for Africa, billions of euros have been directed to countries such as Niger, Libya, and Sudan to strengthen border control, create jobs, and discourage migration (Castillejo, 2019). While presented as development cooperation, these funds serve Europe's domestic political interests by reducing pressure on its borders. Of equal importance in aid donation is the donors' economic interest in securing unrestricted access to Africa's vast natural resources. Nations such as Niger and the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) have become focal points of donor attention due to their rich deposits of uranium and a wide range of critical minerals, respectively. Thus, behind the rhetoric of partnership and development lies a continuing pursuit of economic and strategic advantage, as donors seek to secure both geopolitical influence and access to Africa's valuable mineral wealth.

Economic calculations are another key driver of donor behavior. Aid is often tied to trade, investment, or resource access. China provides the clearest example. Over the past two decades, China has become Africa's largest bilateral financier, offering loans and grants for infrastructure projects such as highways, railways, and power plants. While framed under the principle of "non-interference" and South-South solidarity, Chinese aid also ensures access to oil, minerals, and new markets for Chinese firms (Brautigam, 2020). African countries benefit from infrastructure expansion, but Chinese companies often secure construction contracts, procurement rights, and long-term commodity agreements, making China a central beneficiary of its own aid model.

Western donors pursue similar aims, though in subtler ways. Aid has often been tied to economic liberalization policies that open African markets to foreign competition. Structural reforms in the 1980s and 1990s, for instance, required African governments to reduce subsidies, privatize industries, and liberalize trade. While these reforms created new opportunities for Western businesses, they often weakened domestic industries and social welfare systems (Harchaoui, Maseland and Watkinson, 2021). While African governments gained short-term financial support, Western states and corporations benefited disproportionately through expanded access to African markets, investment opportunities, and extractive industries. This pattern illustrates that aid often stimulates donor economic objectives more than it strengthens African economic sovereignty.

Donors frequently justify aid in the language of humanitarianism and development, pointing to poverty reduction strategies, health interventions, and support for the Sustainable Development Goals. While there is no doubt that aid has helped improve literacy, reduce child mortality, and combat diseases such as HIV/AIDS and malaria, the humanitarian narrative often masks deeper political realities. Aid is almost always tied to conditions, whether on governance, security cooperation, or economic reforms, that reflect the priorities of the donor rather than the needs of the recipient. The gap between what donors say and what they do is therefore a central feature of aid politics. As a result, humanitarian beneficiaries (African citizens) gain in specific sectors, while donors benefit from the broader political and economic alignment that accompanies such assistance.

For example, U.S. aid to Africa reflects a blend of humanitarian and strategic objectives. Programs like PEPFAR (President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief) have saved millions of lives, but large shares of aid are directed toward countries that are seen as vital in the fight against terrorism, such as Ethiopia, Nigeria, and Kenya. U.S. aid is thus both a tool of global health and an extension of foreign policy interests in counter terrorism and regional stability. Beyond health and security goals, U.S. aid often carries subtle ideological undertones, promoting governance, liberal economic reforms, and Western conceptions of human rights. In this sense, aid functions not only as a tool of global health and counter-terrorism but also as a mechanism of ideological influence that seeks to align recipient nations with American policy values and worldviews. Similarly, China's aid model is centered on infrastructure and trade. Yet the heavy reliance on Chinese loans raises the risk of debt dependency, giving China leverage in future negotiations involving resources, trade, or foreign policy. Thus, while African states benefit from physical infrastructure, China benefits through expanded political influence, resource security, and long-term economic positioning.

The construction of major projects, such as the Addis Ababa-Djibouti railway or Kenya's Standard Gauge Railway, has boosted connectivity and economic growth. Yet, these projects are often financed by loans, raising concerns about debt dependency and giving China long-term leverage in negotiations over resources and policy directions (Castillejo, 2019). In the same vein, EU aid increasingly links development with migration management. By funding projects that discourage outward migration, such as job training programs in West Africa, the EU aims to address what it calls the "root causes" of migration. Critics argue, however, that these policies prioritized European concerns over African development goals, turning aid into a form of migration control.

RECIPIENT GOVERNMENT DYNAMICS

The role of African governments in shaping the politics of development aid is complex and often contradictory. On one hand, aid represents a vital source of revenue for states struggling with limited fiscal capacity, infrastructural deficits, and persistent poverty. On the other hand, it raises important questions about sovereignty, accountability, and the internal political uses of external resources. African governments are not passive recipients of aid; they actively negotiate, redirect, and sometimes manipulate donor funds in ways that reflect domestic political realities. Understanding who benefits from aid requires examining not only donor intentions but also how governments appropriate aid for political, economic, and institutional purposes.

