Generic: Foreign Aid - good

By Rebecca Sumner

***Resolved: The United States Federal Government should substantially reform its foreign policy regarding international terrorism.***

This is a generic brief that runs through several pros of foreign aid. For example: how aid is critical to preventing conflict, establishing U.S. global leadership, gaining soft power. It also has disadvantages of decreasing aid, including safe havens for terrorist groups, lives lost, and increased poverty.

This brief also refutes several criticisms to foreign aid. For example, it refutes the common assumption that the government spends 25-27% of its budget on foreign aid (the real figure is around 1%). It also refutes the assertion that slashing foreign aid would significantly reduce the federal deficit (foreign aid actually contributes to deficit reduction). It also tackles the myth that foreign aid creates dependency: actually, it’s a long-term investment in developing trading partners, and in fact, out of the U.S.’ top 20 trading partners, 18 were once major recipients of U.S. aid).
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General: Pros of Foreign Aid

NEGATIVE PHILOSOPHY / OPENING QUOTES

Removing foreign aid is not putting America First

Dr. Stewart M. Patrick 2017 (senior fellow in global governance and director of the International Institutions and Global Governance Program at the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR). From 2005-2008, he was research fellow at the Center for Global Development; taught at Johns Hopkins University's School of Advanced International Studies; served on the secretary of state's policy planning staff, with lead staff responsibility for U.S. policy toward Afghanistan and a range of global and transnational issues, including refugees and migration, international law enforcement, and global health affairs; has two master’s degrees and his doctorate in international relations from Oxford University, where he was a Rhodes Scholar) 16 Mar 2017 “Trump’s Misguided National Security Budget: Every Problem is Not a Nail,” <https://www.cfr.org/blog/trumps-misguided-national-security-budget-every-problem-not-nail>

The director of the Office of Management and Budget, Mick Mulvaney, boasts that this is an “America First” budget. That is true only if one accepts the false premise that the United States can somehow wall itself off from the world. It assumes the nation will pay no price for hollowing out its diplomacy, slashing foreign aid, and turning its back on international institutions that it helped to create and that advance U.S. national interests every day—whether by keeping civil aviation safe, combating emerging pandemics, or mitigating the looming catastrophe that is climate change.

Foreign Aid has several objectives: national security, providing stability, bolster allies, promote democracy, and contributing to counterterrorism

James McBride 2017 (Deputy Editor for Council on Foreign Relations; M.A. in Government and Latin American Studies from Georgetown University’s School of Foreign Service) 11 Apr 2017, “How Does the U.S. Spend Its Foreign Aid?” <https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/how-does-us-spend-its-foreign-aid>

**What are its objectives?** As former State Department official and aid expert Carol Lancaster pointed out in her book, *Foreign Aid: Diplomacy, Development, Domestic Politics*, modern U.S. aid originated in Cold War geopolitics: the Marshall Plan to rebuild Europe was designed to blunt the influence of rising Communist political forces on the continent. National security concerns have continued to drive U.S. assistance policy, aiming to provide stability in conflicted regions, bolster allies, promote democracy, or contribute to counterterrorism and law enforcement efforts abroad. Other objectives, related to but separate from U.S. national security, also drive assistance. These include most notably humanitarian relief efforts to respond directly to acute disasters, poverty reduction, health care, and other development programs.

It is impossible to make America First by treating the World Last

Dr. Stewart M. Patrick 2017 (senior fellow in global governance and director of the International Institutions and Global Governance Program at the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR). From 2005-2008, he was research fellow at the Center for Global Development; taught at Johns Hopkins University's School of Advanced International Studies; served on the secretary of state's policy planning staff, with lead staff responsibility for U.S. policy toward Afghanistan and a range of global and transnational issues, including refugees and migration, international law enforcement, and global health affairs; has two master’s degrees and his doctorate in international relations from Oxford University, where he was a Rhodes Scholar) 16 Mar 2017 “Trump’s Misguided National Security Budget: Every Problem is Not a Nail,” <https://www.cfr.org/blog/trumps-misguided-national-security-budget-every-problem-not-nail>

Foreign aid is a perfect example. According to the administration, these cuts are designed to “free[] up funding for critical priorities here at home and put America first.” The document continues, “It is time to prioritize the security and well-being of Americans, and to ask the rest of the world to step up and pay their fair share.” Let’s leave aside for the moment that U.S. expenditures for international affairs (including foreign aid) comprise just one percent of the federal budget. Let’s ignore for now that the United States spends fifteen times as much as this on the military, which consumes more than half of the U.S. discretionary budget. And let’s overlook that the United States ranks only 20th out of 28 wealthy democracies in the proportion of GDP it devotes to development assistance. The more fundamental problem is that Trump treats such international affairs outlays as if they were mere handouts, whereas in fact they are deeply in U.S. interests and consistent with (at least until recently) American values. Moreover, Trump could easily preserve them by holding military spending increases to inflation, rather than giving the defense industrial complex every single toy it desires. The bottom line is that it is impossible to make America First by treating the World Last, as a mere afterthought of no consequence to the nation’s ultimate fate.

Minimal investments in foreign aid can result in maximum returns

David A. Weiss 2013 (President and CEO of Global Communities; former Senior Policy Advisor at the global law firm DLA Piper, advising on international trade and foreign policy matters; spent 18 years with the Federal Government in the following roles: Special Assistant to the Director of the Peace Corps; member of the US Foreign Service; Economic Officer in Haiti; Staff Aide to the Secretary of State; Senior Special Assistant to the Deputy Secretary of State; Assistant US Trade Representative for North American Affairs in charge of NAFTA; and other senior positions in the Office of the US Trade Representative. He received the US Department of State’s Superior Honor Award; B.A. from Hamilton College;M.S.F.S. from Georgetown Univ.) 21 May 2013 **Updated** 21 Jul 2013, “Reducing the Deficit Through Foreign Aid,” <https://www.huffingtonpost.com/david-weiss/reducing-the-deficit-thro_b_3312844.html>

Looking to OPIC as a prime example, I hope our leaders in Washington will seize this opportunity to further our economic progress and plan a more strategic approach toward foreign aid - an approach that capitalizes on the tremendous opportunities it presents. As we are already seeing, minimal investments can result in maximum returns for the U.S. and our friends abroad.

