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GENERIC BRIEF: Foreign Aid - good

By Vance Trefethen

**This brief can be used against any arguments that claim foreign aid is bad.**

HARMS / SIGNIFICANCE – Foreign aid isn’t bad

Can’t just say “aid is bad”: You have to specify which types of aid you’re talking about because they work differently

Alice N. Sindzingre 2012. (Research Fellow at the National Centre for Scientific Research, Paris, Franc), EconomiX-University Paris-West; and Visiting Lecturer, School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), Department of Economics, University of London) Theoretical Criticisms and Policy Optimism: Assessing the Debates on Foreign Aid Feb 2012 <http://economix.fr/docs/35/SindzingreCriticismsPolicyAidViennaWP-IE-12.pdf>

The debate on the relationship aid-growth is also made more complex if one considers that it depends on the type of aid – some may be appropriate, others not. Types of aid flows have to be distinguished for assessing the relationship between aid and growth. Aid is heterogeneous, and governments respond differently according to the nature of the aid inflows. There are many types of aid - technical assistance, food aid, aid to imports, counterpart funds, project aid, programme aid and so on. There is therefore a debate on their respective positive or negative effects, as well as on their effectiveness on the recipient country’s fiscal management. For example, food aid is often criticised for its negative effects, such as being often procyclical and harming local agricultural producers in lowering prices. Clemens et al. (2004) distinguish 3 categories of aid: 1) emergency and humanitarian aid (likely to be negatively correlated with growth); 2) aid that affects growth over a long period of time, e.g. aid to support democracy, the environment, health or education (likely to have no relationship to growth in the short-term); 3) aid that stimulates growth within a short-term time span, i.e. 4 years, such as budget and balance of payments support, investments in infrastructure, aid to productive sectors (agriculture, industry). Clemens et al. find a positive causal relationship between aid and growth for this third type of aid over a four-year period (but with diminishing returns).

Foreign aid can make a lasting difference in combatting multiple problems

John Norris 2011. (executive director of the sustainable security program at the Center for American Progress) Five myths about foreign aid 28 Apr 2011 <http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/five-myths-about-foreign-aid/2011/04/25/AF00z05E_story.html>

Flagship efforts such as those undertaken by the Millennium Challenge Corporation, established under George W. Bush, make clear that the United States expects progress in combating corruption, improving governance and tackling economic reforms in exchange for assistance. That’s the most enduring truth about foreign aid: Though it probably won’t do more than blunt the suffering in some places, it can make a lasting difference in countries committed to change.

Aid builds capacity to lift people out of poverty and saves lives

**Malcolm Fraser 2011. (former prime minister of Australia, and founding chairman of CARE Australia, a non-profit foreign charitable aid group) 19 Mar 2011** Does foreign aid do more harm than good? <http://www.theage.com.au/it-pro/does-foreign-aid-do-more-harm-than-good-20110318-1c0a1.html>

Effective aid addresses the basic needs of livelihoods, education, health, clean water, sanitation, and the rule of law for the poor and vulnerable in developing countries. Foreign direct investment alone cannot break the cycle of poverty for the "bottom billion" of the world's poor who live on less than a dollar a day. Aid builds the capacity of people, communities and countries to move out of poverty. This capacity-building works. Last year alone CARE, the aid organisation which I founded in Australia in 1987, assisted 10 million children go to school, improved the health of 35 million people and given 11 million people access to clean water. AusAID reports that Australian aid has had a significant impact in the region. Polio has been eradicated in the Pacific and 1.5 million children have been immunised against measles and polio in Papua New Guinea. Research by UN agencies has found that the incremental increases in aid over the past 20 years account for an extra 14,000 lives saved per day.

Foreign aid works: It saves lives

Prof. Jeffrey Sachs 2012. (Professor of Sustainable Development, Professor of Health Policy and Management, and Director of the Earth Institute at Columbia Univ, is also Special Adviser to the UN Secretary-General on the Millennium Development Goals ) 30 May 2012 “Aid Works” <https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/aid-works>

The critics of foreign aid are wrong. A growing flood of data shows that death rates in many poor countries are falling sharply, and that aid-supported programs for health-care delivery have played a key role. Aid works; it saves lives. One of the newest [studies](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2050847" \t "_blank), by Gabriel Demombynes and Sofia Trommlerova, shows that Kenya’s infant mortality (deaths under the age of one year) has plummeted in recent years, and attributes a significant part of the gain to the massive uptake of anti-malaria bed nets. These findings are consistent with an important study of[malaria death rates](http://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(12)60034-8/abstract" \t "_blank) by Chris Murray and others, which similarly found a significant and rapid decline in malaria-caused deaths after 2004 in sub-Saharan Africa resulting from aid-supported malaria-control measures.

