



**About the Author:**

Patricia Nevoa

**About the publication:**

**3 Main Points:**

Executive Order: "Reevaluating and Realigning United States Foreign Aid"; who could oppose the need to eliminate abuses of the system? Domestically, the freeze on spending carries tangible risks for essential social programmes, threatening services that many communities rely on. Internationally, it also fuels uncertainty: allies and partners are left wondering whether the country will remain a dependable security provider and consistent strategic partner in the years ahead.



### **Highlight Sentence:**

*“However, controversy arises from the lack of robust public evidence to support the scale of the alleged irregularities.”*

### **Definition:**

The “America First” narrative serves as a guiding thread here. Domestically, this translates into a redefinition of funding priorities and increased pressure on social programmes

### ***Funding Freeze: An Implicit and Yet Explicit Meaning?***

On 20 January 2025, an executive order titled “Reevaluating and Realigning United States Foreign Aid” imposed a 90-day suspension of assistance programmes pending review. The sudden halt in funding from the United States of America has triggered severe humanitarian consequences, disrupting aid flows and heightening concerns about the stability of global support mechanisms that many vulnerable populations rely on. In this article I am going to examine the domestic consequences of recent policy decisions by the Trump administration and explore their broader international implications.

### **Realigning Values**

The formal starting point was Executive Order on “Reevaluating and Realigning United States Foreign Aid”, signed in January 2025, which ordered a comprehensive 90-day review of US foreign aid. The stated goal was to realign international assistance with the ‘America First’ policy. During this period, the distribution of funds was suspended or subject to reassessment, creating immediate impacts on humanitarian, health, and development programmes. Although the administration [declared](#) the formal end of the pause in March 2025, several reports continued to point to persistent effects in countries such as Colombia and the Democratic Republic of Congo, where essential projects suffered interruptions and delays.

Domestically, the administration moved forward with freezes and restrictions on federal funding in sensitive areas such as childcare, support for farmers, and funding



for prosecutors. Emphasis was placed on freezing funds in five states led mainly by Democratic governors - a measure critically analysed by the Centre on Budget and Policy Priorities. [According to their analysis](#), the cuts affected programmes such as Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG), both of which are essential for low-income families.

### **The American Card**

The justification given for the federal funding cuts was to combat fraud. From a political point of view, this is a powerful argument: who could oppose the need to eliminate abuses of the system? However, controversy arises from the lack of robust public evidence to support the scale of the alleged irregularities. In addition, federal courts have blocked some of these decisions, emphasising that the executive branch cannot unilaterally suspend funds previously approved by Congress. [This tension](#) places the separation of powers and the constitutionally assigned budgetary control of the legislature at the centre of the debate.

The “America First” narrative serves as a guiding thread here. Domestically, this translates into a redefinition of funding priorities and increased pressure on social programmes aimed at vulnerable populations. Internationally, it manifests itself in strategic retrenchment and an ideological review of foreign aid. In both cases, the pattern is similar: pause, review, reassessment and uncertainty. [Uncertainty](#) being the keyword for what is perceived of Trump's administration internally and internationally.

### **Uncertain times**

Answering the initial question: what do these federal cuts represent? They represent more than simple budgetary adjustments. Domestically, the freeze on spending carries tangible risks for essential social programmes, threatening services that many communities rely on. Internationally, it also fuels uncertainty: allies and partners are left wondering whether the country will remain a dependable security provider and consistent strategic partner in the years ahead.