It would be a fatal mistake for governments to adopt aid-skeptical, or worse still, anti-aid approaches

Ellen Johnson Sirleaf 2011 (Former President of Liberia (2006 to 2018), Goodwill Ambassador for Water and Sanitation in Africa) 7 Apr 2011, “Foreign aid is not a waste of money,” https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/africaandindianocean/8434965/Foreign-aid-is-not-a-waste-of-money.html

And whilst it can only be right in the current context that aid budgets in all donor countries undergo increased scrutiny, and that strong results and value for money are both demanded and expected, I believe it would be a fatal mistake for governments to adopt aid-sceptic or, worse still, anti-aid approaches. Aid should, of course, never be an end in itself. Provided that it is delivered on the basis of being timely, temporary, and targeted, it can save lives and transform life chances in today’s developing world, just as the Marshall Plan helped rebuild European economies after the long years of war, laying the platform for stability and prosperity. African entrepreneur Mo Ibrahim recently commented that *the main objective of aid is to abolish the need for aid.* Let this inform our approach as our vision for Africa and other developing nations going forward.

HARMS / SIGNIFICANCE

1. A/T: “The government spends a lot on foreign aid”—The financial load is pretty small

While Americans typically believe the U.S. spends 25-27% of the budget on foreign aid, the actual amount is around 1%

Ann M. Simmons 2017 (Former global development writer/editor on the foreign desk of the LA Times. She’s been based in Russia, Kenya and South Africa and has reported from Iraq and several other countries across the globe; master’s degree from Columbia University’s Graduate School Journalism.) 10 May 10 2017, LOS ANGELES TIMES “U.S. foreign aid: A waste of money or a boost to world stability? Here are the facts,” <http://www.latimes.com/world/la-fg-global-aid-true-false-20170501-htmlstory.html>

More than 20% of America’s federal budget goes to foreign aid. False The amount is actually about 1%. The current projected spending for fiscal year 2017 is $4 trillion. The Obama administration had planned for $41.9 billion in foreign aid for this year. Polls show that Americans typically believe that the U.S. spends 25% to 27% on foreign aid.

Even with the broadest definition of aid, the total spending is only 1.3% of the federal budget

James McBride 2017 (Deputy Editor for Council on Foreign Relations; professional writer, editor, and policy analyst covering global economics, U.S. foreign policy, climate and energy, urban affairs, and culture. He holds an M.A. in Government and Latin American Studies from Georgetown University’s School of Foreign Service) 11 Apr 2017, “How Does the U.S. Spend Its Foreign Aid?” <https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/how-does-us-spend-its-foreign-aid>

**How much does the United States spend on it?** Given the many agencies, funding methods, and categories of aid associated with U.S. foreign assistance efforts, estimates can differ. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service (CRS), which uses the broadest definition of aid [PDF], including military and security assistance, total spending was nearly $49 billion in 2015. This accounts for roughly 1.3 percent of the federal budget.

Contrary to popular opinion, only a tiny fraction of the federal budget is foreign aid

Max Bearak and Lazaro Gamio 2016 (**Bearak**—Carleton College, BA in international relations. He covers Africa, & is based in Nairobi; Washington Post’s Africa bureau chief. Previously, he reported from Afghanistan, Bangladesh, India, Somalia and D.C. for the Post, following stints in Delhi and Mumbai reporting for the NY Times and others. **Gamio**—makes interactive graphics for The Washington Post) 18 Oct 2016, THE WASHINGTON POST, “The U.S. foreign aid budget, visualized,” <https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/world/which-countries-get-the-most-foreign-aid/?noredirect=on>

At the top of this page, you’ll see what a tiny fraction of the entire federal budget is devoted to foreign assistance — just about 1 percent. As we pointed out in the previous post, most Americans vastly overestimate this number in surveys. In a Kaiser Family Foundation study published in early 2015, the average respondent thought that 26 percent of the federal budget went to foreign aid. Unsurprisingly, more than half the respondents thought the United States was spending too much on foreign aid.

US spends less than 0.2% of national income on development assistance, about half of what other countries spend

Prof. Stephen A. O’Connell 2017 (Professor at Swarthmore College; authority on the political economy of Africa & on macroeconomic policy in low-income developing countries; member of the Programme Committee of the AERC, an NGO devoted to building the research and advisory capacity of the economics profession in sub-Saharan Africa; Ph.D. from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology) 31 Jan 2017, “What the U.S. Gains From its Development Aid to Sub-Saharan Africa,” <http://econofact.org/what-the-u-s-gains-from-its-development-aid-to-sub-saharan-africa>

The financial burden of foreign aid is much smaller than most Americans think. The U.S. government spends less than one fifth of 1 percent of national income on official development assistance across the world, about half of what other donor countries spend relative to their incomes (see chart). Foreign aid (which excludes military assistance) accounts for less than 1 percent of the federal budget, a number Americans routinely overestimate by a margin of roughly 20 to 1. Sub-Saharan Africa accounts for about a third of our total aid budget – about 25 cents per person per day in the U.S., by contrast with daily defense outlays of more than $5 per person.