A central issue is the balance between sovereignty and donor conditionality. Donor agencies often impose conditions tied to governance, human rights, or macroeconomic reforms as prerequisites for disbursing funds. While intended to promote transparency and effective use of aid, such conditions frequently constrain the policy space of recipient governments. Many African leaders have sought to navigate this dilemma strategically. In Ethiopia, for instance, successive governments have used aid as leverage to pursue ambitious state-led development strategies. Under Prime Minister Meles Zenawi, Ethiopia received billions in donor funding but resisted Western demands for broad political liberalization, arguing that stability and economic growth were national priorities (Hackenesch and Bader, 2020). Rwanda offers another example, where Paul Kagame's government has welcomed donor support for social reconstruction while simultaneously curbing political dissent (Akinola and Magam-Chaka, 2024). In both cases, aid flows were not accepted uncritically but negotiated in ways that allowed governments to safeguard elements of their sovereignty. Donors, in turn, benefit from maintaining relationships with stable and reform-oriented states, even if political liberalization remains limited.

Aid also plays a role in the domestic political economy. Far from being distributed solely for developmental purposes, aid resources are often captured by political elites and channeled into patronage systems. This phenomenon, commonly referred to as elite capture, undermines developmental goals while entrenching regime survival. In Nigeria, health and infrastructure aid has repeatedly been compromised by corruption, with donor funds redirected toward personal enrichment or electoral campaigns (Okonjo-Iweala, 2018). Similarly, in Kenya during the Moi era, donor resources frequently reinforced political patronage networks, strengthening the ruling party's hold over key ethnic constituencies. Even in more democratic settings, such as Ghana, aid has been used strategically during election periods to enhance the ruling party's credibility, raising concerns about the distortion of democratic competition (Asongu and Nwachukwu, 2015). In these cases, the primary beneficiaries are ruling elites who convert external resources into political capital, while donors benefit indirectly through continued access and influence, and citizens benefit only partially or unevenly.

The reliance on external aid has also been described as an "aid curse", wherein governments dependent on donor funding become less accountable to their citizens. Instead of fostering a robust social contract through domestic taxation, aid-dependent regimes often prioritize satisfying donor requirements over meeting citizen demands. This dynamic can weaken state capacity in the long run, as domestic institutions are sidelined in favor of donor-driven priorities. In fragile states such as South Sudan, the heavy presence of humanitarian aid has at times displaced the responsibility of the government to provide basic services, further weakening legitimacy (Curtis, 2021). Here, donors may achieve short-term humanitarian objectives, but citizens pay the price through weakened institutions and limited political accountability.

Despite these challenges, aid has not been uniformly negative in its domestic political impact. Some governments have used aid effectively to support genuine development reforms. Ghana, for example, has made strides in strengthening public financial management and improving health outcomes with donor support, even if political distortions remain (Adu-Gyamfi, 2019). Similarly, Rwanda has leveraged aid to expand access to education and health care, thus achieving significant improvements in social indicators (Chemouni, 2018). In both cases, aid has complemented national development strategies rather than substituting for them, suggesting that positive outcomes are possible when there is strong local ownership and alignment between donor priorities and domestic agendas.

Taken together, the dynamics of aid at the recipient level reveal a double-edged reality. While external assistance provides crucial resources for development, it also shapes the political economy of African states in ways that can reinforce authoritarianism, patronage, and dependency. The ultimate impact of aid thus depends not only on donor motivations but also on how African governments choose to negotiate, appropriate, or resist aid in the pursuit of their own political and developmental objectives.

IMPACT OF AID ON GOVERNANCE AND DEVELOPMENT

On the surface, aid is expected to strengthen institutions, promote transparency, and stimulate economic growth by filling fiscal gaps and supporting development programs. However, its actual impact is far more complex, producing both positive and negative outcomes that vary across countries and sectors.

In many cases, aid has supported the creation and strengthening of state institutions. Donors have invested heavily in public financial management systems, electoral commissions, anti-corruption bodies, and judicial reforms. For example, in Ghana, donor assistance has been instrumental in establishing budget transparency mechanisms and enhancing parliamentary oversight (Adu-Gyamfi, 2019). Similarly, in Liberia, after the civil war, external aid supported the rebuilding of state institutions, including the training of civil servants and the restoration of core government functions (Curtis, 2021). These interventions demonstrate that, when well-targeted, aid can contribute to institutional development and enhance the capacity of states to deliver public services.

