Published by :
http://www.ijert.org

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 14 Issue 11, November 2025

History Repeating Itself: Where the World Stands Against Epidemics

Dr. Natasha Sharma
PG Department of Mathematics, Kanya Maha Vidyalaya, Jalandhar, India

Abstract - From ancient plagues to the COVID-19 crisis, epidemics and pandemics have been a part of human history that has changed demographics, economics, science, and government. Despite remarkable technological advancements, including genomic sequencing and mRNA vaccine platforms, enduring inequities, political disunity, and public skepticism persist in hindering preparedness. This longer paper looks at how historical parallels show systemic patterns that come back every century, like delayed detection, unfair access to care, and reactive governance [1–3]. It adds to the conversation about global health governance, vaccine fairness, managing the infodemic, putting One Health into action, antimicrobial resistance (AMR), and health risks linked to climate change [4–6]. It contends that ending the cycle of repeated epidemic failure necessitates an institutional overhaul—rooting preparedness in equity, openness, and resilience across sectors [7,8]. Proposed policy frameworks aim to change the way epidemics are handled in the twenty-first century from crisis containment to adaptive resilience and sustainable prevention.

1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout human history, epidemics have frequently acted as crucial turning points that have altered the political agenda, cultural norms, and economic systems of societies. Every infectious disease outbreak, from the Antonine Plague to COVID-19, has put human adaptability to the test [1,9]. Civilizations saw recurrent cycles of emergence, panic, containment, and reform long before microbes were understood. Social change was sparked by the Black Death, which killed almost half of Europe's population [10]. While the 1918 influenza pandemic reshaped international health policy, cholera pandemics in the 19th century spurred urban reforms [11]. Funding models and civil society engagement were altered by the HIV/AIDS crisis [12], and COVID-19 revealed the vulnerability of even highly developed health systems [13, 14]. By 2025, disparities in response and readiness still exist despite genomic surveillance and data-sharing networks.

2. HISTORICAL PATTERNS: WHAT REPEATS

Four recurring dynamics explain the cyclical nature of epidemics: uncertainty of information, crisis governance, social inequity, and uneven diffusion of innovation [3,9]. In the earliest stages, limited data create fertile ground for rumors and political disputes. During SARS (2003), lack of transparency delayed containment, prompting reform of the International Health Regulations (IHR) [15]. Ebola (2014–16) highlighted how mistrust and misinformation undermined control efforts [16]. COVID-19 magnified this in the digital era, where misinformation spread faster than pathogens [17].

Throughout human history, epidemics have frequently acted as crucial turning points that have altered the political agenda, cultural norms, and economic systems of societies. Every infectious disease outbreak, from the Antonine Plague to COVID-19, has put human adaptability to the test [1,9]. Civilizations saw recurrent cycles of emergence, panic, containment, and reform long before microbes were understood. Social change was sparked by the Black Death, which killed almost half of Europe's population [10]. While the 1918 influenza pandemic reshaped international health policy, cholera pandemics in the 19th century spurred urban reforms [11]. Funding models and civil society engagement were altered by the HIV/AIDS crisis [12], and COVID-19 revealed the vulnerability of even highly developed health systems [13, 14]. By 2025, disparities in response and readiness still exist despite genomic surveillance and data-sharing networks.

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 14 Issue 11, November 2025

Table 1. Major Historical Epidemics and Their Socio-Economic Impact

Epidemic	Period	Estimated Death Toll	Region(s)	Socio-Economic Impact
Antonine Plague	165–180 AD	~5 million	Roman Empire	Military decline
Black Death	1346–1353	75–100 million	Europe, Asia	End of feudalism
Cholera Pandemics	1817–1923	>1 million	Global	Sanitation reforms
1918 Influenza	1918–1920	50 million	Global	Public health system expansion
HIV/AIDS	1981–present	39 million	Global	Human-rights-based health governance
COVID-19	2019–2024	7 million+	Global	Digital transformation, inequity exposure

Note: Historical reconstruction is used to determine mortality estimates for ancient pandemics, which can differ. However, the table shows how political and economic systems are constantly altered by epidemics.

Crisises in legitimacy and governance continue to occur everywhere. When trust is low, coercive public health measures frequently lead to backlash. Punitive laws deter testing and adherence, as demonstrated by HIV/AIDS [12]. Foreign-led Ebola responses that lacked local participation decreased compliance [16]. COVID-19 showed that social solidarity and open communication work better than coercion [18].