U.S. aid spending only accounts for .17% of GDP, putting the U.S. near the bottom of all developed countries

James McBride 2017 (Deputy Editor for Council on Foreign Relations; professional writer, editor, and policy analyst covering global economics, U.S. foreign policy, climate and energy, urban affairs, and culture. He holds an M.A. in Government and Latin American Studies from Georgetown University’s School of Foreign Service) 11 Apr 2017, “How Does the U.S. Spend Its Foreign Aid?” <https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/how-does-us-spend-its-foreign-aid>

As a percent of GDP, however, U.S. aid spending ranks near the bottom of all developed countries. It accounts for 0.17 percent of GDP, twentieth out of twenty-eight countries measured by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). Sweden, Norway, Luxembourg, Denmark, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom all spend more than 0.7 percent of GDP on foreign aid, which is the target set by the United Nations.

The U.S. spends far more domestically than it does overseas

Theres Lessing 2018 (Policy Economist in the International Growth Centre London Hub and is the thematic lead for State, with a focus on political economy and governance; Master’s degree in economics from the Univ of Oxford and a Bachelor of Arts degree in Economics from Univ of Exeter) 19 Mar 2018, “US foreign aid: How is it spent?” <https://www.theigc.org/blog/us-foreign-aid-spent/> [brackets added]

**The US is already spending much more domestically** [Angus] Deaton’s article seems to recommend reallocating spending from overseas development aid (ODA) to domestic spending. But as Ryan Briggs from Vox writes, US ODA is relatively small – various estimates put it at around 1% of the federal budget (around $3.5-$4 trillion). The broadest definition, including military and security assistance, puts it at 1.3%. Compare this to spending shares on social programs, as reported by the Congressional Budget Office for the last four months: 9.6% on Medicaid, 13.3% on Medicare, and 24.4% on Social Security.

2. A/T: “Just charity”—No, it’s common sense

We need to do foreign aid to help relationships with strategic partners, fight poverty, combat disease, and save lives

Dr. Stewart M. Patrick 2017 (senior fellow in global governance and director of the International Institutions and Global Governance Program at the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR). From 2005-2008, he was research fellow at the Center for Global Development; taught at Johns Hopkins University's School of Advanced International Studies; served on the secretary of state's policy planning staff, with lead staff responsibility for U.S. policy toward Afghanistan and a range of global and transnational issues, including refugees and migration, international law enforcement, and global health affairs; has two master’s degrees and his doctorate in international relations from Oxford University, where he was a Rhodes Scholar) 16 Mar 2017 “Trump’s Misguided National Security Budget: Every Problem is Not a Nail,” <https://www.cfr.org/blog/trumps-misguided-national-security-budget-every-problem-not-nail>

The United States also needs foreign aid tools to bolster relationships with strategic partners, fight poverty, combat disease, and save lives, including in insecure areas where U.S. enemies might otherwise take root. And it has a fundamental interest in doing its share to bolster international agencies—from the UN High Commission for Refugees to the International Atomic Energy Agency—that help advance peace, justice, and prosperity around the world. As a founding member of and major donor to these organizations, the United States steers their work, while leveraging the financial contributions of others. This isn’t charity. It’s simply common sense.

3. A/T: “Cutting foreign aid would reduce the federal deficit”

Experts say cutting foreign aid would do very little to reduce the deficit

Ann M. Simmons 2017 (Former global development writer/editor on the foreign desk of the LA Times. She’s been based in Russia, Kenya and South Africa and has reported from Iraq and several other countries across the globe; master’s degree from Columbia University’s Graduate School Journalism.) 10 May 10 2017, LOS ANGELES TIMES “U.S. foreign aid: A waste of money or a boost to world stability? Here are the facts,” <http://www.latimes.com/world/la-fg-global-aid-true-false-20170501-htmlstory.html>

**Slashing foreign aid would reduce the federal deficit by as much as 20%. False** Experts say cutting the foreign aid budget, which currently amounts to $50.1 billion, would do very little to reduce the deficit, which in 2016 was $552 billion.

Cuts would have little impact on deficit reduction, but foreign assistance can contribute to deficit reduction

David A. Weiss 2013 (President and CEO of Global Communities; former Senior Policy Advisor at the global law firm DLA Piper, advising on international trade and foreign policy matters; spent 18 years with the Federal Government in the following roles: Special Assistant to the Director of the Peace Corps; member of the US Foreign Service; Economic Officer in Haiti; Staff Aide to the Secretary of State; Senior Special Assistant to the Deputy Secretary of State; Assistant US Trade Representative for North American Affairs in charge of NAFTA; and other senior positions in the Office of the US Trade Representative. He received the US Department of State’s Superior Honor Award; B.A. from Hamilton College;M.S.F.S. from Georgetown Univ.) 21 May 2013 **Updated** 21 Jul 2013, “Reducing the Deficit Through Foreign Aid,” <https://www.huffingtonpost.com/david-weiss/reducing-the-deficit-thro_b_3312844.html>

It’s fairly well known that foreign aid comprises less than 1% of the federal budget, and that cuts to foreign aid would have little impact on deficit reduction. But, under the right circumstances, foreign assistance can in fact go further, contributing to deficit reduction, greater mobility, and improved global security.

Example: Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) costs taxpayers nothing and has supported more than $200 billion of investment

David A. Weiss 2013 (President and CEO of Global Communities; former Senior Policy Advisor at the global law firm DLA Piper, advising on international trade and foreign policy matters; spent 18 years with the Federal Government in the following roles: Special Assistant to the Director of the Peace Corps; member of the US Foreign Service; Economic Officer in Haiti; Staff Aide to the Secretary of State; Senior Special Assistant to the Deputy Secretary of State; Assistant US Trade Representative for North American Affairs in charge of NAFTA; and other senior positions in the Office of the US Trade Representative. He received the US Department of State’s Superior Honor Award; B.A. from Hamilton College;M.S.F.S. from Georgetown Univ.) 21 May 2013 **Updated** 21 Jul 2013, “Reducing the Deficit Through Foreign Aid,” <https://www.huffingtonpost.com/david-weiss/reducing-the-deficit-thro_b_3312844.html>

One often overlooked federal agency is the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) which, since 1971, has served as the U.S. government’s development finance institution. OPIC works with the U.S. private sector and ensures investment in areas where the market fails to invest appropriately. These programs help create and sustain jobs, and build new markets for U.S. goods and services. Since its creation, OPIC has supported more than $200 billion of investment in developing markets - at no cost to the U.S. taxpayer.