Aid has also been used as a lever for promoting democratization and good governance. Conditionality attached to aid packages often requires recipient governments to adopt political reforms, such as holding multiparty elections, respecting human rights, and ensuring press freedoms. In Malawi during the 1990s, donor pressure played a key role in the transition from one-party rule to multiparty democracy. More recently, international donors have supported election monitoring and civic education programs in Kenya and Nigeria, strengthening democratic practices (Hackenesch & Bader, 2020). Nevertheless, these achievements remain fragile. In many cases, aid has promoted formal compliance with democratic norms without securing bigger institutional change, leading to what some scholars describe as “facade diplomacy” (Akinola and Magam-Chaka, 2024).

Despite its potential benefits, aid has often undermined domestic accountability structures. By providing governments with external resources, aid can reduce the incentive to raise revenue taxation, thereby weakening the social contract between rulers and citizens. Instead of being accountable to domestic taxpayers, governments may become more responsive to external donors. Moreover, aid inflows can fuel corruption by creating large pools of resources that are vulnerable to elite capture. Nigeria provides a striking example, where billions in donor funds intended for infrastructure and social development projects have been misappropriated through corruption and mismanagement (Okonjo-Iweala, 2018). Similar patterns of misappropriation have been reported in Uganda, where aid funds have sometimes been diverted to bolster ruling party patronage networks (Curtis, 2021).

In terms of economic growth, the record of aid is mixed. On the one hand, aid has financed important development projects in infrastructure, education, and health. The expansion of primary education in Tanzania, for example, was heavily supported by donor funding, leading to significant improvements in enrollment rates (Aja-Eke, 2024). Donor-supported health interventions, such as the Global Fund and PEPFAR (President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief), have contributed to the reduction of HIV/AIDS prevalence in several African countries (Chemouni, 2018). On the other hand, critics argue that aid fosters dependency, distorts local markets, and discourages domestic innovation.

In some cases, the influx of aid has undermined local industries, as seen with food aid programs that displaced local agricultural producers (Asongu and Nwachukwu, 2015).

Food aid, though vital in addressing immediate hunger, can sometimes produce unintended negative effects on local agriculture. When large amounts of food aid are distributed, farmers and communities may begin to rely on these free or subsidized supplies instead of cultivating their own crops, leading to reduced agricultural activity and long-term dependency. Evidence from several African countries illustrates this challenge. In Malawi, for example, a 2013 study found a 5% decline in agricultural production as smallholder farmers turned to food aid rather than investing in their farms (Lee, 2025). Similarly, in Ethiopia in 2015, large inflows of food aid contributed to a 10% drop in local grain production due to reduced market prices and lower incentives to farm (Lee, 2025). In Somalia, the impact was even more pronounced, with agricultural output falling by about 15% in 2017 as aid distribution weakened local production efforts (Lee, 2025). These cases highlight the delicate balance between meeting urgent humanitarian needs and ensuring that food aid does not inadvertently undermine local agricultural systems or deepen long-term food insecurity.

The overall impact of aid on governance and development in Africa reveals a paradox. While aid has enabled significant progress in certain areas, such as health, education, and institutional reforms, it has also entrenched corruption, fostered dependency, and undermined democratic accountability. This dual legacy underscores the political nature of aid: its effectiveness is not determined solely by the volume of resources provided but by the context in which it is delivered and how recipient governments and donors interact. Ultimately, aid can promote good governance and sustainable development only when it is aligned with domestic priorities, accompanied by strong accountability mechanisms, and embedded in strategies that reduce dependency over time.

CONCLUSION

Development aid has played an important role in shaping Africa's political and economic path, but it has also raised many difficult questions. While aid is often presented as a tool for helping countries grow and fight poverty, it is also influenced by the political and economic interests of donors and the internal strategies of recipient governments. This has sometimes limited its ability to bring lasting change to the recipient countries. In some cases, aid has supported important reforms, built infrastructure, and improved access to health and education. However, in many others, it has encouraged dependency, weakened accountability, or been used for political gain. The evidence suggests that the effectiveness of aid depends less on the amount given and more on how it is managed, the balance of power between donors and governments, and the willingness of leaders to prioritize the needs of their citizens. For Africa to benefit more fully from aid, it must be tied to stronger local institutions, greater transparency, and a focus on building self-reliance. At the same time, donors need to move beyond short-term political or strategic interests and align their support with the long-term development goals of African societies. Only when both sides take responsibility can aid serve as a genuine tool for sustainable growth and good governance in Africa. This does not mean aid is the only path. Africa cannot rely on it alone. Sustainable development depends more on boosting domestic resources, encouraging trade within the continent, investing in education and skills, and fostering innovation and entrepreneurship. Aid can support these efforts, but lasting progress will come from Africa taking charge of its own growth.

REFERENCES

Adu-Gyamfi, S. (2019). *Foreign Aid and the Challenges of Development in Ghana*. Cogent Social Sciences, 5 (1), 160-175. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2019.160-175.