Pandemics also highlight structural injustices. Mortality and access to countermeasures are consistently correlated with socioeconomic gradients [19]. The distribution of COVID-19 vaccines was uneven, and antiretroviral drugs reached low-income countries years after international commitments [20]. These differences are not coincidental; rather, they are the result of global hierarchies in manufacturing, finance, and political bargaining power. Innovation and science are not always equitable, but they do speed up in times of crisis. Global benefit-sharing has been limited by patents, technology monopolies, and limited local capacity, despite the fact that germ theory, antibiotics, and mRNA vaccines revolutionized medicine [21,22].

3. WHERE THE WORLD STANDS IN 2025

The foundation of epidemic governance continues to be the International Health Regulations (IHR) (2005). Although sample sharing and accountability are now more clearly defined thanks to recent amendments (2024), enforcement still depends on voluntary compliance [15, 23]. Less than 20% of WHO's budget comes from assessed contributions, indicating that the organization's funding is still limited [24]. Decentralized resilience has been modeled by regional networks such as the Emergency Operations Center of ASEAN and the Africa CDC [25].

Equity in vaccines is still lacking. With the help of technology transfer from high-income nations, regional manufacturing hubs are emerging in Asia, Latin America, and Africa [26]. However, regulatory harmonization, cold chain, and workforce training are lagging behind. Although programs like the Medicines Patent Pool and TRIPS flexibilities offer some partial solutions, intellectual property reform is still controversial [27].

It is now acknowledged that managing the infodemic is crucial. Proactive communication, community involvement, and platform partnerships are highlighted in WHO's 2023 Infodemic Management Framework [17, 28]. Transparency and interactive communication are essential for reestablishing trust; algorithms by themselves cannot [29].

Despite its limited operationalization, the One Health approach—which integrates environmental, animal, and human health—has gained international policy traction [30]. Funding is sporadic and there is still a lack of interoperability between veterinary and human surveillance systems. However, integrated governance is inevitable due to the growing rate of zoonotic spillovers [31].

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 14 Issue 11, November 2025

4. FUTURE OUTLOOK

One example of a slow-moving pandemic is antimicrobial resistance (AMR). AMR poses a threat to routine surgery, childbirth, and cancer care, and is estimated to cause 1.27 million deaths annually [32]. Resistance is accelerated by antibiotic misuse in both humans and animals. WASH infrastructure, global stewardship frameworks, and sustainable antibiotic R&D incentives are some of the solutions [33]. Plans for national preparedness should incorporate AMR surveillance [34].

By increasing vector habitats, escalating heat waves, and promoting human-wildlife interaction, climate change increases the risk of epidemics [35]. Unsanitary urbanization makes people more susceptible to dengue and cholera. Policies pertaining to sustainable agriculture, urban planning, and climate adaptation must now include epidemic prevention [36]. Innovation in technology opens up new possibilities. Rapid response is made possible by metagenomic sequencing, mRNA platforms, and AI-based outbreak prediction [37]. However, new biosecurity governance frameworks are needed to address dual-use, cyber-security, and data privacy risks [38, 39]. Every new technological advancement must be accompanied by ethical supervision and responsible research.

5. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Institutionalize equity: Include provisions for equitable access in all contracts for public-funded R&D and procurement [26];
2. Reform WHO financing: Fund cross-sectoral data systems, joint training, and transparent peer review [24];
3. Operationalize One Health: Fund infodemic response: Establish community-based communication networks and improve digital literacy [17, 28];
4. Elevate AMR: Include AMR metrics in global health security indices and provide incentives for new antibiotic pipelines [32–34];
5. Embed preparedness into development: Create global financing facilities and pandemic bonds for ongoing investment [7, 8].
6. Strengthen the infodemic response by improving digital literacy and institutionalizing community-based communication networks [17, 28].

6. CONCLUSIONS

The resilience of civilization has always been put to the test by epidemics. The methods change from medieval quarantines to digital surveillance, but the lessons are always the same [9, 10]. Being prepared is a reflection of political will, equity, and trust, not just technology. Even though humanity has the scientific capacity to stop the majority of outbreaks from turning into worldwide tragedies by 2025, inequality and fragmentation still exist. The ability of international organizations and societies to move beyond reactive crisis management and create proactive, inclusive resilience will determine the course of the future [40].