Example: OPIC has cost nothing to the U.S. taxpayer, and reduced the deficit by almost $2 billion in the past 5 years

David A. Weiss 2013 (President and CEO of Global Communities; former Senior Policy Advisor at the global law firm DLA Piper, advising on international trade and foreign policy matters; spent 18 years with the Federal Government in the following roles: Special Assistant to the Director of the Peace Corps; member of the US Foreign Service; Economic Officer in Haiti; Staff Aide to the Secretary of State; Senior Special Assistant to the Deputy Secretary of State; Assistant US Trade Representative for North American Affairs in charge of NAFTA; and other senior positions in the Office of the US Trade Representative. He received the US Department of State’s Superior Honor Award; B.A. from Hamilton College;M.S.F.S. from Georgetown Univ.) 21 May 2013 **Updated** 21 Jul 2013, “Reducing the Deficit Through Foreign Aid,” <https://www.huffingtonpost.com/david-weiss/reducing-the-deficit-thro_b_3312844.html>

OPIC works with the U.S. private sector and ensures investment in areas where the market fails to invest appropriately. These programs help create and sustain jobs, and build new markets for U.S. goods and services. Since its creation, OPIC has supported more than $200 billion of investment in developing markets - at no cost to the U.S. taxpayer. And in fact, OPIC has returned money to the U.S. Treasury for 35 consecutive years, and has already reduced the deficit by almost $2 billion over the past five years.

4. A/T: “Dependency / Once a foreign aid recipient, always a foreign aid recipient”

Several key trading partners were once recipients of aid, but today receive limited, if any, assistance

Ann M. Simmons 2017 (Former global development writer/editor on the foreign desk of the LA Times. She’s been based in Russia, Kenya and South Africa and has reported from Iraq and several other countries across the globe; master’s degree from Columbia University’s Graduate School Journalism.) 10 May 10 2017, LOS ANGELES TIMES “U.S. foreign aid: A waste of money or a boost to world stability? Here are the facts,” <http://www.latimes.com/world/la-fg-global-aid-true-false-20170501-htmlstory.html>

But several of America’s key trading partners were once recipients of U.S. aid and today receive limited, if any, assistance from USAID, according to data from the agency. South Korea, for example, has been dubbed by some analysts as “a poster child for successful poverty eradication” and is today itself a donor of humanitarian assistance. USAID calls the Asian nation “a textbook example of aid-recipient-turned donor.”

Multiple countries in Latin America and Asia received aid and then progressed into lasting growth

Ann M. Simmons 2017 (Former global development writer/editor on the foreign desk of the LA Times. She’s been based in Russia, Kenya and South Africa and has reported from Iraq and several other countries across the globe; master’s degree from Columbia University’s Graduate School Journalism.) 10 May 10 2017, LOS ANGELES TIMES “U.S. foreign aid: A waste of money or a boost to world stability? Here are the facts,” <http://www.latimes.com/world/la-fg-global-aid-true-false-20170501-htmlstory.html>

According to a 2012 report from the Center for Global Development and the Center for American Progress, “nations need not be aid recipients forever.” “In the 1960s, nations across Latin America and Asia were dismissed as perennial basket cases yet countries in both regions combined sensible reforms with a jump-start from U.S. assistance programs to achieve dynamic, lasting growth,” according to the report.

Foreign aid is a good long-term investment in developing trading partners, and we should expand it

David A. Weiss 2013 (President and CEO of Global Communities; former Senior Policy Advisor at the global law firm DLA Piper, advising on international trade and foreign policy matters; spent 18 years with the Federal Government in the following roles: Special Assistant to the Director of the Peace Corps; member of the US Foreign Service; Economic Officer in Haiti; Staff Aide to the Secretary of State; Senior Special Assistant to the Deputy Secretary of State; Assistant US Trade Representative for North American Affairs in charge of NAFTA; and other senior positions in the Office of the US Trade Representative. He received the US Department of State’s Superior Honor Award; B.A. from Hamilton College;M.S.F.S. from Georgetown Univ.) 21 May 2013 **Updated** 21 Jul 2013, “Reducing the Deficit Through Foreign Aid,” <https://www.huffingtonpost.com/david-weiss/reducing-the-deficit-thro_b_3312844.html>

Providing foreign aid means making a long-term investment in developing our aid partners, which results in both trade and security benefits for the U.S. And, as the OPIC model shows, private sector-led assistance has a multiple bottom line, contributing to deficit reduction while having positive social impact. Here in the U.S., we should expand and improve our development finance capabilities so that private investment can be even more sharply focused upon key development sectors that will benefit both the U.S. and emerging economies.

