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**Resolved: Wealthy nations have an obligation to provide development assistance to other nations.**
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# Topic Notes

When looking to the resolution it can be seen that debaters are being asked to consider a question that has been asked for years. The debate over whether or not international aid is an obligation or even an effective way to boost development is not a new one. This topic is rooted in countries with the means to provide aid,  providing assistances to those deemed ‘in need’, more specifically, those in development. The types of assistance that students may discuss could be economic, humanitarian, military, etc. The topic does not define the ‘assistance’ for them, meaning that there are many ways debaters can shape their cases. The type of assistance can be narrowed down to something specific or students can look at all types of assistance as a whole.

For the sake of this brief, development assistance will be used as follows:

*Development aid (also development assistance, technical assistance, international aid, overseas aid, official development assistance (ODA), or foreign aid) is financial aid given by governments and other agencies to support the economic, environmental, social, and political development of developing countries.*

"Development aid." Wikipedia. Wikimedia Foundation, 07 July 2017. Web. 08 July 2017. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Development\_aid>.

It is wise to narrow a case into specific types of development assistance and point out the good and the bad that comes from the specifics chosen. It should be relatively easy to find arguments for and against almost all types of development assistance written by authors in all fields. After All, the ways in which aid actually affects countries, is going to be different in almost all situations. For example, some countries have benefited from development assistance and have greater economies to show for that. Others still struggle and remain a point of profit for the nations assisting them.

When it comes to the affirmative side of the debate, students will need to prove the obligation exists. This can be done through the lens of moral responsibility to the rest of the world. This argument can also be strengthened by suggesting that all nations have an obligation to protect and provide for their own citizens, thus, if foreign aid comes back to help those in the donor country, the obligation is a part of that ripple effect. With the affirmative, it would be preferable to consider the types of development assistance that are helpful to countries. Such as water, infrastructure, and other types of humanitarian aid. Medical aid is also a smart choice. Malaria assistance in Africa and the number of deaths prevented annually due to anti-malaria programs funded by wealthy governments are a clear example of aid that was in fact helpful, and not just a point of business and personal profit for wealthy countries. With that in mind, the affirmative would also be wise to make the argumentation that it is a good thing when the donor as well as those donated to are benefitted. For when aid is mutually beneficial it can create ally relationships and help prevent disaster spreading and global economic benefits due to the ongoing and current globalization of the markets.

There are several examples of development aid that was needed, implemented by wealthy nations, and effective upon implementation for both the donor country and that which received. These successful programs are the reason that obligation to provide assistance must exist, and thus reason to vote affirmative.

On the side of the negative, one can find many examples of wealthy nations using development assistance to manipulate other countries for their own benefit, meaning that the obligation is not to “provide development assistance”, but rather an obligation to personal interest which means that there is underlying layer of corruption affecting the idea of “obligation”.  In addition to argumentation that the obligation does not exist at all. The definition of obligation would be defined differently on this side of the debate, showing that the moral obligation is to allow independent development to occur. Thus by pinpointing the ways that development assistance creates further reliability on foreign aid and corruption and explanation of how this is harmful or ineffective for independent development will be the way to win this debate from the negative side.

# \*\*\*AC\*\*\*

**I Stand in firm affirmation that Wealthy nations have an obligation to provide development assistance to other nations.**

**Since the resolution uses the word ‘obligation’ we look to the Oxford Living Dictionaries for definition as “An act or course of action which is morally or legally bound; a duty or commitment.**

**For this resolution we will look to the obligation of ‘wealthy nations’ to provide development assistance as the moral binding of these nations to provide such service.**

**Through the value of Life, we can evaluate the importance of such an obligation to exist. Slovic, Johnson, and Friedrich (1997) explain that there is an insensitivity to the loss of life** when lives at risk are low**. However, in relation to developmental aid, it is important to look to the magnitude of lives at risk without assistance and evaluate the best way to remain sensitive to said lives.**

Fetherstonhaugh, David, Paul Slovic, Stephen Johnson, and James Friedrich. "Insensitivity to the Value of Human Life: A Study of Psychophysical Numbing." SpringerLink. Kluwer Academic Publishers, n.d. Web. 05 July 2017. <[https://link.springer.com/article/10.1023%2FA%3A1007744326393?LI=true](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1023/A%3A1007744326393?LI=true)>.

**Through the standard of Altruism, we can do just that. According to Batson** (1991) **and Comte** (1851/1875)**, Altruism is a motivational state with the ultimate goal of increasing another’s welfare without expecting a personal return.**

Batson, C. Daniel. "The Altruism Question." Google Books. Psychology Press, n.d. Web. 05 July 2017. <<https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=KI57AgAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=altruism&ots=a2R9FJxe1N&sig=PAGeW1IRa4ObY9KZ8esie90hb1o#v=onepage&q=altruism&f=false>>.

**More lives can be assisted and aided through an affirmation of the resolution when valuing life through an altruistic view.**

# Contention One: Sanitation & Water

**Sub Point A: Water and Sanitation Services are Lacking (Wateraid America 2017)**

"One in five newborn deaths could be prevented." WaterAid America. N.p., 10 Feb. 2017. Web. 05 July 2017. <<http://www.wateraidamerica.org/news/one-in-five-newborn-deaths-in-the-developing-world-could-be-prevented>>.