Foreign aid for public health has saved millions of lives

Prof. Jeffrey Sachs 2012. (Professor of Sustainable Development, Professor of Health Policy and Management, and Director of the Earth Institute at Columbia Univ, is also Special Adviser to the UN Secretary-General on the Millennium Development Goals ) 30 May 2012 “Aid Works” <https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/aid-works>

With one billion people living in high-income countries, total aid in 2010 amounted to around $27 per person in the donor countries – a modest sum for them, but a life-saving one for the world’s poorest people. The public-health successes can now be seen on many fronts. Around 12 million children under five years old died in 1990. By 2010, this number had declined to around 7.6 million – still far too high, but definitely an historic improvement. Malaria deaths in children in Africa were cut from a peak of around one million in 2004 to around 700,000 by 2010, and, worldwide, deaths of pregnant women declined by almost half between 1990 and 2010, from an estimated 543,000 to 287,000.

Foreign aid doesn’t have to make countries feel good toward us in order to be effective. Examples: Costa Rica and India

John Norris 2011. (executive director of the sustainable security program at the Center for American Progress) Five myths about foreign aid 28 Apr 2011 <http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/five-myths-about-foreign-aid/2011/04/25/AF00z05E_story.html>

But foreign aid is not designed to make countries like us. The United States wants stable democratic partners that are reliable allies in the long run. Aid builds these relationships, even when the countries we help don’t support us in the short run. For example, the Reagan administration didn’t approve when Costa Rica inserted itself into multiple conflicts raging in Central America during the 1980s. But U.S. assistance to Costa Rica helped that nation become a champion of democracy and human rights as well as of regional trade agreements. Similarly, the United States and India were badly estranged at different points during the Cold War, but U.S. assistance to India helped spark the “green revolution” that prevented massive famine in the late 1960s. Today, India is one of America’s most important allies in Asia.

Military aid helps our foreign policy by building strong relationships, and makes foreign armies more professional

Al Pessin 2011. (journalist) VOICE OF AMERICA News 15 Feb 2011 US Administration Calls on Congress to Continue Foreign Military Aid <http://www.voanews.com/content/mullen-warns-against-cutting-us-aid-to-egypt----116321364/135142.html>

And within that amount, one of the most attractive targets for some members of Congress is aid to foreign militaries.  On Wednesday, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Mike Mullen, urged the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives not to cut such programs, and said recent events in Egypt are evidence of their value. “Foolhardy would it be for us to make hasty judgments about the benefits - tangible and intangible - that are about to be derived from forging strong military relationships overseas, such as the one we enjoy with Egypt," said Admiral Mullen. "Changes to those relationships - in either aid or assistance - ought to be considered only with an abundance of caution and a thorough appreciation for the long view, rather than in the flush of public passion and the urgency to save a buck. Mullen said the $1.3 billion annual military aid package for Egypt helped make its army what he called a “capable, professional force,” which he said proved to have “incalculable value” in the crisis.

Military aid promotes professionalism & good behavior of foreign military in times of crisis. Example: Egypt

Al Pessin 2011. (journalist) VOICE OF AMERICA News 15 Feb 2011 US Administration Calls on Congress to Continue Foreign Military Aid <http://www.voanews.com/content/mullen-warns-against-cutting-us-aid-to-egypt----116321364/135142.html>

U.S. Defense Secretary Robert Gates also praised the Egyptian Army, and linked its performance to its long financial and training relationship with the U.S. military. “If you ever wanted proof of the value of our military assistance to Egypt over the past 30 years, it has been in the behavior of the Egyptian Army over the past three weeks, and their professionalism in dealing with the kind of situation they had," said Secretary Gates.

SOLVENCY – Cutting foreign aid won’t benefit us

Foreign aid is just over 1% of the federal budget, and cutting it would do nothing to help American security or economy

Julian Pecquet 2013. (journalist) Kerry slams critics of foreign aid in first major speech as secretary 20 Feb 2013 <http://thehill.com/policy/international/283997-kerry-slams-capitol-hills-foreign-aid-critics-in-first-major-address-as-secretary-of-state> (brackets added)

[US Secretary of State John] Kerry said many Americans believe that the United States spends 25 percent of its budget on foreign affairs, instead of the real figure of just over 1 percent. He said politicians looking for an applause line have contributed to that misperception. “Where do you think this idea comes from?” Kerry asked. “Well I'll tell you, it's pretty simple. As a recovering politician, I can tell you that nothing gets a crowd clapping faster in a lot of places than saying: 'I'm going to Washington to get them to stop spending all that money over there.' ” “If you're looking for an applause line, it's about as guaranteed an applause line as you can get. But guess what: It does nothing to guarantee our security. It does nothing to guarantee a stronger country. It doesn't guarantee a sounder economy or a more stable job market.”