Example: Of the U.S.’ top 20 trading partners, 18 were once major recipients of U.S. aid

David A. Weiss 2013 (President and CEO of Global Communities; former Senior Policy Advisor at the global law firm DLA Piper, advising on international trade and foreign policy matters; spent 18 years with the Federal Government in the following roles: Special Assistant to the Director of the Peace Corps; member of the US Foreign Service; Economic Officer in Haiti; Staff Aide to the Secretary of State; Senior Special Assistant to the Deputy Secretary of State; Assistant US Trade Representative for North American Affairs in charge of NAFTA; and other senior positions in the Office of the US Trade Representative. He received the US Department of State’s Superior Honor Award; B.A. from Hamilton College;M.S.F.S. from Georgetown Univ.) 21 May 2013 **Updated** 21 Jul 2013, “Reducing the Deficit Through Foreign Aid,” <https://www.huffingtonpost.com/david-weiss/reducing-the-deficit-thro_b_3312844.html>

For sixty years, aid has been a smart investment for the U.S. Long-term U.S. prosperity and security are closely tied to economic growth in developing countries. Of our top 20 trading partners, 18 were once major recipients of U.S. aid, including South Korea, Taiwan and Poland. Facing the manifold security threats around the world would be a far lonelier business were it not for the support of these former aid recipients, many of which are now important markets for U.S. private direct investment and exports.

5. Foreign aid is good because it brings Soft power, which benefits the US

Soft power is the ability to influence the behavior and thinking of others

Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade 2017 (The department’s purpose is to help make Australia stronger, safer and more prosperous by promoting and protecting their interests internationally and contributing to global stability and economic growth. The department provides foreign, trade and development policy advice to the government) **ethical note:** the article was undated, but contained references to 2017 material, “Soft Power Review,” <https://dfat.gov.au/people-to-people/soft-power-review/Pages/soft-power-review.aspx>

The 2017 Foreign Policy White Paper committed the Australian Government to conducting a review of the nation's unique soft power strengths and capabilities. The White Paper defines soft power as the ability to influence the behaviour and thinking of others through the power of attraction and ideas. Soft power assets can include a nation's education institutions, its aid program, its tourism assets and economic strength as well as other elements of national identity such as lifestyle and culture.

Foreign aid is a form of soft power

Dr. Sarah Bermeo 2017 (Associate Prof. of Public Policy and Political Science; Faculty Affiliate, Duke Center for International Development - Duke Univ.; Ph.D., Princeton Univ., M.A., Princeton Univ) 20 Sept 2017, “Not your parents’ foreign aid: The shift from power to proximity and poverty,” <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/future-development/2017/09/20/not-your-parents-foreign-aid-the-shift-from-power-to-proximity-and-poverty/>

When President Donald Trump released his proposed budget earlier this year, policymakers on the left and right criticized his cuts to foreign aid and declared them a non-starter. Foreign aid, many lawmakers said, is a form of soft power, helping the United States achieve its interests in the world without resorting to more forceful tactics. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation also responded to the proposed cuts, noting that aid saves the lives of children, decreases poverty, and is crucial to fighting disease.

Foreign aid helps spread power and influence

Professor Dan Banik and Nikolai Hegertun 2017 (**Banik**—professor of political science and research director at the Center for Development and the Environment, University of Oslo. **Hegertun**—PhD candidate in political science and research fellow at the Center for Development and the Environment, University of Oslo) 27 Oct 2017, “Why do nations invest in international aid? Ask Norway. And China.” <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2017/10/27/why-do-nations-invest-in-international-aid-ask-norway-and-china/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.36d64824cd71>

How much are acts of generosity worth in international relations? For affluent countries, foreign aid has helped spread power and influence. Donors give foreign aid in part because it will benefit them. For example, political scientist Carol Lancaster finds that domestic politics and international pressures combine to shape how and why donor governments give aid, and that aid was initially based on “hard-headed, diplomatic realism.”

The U.S. has plenty of hard power—what we need is soft power

Dr. Stewart M. Patrick 2017 (senior fellow in global governance and director of the International Institutions and Global Governance Program at the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR). From 2005-2008, he was research fellow at the Center for Global Development; taught at Johns Hopkins University's School of Advanced International Studies; served on the secretary of state's policy planning staff, with lead staff responsibility for U.S. policy toward Afghanistan and a range of global and transnational issues, including refugees and migration, international law enforcement, and global health affairs; has two master’s degrees and his doctorate in international relations from Oxford University, where he was a Rhodes Scholar) 16 Mar 2017 “Trump’s Misguided National Security Budget: Every Problem is Not a Nail,” <https://www.cfr.org/blog/trumps-misguided-national-security-budget-every-problem-not-nail>

Using U.S. taxpayer dollars wisely is essential. But Trump’s proposed budget flies in the face of a broad consensus among national security professionals that the United States must invest in the so-called “soft power” components of its international influence. The United States has plenty of hard-edged power, accounting for roughly 37 percent of all global defense spending in 2015, more than the next nine nations combined. Where it has too often failed to invest is in diplomatic capabilities that ensure that the United States has the best information about political developments in nations around the world—and trained diplomats who know which levers to push in advancing U.S. interests and equities with foreign governments.

Example: Norway. Norway offers a generous amount of aid, which builds its soft power

Professor Dan Banik and Nikolai Hegertun 2017 (**Banik**—professor of political science and research director at the Center for Development and the Environment, University of Oslo. **Hegertun**—PhD candidate in political science and research fellow at the Center for Development and the Environment, University of Oslo) 27 Oct 2017, “Why do nations invest in international aid? Ask Norway. And China.” <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2017/10/27/why-do-nations-invest-in-international-aid-ask-norway-and-china/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.36d64824cd71>

Given its size and lack of military might, Norway has actively tried to promote the virtues of the Nordic model — a peaceful, rule-based, globalized and prosperous world. It has done this through offering a generous amount of aid, consistently giving away more than 1 percent of its Gross National Income. It does so following the 2005 Paris principles, which aim at achieving better impacts by formulating aid policies around five pillars — ownership, alignment, harmonization, managing for results, and mutual accountability. Such acts of generosity give Norway a seat at the table usually reserved for the bigger players in peace processes or efforts to promote development and reduce poverty around the world. In building this soft power, Norway attracts the attention of the United States and consistently “punches above its weight.” It gains international recognition by demonstrating consistent support for promoting global development, thus enhancing its reputation, along with Sweden, as a humanitarian superpower.