Aja-Eke, D. (2024). Foreign Aid and Socioeconomic Development: The Perceptions of Aid in Nigeria. *Journal of Asian and African Studies.* https://doi.org/10.1177/00219096241270702.

Aja-Eke, I. (2024). *Dependency and Development Aid in Africa: A Reassessment.* London: Routledge.

Akinola, A., & Magam-Chaka, N. (2024). Foreign Aid, Loans and the Quest to Achieve the Sustainable Development Goals in Sub-Saharan Africa. *African Journal of Development Studies* 14(4). https//.doi.org/10.31920/2634-3649/2024/v14n4a5.

Aregbeshola, R.A. (2024). *Examining the Sustainability of African debt owed to China in the context of debt-trap diplomacy.* Journal of International Development, 36(2), 145-160. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jidev.2024.102315.

Asongu, S., & Nwachukwu, J. (2015). Foreign Aid and Inclusive Development: Updated Evidence from Africa, 2005-2012. *Social Indicators Research* 120 (1): 23-49. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-014-0589-x.

Brautigam, D., (2020). *Will Africa Feed China?* New York: Oxford University Press.

Carmody, P., & Hampwaye, G. (2022). *China's Belt and Rod Initiative in Africa: Debt, Development, and Geopolitics.* Geoforum, 133, 39-49. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2022.04.019.

Castillejo, C., (2019). The Influence of EU Migration Policy on Development Cooperation: The Case of the Trust Fund for Africa. *Journal of Contemporary European Research,* 15 (3): 250-65. https://doi.org/10.30950/jcer.v15i3.1062.

Brautigam, D., (2020). *A Critical Look at Chinese 'debt-trap diplomacy': The rise of a narrative.* Area and Development Policy, 5(1), 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1080/23792949.2019.1689828.

Chemouni, B., (2018). The Political Path to Universal Health Coverage: Power, Ideas and Community-Based Health Insurance in Rwanda. *World Development* 106: 87-98. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.01.023.

Curtis, D., (2021). *Humanitarianism, Aid and Politics in South Sudan.* Woodbridge: James Currey.

Dreher, A., Fuchs, A., Parks, B., Strange, A. M., & Tierney, M.J. (2022). *Lightening up Africa: The Effects of Chinese aid on Economic Development.* World Development, 156, 105920. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2022.105920.

Foster, V., & Rana, A. (2024). *Infrastructure Financing in Africa: Challenges and Pathways for Sustainable Investment.* Journal of Infrastructure Policy & Development, 8(1), 1-22. https://doi.org/10.24294/jipd.v.8i1.1685.

Hackenesch, C., & Bader, J., (2020). Aid, Political Conditionality and Democratic Backsliding in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of Development Studies* 56 (9): 1745-1762. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2019.1696957.

Harchaoui, S., Maseland, R., & Watkinson, H., (2021). Emerging Donors and the Changing Landscape of Development Cooperation in Africa. *World Development* 146:105611. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2021.105611.

Harchaoui, T., Maseland, J., & Watkinson, J. (2021). Carving Out an Empire? How China Strategically Uses Aid to Facilitate Chinese Business Expansion in Africa. *Journal of African Economies* 30(2): 183-211. https://doi.org/10.1093/jae/ejaa029.

Kato, H.., & Lee, H. (2020). *The Emergence of New Donors and the Transformation of Development Cooperation.* Journal of International Development, 32(6), 932-950. https://doi.org/10.1002/jid.3489.

Lee, S. (2025). *The Impact of Food Aid on Communities.* https://numberanalytics.com.

Munyi, E.W., & Warmerdam, W. (2021). *Emerging Donors and African Agency: Rethinking Development Cooperation in Africa.* Development Policy Review, 39(4), 546-563. https://doi.org/10.1111/dpr.12556.

Okonjo-Iweala, N. (2018). *Fighting Corruption is Dangerous: The Story Behind the Headlines.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Oluwadara, D., (2022). Explaining Africa's Eonomic Dilemma in the Context of the Dependency Theory. *Journal of Innovative Social Science and Human Resources* 22 (6): 15-32. https://www.hummingbirdpubng.com.

Oluwadara, D., (2022). Neoliberalism and Impoverishment of the Global South: A Case of Nigeria and Ghana. *Oracle of Wisdom Journal of Philosophy and Public Affairs* 6 (1): 15-32. https://acjol.org.

Sun, Y., & Zoubir, Y. (2023). *China and African Debt: The Politics of Debt Distress and the Restructuring Dilemma.* The Third World Quarterly, 44(3), 487-505. https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2022.2161327.

Voluntas: *International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations.* 2024. Fragmentation of Projects and the Symbolism of Development Aid in Northern Ghana. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-024-00680-5.