REFERENCES

[1] Snowden FM. Epidemics and Society: From the Black Death to the Present. Yale University Press; 2019.
[2] Barry JM. The Great Influenza. Penguin; 2005.
[3] Taubenberger JK, Morens DM. 1918 Influenza: the mother of all pandemics. Emerg Infect Dis. 2006;12(1):15–22.
[4] Piot P, Quinn TC. Response to the AIDS pandemic: a global health model. N Engl J Med. 2013;368:2210–2218.
[5] World Health Organization. International Health Regulations (2005). Geneva: WHO; 2005.
[6] Gostin LO, Friedman EA. Global Health Law and Governance. Lancet. 2020;395(10225):1601–1603.
[7] Moon S, Sridhar D, Pate MA, et al. Will Ebola change the game? Lancet. 2015;386(10009):2204–2221.
[8] WHO. Global Preparedness Monitoring Board Annual Report 2024. Geneva: WHO; 2024.
[9] Morens DM, Fauci AS. Emerging pandemic diseases: how we got to COVID-19. Cell. 2020;182(5):1077–1092.
[10] Benedictow OJ. The Black Death 1346–1353: The Complete History. Boydell Press; 2021.
[11] Barry JM. The Great Influenza. Penguin; 2005.
[12] UNAIDS. Global AIDS Update 2023. Geneva: UNAIDS; 2023.
[13] WHO. COVID-19: Lessons Learned Report 2023. Geneva: WHO; 2023.
[14] Gostin LO, Habibi R. What's wrong with the WHO and how to fix it. Foreign Aff. 2023;102(1):132–145.
[15] WHO. International Health Regulations (2005): 2024 Amendments. Geneva: WHO; 2024.
[16] Gostin LO, Friedman EA. A retrospective and prospective analysis of the West African Ebola epidemic. Lancet. 2016;385(9980):1902–1909.
[17] Cinelli M, Quattrociocchi W, Galeazzi A, et al. The COVID-19 social media infodemic. Sci Rep. 2020;10:16598.
[18] Zarocostas J. How to fight an infodemic. Lancet. 2020;395(10225):676.
[19] Marmot M. The Health Gap: The Challenge of an Unequal World. Bloomsbury; 2015.
[20] Wouters OJ, Shadlen KC, Salcher-Konrad M, et al. Challenges in ensuring global access to COVID-19 vaccines. Lancet. 2021;397(10278):1023–1034.
[21] Krammer F. SARS-CoV-2 vaccines in development. Nat Rev Immunol. 2020;20(10):593–594.
[22] McMahon A, Buyx A, Prainsack B. Solidarity in pandemics: a reflection on COVID-19. Lancet. 2020;395(10234):2469–2471.
[23] WHO. World Health Assembly Resolution on IHR Amendments. Geneva: WHO; 2024.
[24] WHO. Programme Budget 2024–2025. Geneva: WHO; 2024.
[25] Nkengasong JN. Africa CDC and regional preparedness. Lancet. 2022;400(10350):123–125.

International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT)
ISSN: 2278-0181
Vol. 14 Issue 11, November 2025

[26] Forman R, Shah S, Jeurissen P, Jit M, Mossialos E. COVID-19 vaccine challenges: from production to distribution. BMJ. 2021;372:n827.
[27] Medicines Patent Pool. Annual Report 2024. Geneva: MPP; 2024.
[28] WHO. Infodemic Management Framework. Geneva: WHO; 2023.
[29] Eysenbach G. How to fight an infodemic: the four pillars of infodemic management. J Med Internet Res. 2020;22(6):e21820.
[30] Mackenzie JS, Jeggo M. The One Health approach—why is it so important? Trop Med Infect Dis. 2019;4(2):88.
[31] Allen T, Murray KA, Zambrana-Torrelio C, et al. Global hotspots and correlates of emerging zoonotic diseases. Nat Commun. 2017;8:1124.
[32] Murray CJL, Ikuta KS, Sharara F, et al. Global burden of bacterial antimicrobial resistance in 2019. Lancet. 2022;399(10325):629–655.
[33] O'Neill J. Tackling Drug-Resistant Infections Globally: Final Report. Review on AMR; 2016.
[34] WHO. Global Antimicrobial Resistance and Use Surveillance System (GLASS) Report 2024. Geneva: WHO; 2024.
[35] Watts N, Amann M, Arnell N, et al. The 2023 report of The Lancet Countdown on health and climate change. Lancet. 2023;402:1836–1878.
[36] IPCC. Climate Change 2023: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Geneva: IPCC; 2023.
[37] Holmes EC, Goldstein SA, Rasmussen AL, et al. The origins of SARS-CoV-2: A critical review. Nat Rev Microbiol. 2021;19(3):155–160.
[38] Kupferschmidt K, Wadman M. Biosecurity challenges in synthetic biology. Science. 2024;374(6571):1234–1240.
[39] WHO. Responsible Research in the Life Sciences: Global Biosecurity Guidance. Geneva: WHO; 2025.
[40] World Bank. Building Resilient Health Systems for the Future. Washington, DC: World Bank; 2024.