Foreign aid is only 1% of the federal budget

WASHINGTON POST 2013. (journalist Ezra Klein) 7 Nov 2013 The budget myth that just won’t die: Americans still think 28 percent of the budget goes to foreign aid <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/11/07/the-budget-myth-that-just-wont-die-americans-still-think-28-percent-of-the-budget-goes-to-foreign-aid/>

A [new poll](http://kff.org/global-health-policy/poll-finding/2013-survey-of-americans-on-the-u-s-role-in-global-health/) by the Kaiser Family Foundation found that Americans think 28 percent of the budget goes to foreign aid. That would make foreign aid pricier than Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, or all defense spending. Of course, foreign aid isn't that pricey. About 1 percent of the budget goes toward foreign aid.

DISADVANTAGES – Cutting foreign aid would cause harm

Increased Corruption - Because foreign aid decreases corruption in recipient countries

Jose Tavares 2002. (economics faculty member at Campus De Campolide, New University of Lisbon, Portugal) “Does Foreign Aid Corrupt?” ECONOMICS LETTERS Vol 79 written in 2002 published in 2003 <http://www.dochas.ie/Shared/Files/4/DoesForeignAidCorruptFinal.pdf>

We find that foreign aid decreases corruption. Our results are statistically and economically significant and robust to the use of different controls. Why might aid decrease corruption? One can advance several possibilities. First, foreign aid may be associated with rules and conditions that limit the discretion of the recipient country’s officials, thus decreasing corruption—a conditionality effect. Second, if foreign aid alleviates public revenue shortages and facilitates increased salaries for public employees it may diminish the supply of corruption by public officials—a liquidity effect. One important caveat is in order. Since most actual aid flows are driven by motives other than the economic and political performance of recipient countries, as pointed out in Alesina and Dollar (2002), one cannot infer from our results that when more aid is observed lower corruption will follow. Instead we should interpret our results as pointing to the potentially beneficial impact of aid inflows on corruption once current biases in aid allocation are weeded out.

Cutting foreign aid would cost an exorbitant price by allowing our adversaries to replace us and do bad things

Julian Pecquet 2013. (journalist) Kerry slams critics of foreign aid in first major speech as secretary 20 Feb 2013 <http://thehill.com/policy/international/283997-kerry-slams-capitol-hills-foreign-aid-critics-in-first-major-address-as-secretary-of-state> (brackets added)

[US Secretary of State John] Kerry defended foreign aid funding as crucial to American interests and American values. The price of retreating from the global stage would be “exorbitant,” he said, and the “vacuum we would leave by retreating within ourselves would quickly be filled by those whose interests differ dramatically from ours.”  "Bad things happening over there threaten us right here," he said. "Knowing that, the question is this: How do we make clear that the opposite is just as true?"

Opposing foreign aid for public health programs will cost lives

Prof. Jeffrey Sachs 2012. (Professor of Sustainable Development, Professor of Health Policy and Management, and Director of the Earth Institute at Columbia Univ, is also Special Adviser to the UN Secretary-General on the Millennium Development Goals ) 30 May 2012 “Aid Works” <https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/aid-works>

The opponents of aid are not merely wrong. Their vocal antagonism still threatens the funding that is needed to get the job done, to cut child and maternal deaths by enough to meet the MDGs by 2015 in the poorest countries, and to continue after that to ensure that *all* people everywhere finally have access to basic health services. A decade of significant progress in health outcomes has proved the skeptics wrong. Aid for health care works – and works magnificently – to save and improve lives. Let us continue to support these life-saving programs, which uphold the dignity and well-being of all people on the planet.

Cutting military aid hurts U.S. foreign policy long-term. Example: Indonesia

Al Pessin 2011. (journalist) VOICE OF AMERICA News 15 Feb 2011 US Administration Calls on Congress to Continue Foreign Military Aid <http://www.voanews.com/content/mullen-warns-against-cutting-us-aid-to-egypt----116321364/135142.html>

U.S. officials have pointed out that past interruptions in U.S. military relations with other countries have often hurt the United States in the long term.  Indonesia is an example frequently cited, where the Congress cut military aid due to human rights violations, and ended up creating a generation of Indonesian military officers who had no relationship with their American counterparts.