Impact: Soft power is the key to the struggle against terrorism

Dr. Joseph S. Nye 2004 (Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, Chair of the National Intelligence Council, and Deputy Under Secretary of State for Security Assistance, Science and Technology, University Distinguished Service Professor Sultan of Oman Professor of International Relations, PhD in political science from Harvard), April 13, 2004, "Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics," Carnegie Council, <https://www.academia.edu/2517747/Soft_power_The_means_to_success_in_world_politics>

So for both reasons, both to attract the moderate majority and to reach a context or setting in which governments can cooperate more fully with us to deal with the hard core, soft power is key to being able to wage this struggle against terrorism.

Impact: Soft power helps address terrorism and weapons of mass destruction by gaining cooperation of other countries

Dr. Joseph S. Nye 2004 (Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, Chair of the National Intelligence Council, and Deputy Under Secretary of State for Security Assistance, Science and Technology, University Distinguished Service Professor Sultan of Oman Professor of International Relations, PhD in political science from Harvard), April 13, 2004, "Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics," Carnegie Council, <https://www.academia.edu/2517747/Soft_power_The_means_to_success_in_world_politics>

According to the national security strategy, the greatest threats that the American people face are transitional terrorism and weapons of mass destruction, and particularly their combination. Yet meeting the challenge posed by transnational military organizations that could acquire weapons of mass destruction requires the cooperation of other countries – and cooperation is strengthened by soft power.

DISADVANTAGES

1. National Security & Terrorism

Link: Foreign aid helps national security

James McBride 2017 (Deputy Editor for Council on Foreign Relations; professional writer, editor, and policy analyst covering global economics, U.S. foreign policy, climate and energy, urban affairs, and culture; M.A. in Government and Latin American Studies from Georgetown Univ.) 11 Apr 2017, “How Does the U.S. Spend Its Foreign Aid?” <https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/how-does-us-spend-its-foreign-aid>

President Donald J. Trump's budget blueprint for 2018 calls for deep cuts to foreign assistance programs, raising pointed questions about the role the United States should play around the world. There has long been broad bipartisan agreement on the moral and strategic significance of foreign aid. Aid levels rose sharply after the 9/11 attacks, with policymakers seeing global economic development as a way to promote U.S. national security.

Link: Reducing funding to USAID would be a danger to our overall national security

James McBride 2017 (Deputy Editor for Council on Foreign Relations; professional writer, editor, and policy analyst covering global economics, U.S. foreign policy, climate and energy, urban affairs, and culture; M.A. in Government and Latin American Studies from Georgetown Univ.) 11 Apr 2017, “How Does the U.S. Spend Its Foreign Aid?” <https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/how-does-us-spend-its-foreign-aid>

R. Nicholas Burns, a Harvard University professor and former U.S. ambassador, concurs with some of the criticisms of the State Department, arguing that the system needs some restructuring to improve performance. However, he warns that reducing funding to USAID and other programs would be “unwise, unnecessary, and a danger to our overall national security.”

Impact: By not doing anything, we would be providing safe-havens for terrorist groups

Prof. Stephen A. O’Connell 2017 (Professor at Swarthmore College; authority on the political economy of Africa & on macroeconomic policy in low-income developing countries; member of the Programme Committee of the AERC, an NGO devoted to building the research and advisory capacity of the economics profession in sub-Saharan Africa; Ph.D. from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology) 31 Jan 2017, “What the U.S. Gains From its Development Aid to Sub-Saharan Africa,” <http://econofact.org/what-the-u-s-gains-from-its-development-aid-to-sub-saharan-africa>

There are also costs and risks associated with not doing anything. Poverty and state failure in Africa threaten U.S. security by providing safe-havens for terrorist groups, propagating conflict and refugee movements across borders, generating intense pressures for permanent out-migration, and heightening cross-border risks from epidemic diseases. The links between defense, diplomacy and development in the 21st century were central to the national security strategies of the Bush and Obama administrations. The vital national security role of civilian-led development assistance was underscored recently by more than 170 former U.S. 3- and 4-star generals from across the ideological spectrum.

2. Lives lost without humanitarian aid

Link: Health aid initiatives have saved millions of lives

James McBride 2017 (Deputy Editor for Council on Foreign Relations; professional writer, editor, and policy analyst covering global economics, U.S. foreign policy, climate and energy, urban affairs, and culture. He holds an M.A. in Government and Latin American Studies from Georgetown University’s School of Foreign Service) 11 Apr 2017, “How Does the U.S. Spend Its Foreign Aid?” <https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/how-does-us-spend-its-foreign-aid>

High-profile defenders of aid like tech billionaire Bill Gates and Columbia University economist Jeffrey Sachs counter that health initiatives in particular have saved millions of lives. Gates says that successes like anti-HIV/AIDS and polio campaigns have increased political stability, expanded economic opportunity, and boosted U.S. popularity.

Impact: Humanitarian aid is a lifesaving assistance, so cuts to it *will* kill people

Jeremy Konyndyk 2017 (Senior policy fellow at the Center for Global Development; previously served as the director of USAID’s Office of US Foreign Disaster Assistance; led major US government humanitarian responses to the Ebola outbreak in West Africa, the 2016 Ethiopia Drought, the complex emergency in Northern Nigeria, the Nepal earthquake, Typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines, and the ongoing war inside Syria, among other crises.; served as the American Refugee Committee’s country director in South Sudan, Uganda, and Guinea; earlier worked with the US Dept of State’s Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration, and for an NGO in the Balkans; currently a member of the World Health Organization’s high level Independent Oversight and Advisory Committee, which oversees the agency’s Health Emergencies Programme), 31 May 2017, “’Trump's aid budget is breathtakingly cruel – cuts like these will kill people’,” <https://www.theguardian.com/global-development-professionals-network/2017/may/31/trumps-aid-budget-is-breathtakingly-cruel-cuts-like-these-will-kill-people>

