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Abstract

Background: This article assesses the global health policies of the European Union (EU) and those of its individual member states. So far EU and public health scholars have paid little heed to this, despite the large budgets involved in this area. While the European Commission has attempted to define the ‘EU role in Global Health’ in 2010, member states are active in the domain of global health as well. Therefore, this article raises the question to what extent a common ‘EU’ vision on global health exists.

Methods: This is examined through a comparative framing analysis of the global health policy documents of the European Commission and five EU member states (France, Germany, the United Kingdom, Belgium, and Denmark). The analysis is informed by a two-layered typology, distinguishing global health from international health and four ‘global health frames,’ namely social justice, security, investment and charity.

Results: The findings show that the concept of global health has not gained ground in the same way within European policy documents. Consequently, there are also differences in how health is being framed. While the European Commission, Belgium, and Denmark clearly support a social justice frame, the global health strategies of the United Kingdom, Germany, and France put an additional focus on the security and investment frames.

Conclusion: There are different understandings of global/international health as well as different framings within relevant documents of the EU and its member states. Therefore, the existence of an ‘EU’ vision on global health is questionable. Further research is needed on how this impacts on policy implementation.
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Definitions Global Health

“Global health refers to health issues that transcend national boundaries and governments and call for actions on the global forces that determine the health of people.” (Kickbusch, 2006)

“Global health is an area for study, research, and practice that places a priority on improving health and achieving equity in health for all people worldwide.” (Koplan, 2009)
Shift international health towards global health:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>International health</th>
<th>Global health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scope</strong></td>
<td>Assisting developing countries in fighting infectious and neglected tropical diseases</td>
<td>Focusing on the health impacts of deepened globalization for all countries (also industrialized countries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy actors</strong></td>
<td>Ministry of development cooperation</td>
<td>‘Whole-of-a-government’ approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Global health frames
Charity

- Fight absolute poverty
- Altruism among states
- Ad-hoc, unpredictable
- Focus on popular themes of victimhood & emergencies
Social justice

- Realizing health as a human right
- Moral commitment to solidarity between individuals
- Long-term engagement
- Focus on basic health care and strengthening the health system
Security

- Fighting infectious diseases and contribute to social and political stability
- Self-interest of Western states
- Long-term engagement
- Often disease-specific focus
Investment

• Health as a means of maximizing economic development
• Self-interest of Western States
• Long-term commitment
• Disease-specific
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charity</th>
<th>Social Justice</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fight absolute poverty</td>
<td>Realizing health as a human right</td>
<td>Fighting infectious diseases and contribute to social and political stability</td>
<td>Maximize economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atruisim among states</td>
<td>Moral commitment to solidarity between individuals</td>
<td>Self-interest of Western states</td>
<td>Sel-interest of Western States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary, temporary and unpredictable</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on crisis situations and popular themes of victimhood</td>
<td>Focus on health system strengthening</td>
<td>Disease-specific focus</td>
<td>Disease-specific focus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**International health**

**Global Health**
International/global health within European countries:

- UK, Germany, France and European Commission*: **Global health**
- Belgium, Denmark (and others): **International** health
Differences in framings

• Absence of charity frame
• Dominance of social justice frame in ‘international health’ documents
  • “Inalienable right”
  • “The EU should apply the common values and principles of solidarity towards equitable and universal coverage of quality health services in all external and internal policies and actions”
• Additional security and investment frames in global health documents
  • “Reassure the UK’s security and prosperity at home, and UK citizens’ interests overseas”
Implications of the increased importance of economic and security frames

+ ‘Lift’ the topic of global health higher on the policy agenda & increase the visibility and coherence

- Possibility of foreclosing certain areas of action that are of less interest for countries providing assistance
Conclusions

• The European Commission and its member states have different policies and framings to further global health objectives.

• European member states that still hold to a traditional ‘international health’ approach should consider a shift towards a ‘global health’ approach.

• However, countries engaging in a global health approach should be careful that interest-based motives (security and investment) are in balance with social justice considerations.