Let’s not sugarcoat this: humanitarian aid is lifesaving assistance, so cuts like these will kill people. As the head of foreign disaster response for the Obama administration, I had to weigh up budget trade-offs every year, knowing that saving lives in one region meant we would save fewer elsewhere. But I never faced trade-offs this extreme. Laying waste to US relief aid would be hard to defend even if the world were in decent shape. But proposing this amidst the worst slate of humanitarian crises in recent decades is breathtakingly cruel. This budget would cut nearly 30 million people from food aid rolls even as aid groups struggle to hold off four potential famines. It would undermine refugee aid even as global refugee numbers hit peaks not seen since the second world war and new South Sudanese refugees flee their country by the tens of thousands. And it would obliterate funding for the health, clean water, nutrition, and shelter programmes that keep victims of conflicts and natural disasters alive.

Impact: Millions of lives at risk. A lot of otherwise easily preventable deaths happen without US foreign aid

Bryant Harris, Robbie Gramer, and Emily Tamkin 2017 (**Harris**—Al-Monitor's congressional correspondent. He was previously the White House assistant correspondent for Yomiuri Shimbun, Japan's largest newspaper; spent two years as a US Peace Corps volunteer in Morocco. **Gramer**—diplomacy and national security reporter at Foreign Policy, covering the State Department; formerly managed the NATO portfolio at the Atlantic Council, a Washington-based think tank, for three years;graduate of American Univ., where he studied international relations and European affairs. **Tamkin**—staff writer at Foreign Policy former associate editor at New America; bachelor's in Russian Literature from Columbia; master's in Russian and East European Studies from Oxford) 24 Apr 2017, “The End of Foreign Aid As We Know It,” <https://foreignpolicy.com/2017/04/24/u-s-agency-for-international-development-foreign-aid-state-department-trump-slash-foreign-funding/>

In addition to closing missions, global health funding is also targeted, with 41 countries facing cuts. While the Trump budget has committed to maintaining funding for the President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, the U.S. initiative that combats HIV/AIDS internationally, the State Department’s budget indicates that health programs abroad are set to take an approximately 25 percent hit in funding. “I’ve seen firsthand how U.S. development money saves millions of lives” said Tom Kenyon, the CEO of Project Hope, a global health nonprofit. “There’s just no question people would die from this.” The administration’s cut to global health funding could also put Americans at risk in the event of a major epidemic. “We’re going to see a lot of deaths that will be easily preventable actually come to fruition,” warned John Norris, a former USAID employee who now serves as the executive director for the Sustainable Security and Peacebuilding Initiative at the Center for American Progress. “We’re going to see our own country much more vulnerable to the spread of infectious diseases as we saw with the Ebola crisis. Things that start abroad can quickly erupt here.”

Example: Malaria deaths dropped over 400,000 thanks to health and humanitarian aid, and poverty is reduced

Prof. Stephen A. O’Connell 2017 (Professor at Swarthmore College; authority on the political economy of Africa & on macroeconomic policy in low-income developing countries; member of the Programme Committee of the AERC, an NGO devoted to building the research and advisory capacity of the economics profession in sub-Saharan Africa; Ph.D. from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology) 31 Jan 2017, “What the U.S. Gains From its Development Aid to Sub-Saharan Africa,” <http://econofact.org/what-the-u-s-gains-from-its-development-aid-to-sub-saharan-africa>

Health and humanitarian aid represent more than 80 percent of U.S. aid to Africa and are supported by many Americans. The U.S. continues to lead the global fight against HIV/AIDS and malaria in Africa, with major results and with apparent support from President Trump during the campaign and from Rex Tillerson, Trump's nominee for Secretary of State. For instance, between 2000 and 2015 the number of malaria deaths in children under 5 years in Sub-Saharan Africa dropped from an estimated 694,000 to 292,000 per year. The U.S. is the largest donor towards efforts to combat malaria, contributing 35 percent of global funding. These programs enhance the well-being and productivity of African populations, including girls and women whose access to security, nutrition, health services and education can break the inter-generational transmission of poverty. Programs targeting agricultural productivity, trade facilitation and domestic revenue mobilization in Africa promote cost-effective routes to economic transformation and self-reliance on the continent. Sustained economic growth in Sub-Saharan Africa benefits the U.S. both by reducing the need for assistance and by providing growing markets for U.S. exports and foreign investment.

3. Poverty

Link: Aid reduces poverty

Ellen Johnson Sirleaf 2011 (Former President of the Republic of Liberia (from 2006 to 2018), and Goodwill Ambassador for Water and Sanitation in Africa) 7 Apr 2011, “Foreign aid is not a waste of money,” <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/africaandindianocean/8434965/Foreign-aid-is-not-a-waste-of-money.html>

I have seen, at first–hand, how aid, effectively targeted and delivered, reduces poverty. In sub-Saharan Africa there have been major improvements in child health and in primary school enrolment over the last two decades. To choose one example, between 1999 and 2004, the continent achieved one of the largest reductions in measles’ deaths ever seen. These positive results and outcomes would not have been possible without the support of donors such as the UK’s Department for International Development (DFID), complementing the resources which low-income countries mobilize domestically. In my own country, Liberia, both humanitarian and development aid have helped us recover and rebuild from the devastation and trauma of civil war, improving the future for the millions directly involved and affected.

Impact: Poverty has terrible impacts on human life and health

Ellen Johnson Sirleaf 2011 (Former President of Liberia (from 2006 to 2018), and Goodwill Ambassador for Water and Sanitation in Africa) 7 Apr 2011, “Foreign aid is not a waste of money,” <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/africaandindianocean/8434965/Foreign-aid-is-not-a-waste-of-money.html>

Whether you measure poverty by the one and a half billion people living on less than a pound a day, the one billion who go hungry each day, or other indicators such as the eight million children who die each year from preventable diseases such as pneumonia, diarrhoea and malaria, poverty on the scale it exists today is an affront to our common humanity. It also carries a significance beyond national borders and is therefore of global importance. In an increasingly interlinked world, countries are more dependent on one another for their prosperity, security and safety, and to answer challenges such as climate change.

Impact: The problems—if left unattended—will spread and come to visit us at home

Sarah Bermeo 2017 (Associate Professor of Public Policy and Political Science; Faculty Affiliate, Duke Center for International Development - Duke University. Education: Ph.D., Princeton University (2008), M.A., Princeton University (2006), M.P.A., Princeton University (2001), B.A., University of Rochester (1997)) 20 Sept 2017, “Not your parents’ foreign aid: The shift from power to proximity and poverty,” <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/future-development/2017/09/20/not-your-parents-foreign-aid-the-shift-from-power-to-proximity-and-poverty/>

When defending his government’s unpopular increases in foreign aid, former United Kingdom Prime Minister David Cameron claimed that it is “in our interests that we build a more prosperous world. If we don’t, the problems of conflict, the problems of mass migration, the problems of uncontrollable climate change are problems that will come and visit us at home.” President George W. Bush made similar claims when announcing new programs such as the Millennium Challenge Account and President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, which significantly increased U.S. aid flows. Policy documents from donors such as Switzerland and Japan also include self-interested rationale for promoting development abroad.

4. Increased risk of war

Reducing the foreign aid budget will leave no solution to crisis other than war

Lindsay Harris 2017 (contributor to the Borgen Project, which is a nonprofit organization addressing poverty and hunger and working towards ending them) 22 Mar 2017, “Why Cutting Foreign Aid Won’t Reduce U.S. Debt,” <https://borgenproject.org/cutting-foreign-aid/>

Reducing the foreign aid budget will leave no solution to crisis other than war. By increasing defense spending and decreasing diplomatic tools, the budget would eliminate some of the most important and effective instruments used to combat extremism. Military operations work hand in hand with diplomatic resolutions to keep the U.S. and the world safe. Thus, cutting foreign aid is not the way to “Make America Great Again.”

Retired admirals and generals say US foreign aid is critical to preventing conflict

James McBride 2017 (Deputy Editor for Council on Foreign Relations; M.A. in Government and Latin American Studies from Georgetown Univ. School of Foreign Service) 11 Apr 2017, “How Does the U.S. Spend Its Foreign Aid?” <https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/how-does-us-spend-its-foreign-aid>

Many military leaders are also outspoken supporters of foreign aid programs. A 2017 letter to Congress authored by more than 120 retired admirals and generals advocated for continued aid funding in the next budget, arguing that “the State Department, USAID, Millennium Challenge Corporation, Peace Corps and other development agencies are critical to preventing conflict and reducing the need to put our men and women in uniform in harm’s way.” President Trump’s secretary of defense, retired General Jim Mattis, has made similar arguments, saying, “If you don’t fully fund the State Department, then I need to buy more ammunition.” CFR’s Patrick agrees, writing that cutting the foreign assistance budget “would signal the definitive surrender of any pretense to U.S. global leadership.”

5. Lost U.S. global leadership

Link: Retired admirals and generals say cutting foreign aid would hurt US foreign policy & influence

Bryant Harris, Robbie Gramer, and Emily Tamkin 2017 (**Harris**—Al-Monitor's congressional correspondent. He was previously the White House assistant correspondent for Yomiuri Shimbun, Japan's largest newspaper; spent two years as a US Peace Corps volunteer in Morocco. **Gramer**—diplomacy and national security reporter at Foreign Policy, covering the State Department; formerly managed the NATO portfolio at the Atlantic Council, a Washington-based think tank, for three years;graduate of American Univ., where he studied international relations and European affairs. **Tamkin**—staff writer at Foreign Policy former associate editor at New America; bachelor's in Russian Literature from Columbia; master's in Russian and East European Studies from Oxford) 24 Apr 2017, “The End of Foreign Aid As We Know It,” <https://foreignpolicy.com/2017/04/24/u-s-agency-for-international-development-foreign-aid-state-department-trump-slash-foreign-funding/>

Foreign-policy and national security experts on both sides of the aisle have argued that the cuts pose concrete risks to U.S. security interests. In February, a group of 121 retired generals and admirals sent an open letter to the White House and Congress cautioning against cuts to foreign aid and diplomacy. The letter cited the State Department and USAID’s role in maintaining global stability by confronting extremist groups like the Islamic State, curbing refugee flows, and combating infectious diseases like Ebola. They expressed fear that cutting foreign aid risks ceding U.S. influence in other regions and countries.

Impact: World peace & prosperity at risk without US influence. US hegemony is key to global peace & prosperity

Capt. M. V. Prato 2009 (United States Marine Corps,Command and Staff College, Marine Corps Combat Development Command,Marine Corps University) “The Need for American Hegemony” <http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a508040.pdf>

The world witnessed a vast shift in the polarity of geopolitics after the Cold War. The United States became the world’s greatest hegemon with an unequalled ability to globally project cultural, political, economic, and military power in a manner not seen since the days of the Roman Empire. Coined the “unipolar moment” by syndicated columnist Charles Krauthammer, the disparity of power between the U.S. and all other nations allows the U.S. to influence the world for the mutual benefit of all responsible states. Unfortunately, the United States is increasingly forced to act unilaterally as a result of both foreign and domestic resentment to U.S. dominance and the rise of liberal internationalism. The United States must exercise benevolent global hegemony, unilaterally if necessary, to ensure its security and maintain global peace and prosperity.
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