In 350 B.C., Hippocrates recommended boiling water to inactivate “impurities”. The U.S. and Central Europe, where water and sanitation services are nearly universal, significantly reduced water-, sanitation-, and hygiene-related diseases by the start of the 20th century by protecting water sources and installing sewage systems. However, **in developing countries, water and sanitation services are still severely lacking. As a result, millions suffer from preventable illnesses and die every year.  More than 1.1 billion people do not have access to** improved **drinking water supplies. Lack of sanitation is an even larger problem; an estimated 2.6 billion individuals live without improved services. In addition, nearly 60% of infant mortality is linked to infectious diseases, most of them water-, sanitation-, and hygiene-related.**

**The need for clean water and sanitation is an imperative component for development, as health and farming both really on clean water access. The obvious need for clean water and sanitation suggest an obligation to development assistance.**

**Sub point B: Prevention of Infant Mortality (Montgomery 2007)**

Montgomery, Maggie A., and Menachem Elimelech. "Water And Sanitation in Developing Countries: Including Health in the Equation." Environmental Science & Technology 41.1 (2007): 17-24. Web. July 2017. <<http://pubs.acs.org/doi/pdf/10.1021/es072435t>>.

**One in five babies who die during their first month of life in the developing world, simply being washed in clean water and cared for in a clean environment by people who had washed their hands could have prevented their untimely deaths. In Mali, for instance, one woman in every 17 will lose a baby to infection during her lifetime compared to one in 2,958 in the US.**

**Sub point C: Successful Projects (Ghana News Agency 2017)**

"World Bank supports Ghana to improve education, water and sanitation." Ghana News Agency. N.p., 02 July 2017. Web. 05 July 2017. <<http://www.ghananewsagency.org/economics/world-bank-supports-ghana-to-improve-education-water-and-sanitation-119078>>.

**As of July 2nd 2017, the World Bank has received and approved funding to increase water and sanitation programs in Ghana. The project is to add 20,000 flushable toilets and improve conditions of 490 communities. The project will reduce the outbreak of diseases such as cholera and diarrhea as well as communicable diseases, leading to improvements to child health.**

**Though the numbers are high when it comes to mortality, we see that is why the obligation to provide developmental assistance ought to exist. Additionally, successful programs that those of the world bank show how assistance is in fact, no waste.**

# Contention Two: Medication & Health

**Sub point A:  Malaria Assistance Saves Millions (Mcneil,2017)**

Donald G. Mcneil Jr., 6-26-2017, "U.S. Malaria Donations Saved Almost 2 Million African Children," New York Times, https://www.nytimes.com/2017/06/26/health/us-foreign-aid-malaria.html

**Over the last decade, American donations to fight** [**malaria**](http://health.nytimes.com/health/guides/disease/malaria/overview.html?inline=nyt-classifier) **in Africa have saved the lives of nearly two million children, according to a new analysis of mortality rates in 32 countries there.** The [study](http://journals.plos.org/plosmedicine/article?id=10.1371/journal.pmed.1002319), published by PLOS Medicine this month, looked at the long-term effects of the [President’s Malaria Initiative](https://www.pmi.gov/), a program started by President George W. Bush in 2005 that has spent over $500 million a year since 2010.**The results debunk one of the persistent myths of foreign aid: that it has no effect because more children survive each year anyway as economies improve.** The researchers — economists from the University of North Carolina and Harvard — looked at death rates for children under 5, contrasting the 19 countries that get American malaria aid (mostly in the form of mosquito nets, house spraying and malaria pills) with 13 countries that do not. **They adjusted the data to filter out neonatal deaths and lives saved by other medical interventions**, such as childhood vaccines supplied by donors or [H.I.V.](http://health.nytimes.com/health/guides/disease/aids/overview.html?inline=nyt-classifier) drugs paid for by the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, or by the [President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief](https://www.pepfar.gov/), which was also initiated by Mr. Bush. **They found that countries helped by the malaria initiative had 16 percent fewer deaths in that age group, which amounts to about 1.7 million lives of babies and toddlers saved since the program began**, said Harsha Thirumurthy, a health economist at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and the lead author.The study was not commissioned or paid for by the malaria agency, Dr. Thirumurthy added.“We thought it was essential to evaluate how P.M.I. was working,” he said, referring to the President’s Malaria Initiative. “We gave them a heads-up that we were doing the analysis, but we didn’t share the results with them till they were in print.” “I welcome this independent external analysis,” said [Rear Adm. R Timothy Ziemer](https://www.nytimes.com/2014/10/21/science/a-quiet-approach-to-bringing-down-malaria.html), coordinator of the initiative from its inception until early this year. “P.M.I.’s effective approach demonstrates to all what can be accomplished in fighting malaria with U.S. leadership.” In an [accompanying editorial](http://journals.plos.org/plosmedicine/article?id=10.1371/journal.pmed.1002320), Dr. Eran Bendavid, a health-policy specialist at Stanford University, called the study’s conclusions “striking.”**Health-related foreign aid, he noted, amounts to less than a penny of every taxpayer dollar** spent but pays dividends in two ways: **Relatively small contributions save many lives, and countries that receive such aid have overwhelmingly favorable views of the United States.** In the Pew Research Center’s [Global Attitudes & Trends surveys](http://www.pewglobal.org/database/indicator/1/survey/all/) over the last 15 years, Dr. Bendavid said in an email, 75 percent or more of residents of Ghana, Kenya, Ivory Coast and Senegal usually said they regard the United States favorably.

**Sub point B: Life–Expectancy figure is increased in countries with greater infusion of aid (Richter, 2014)**

Richter, Ruthann. "Health-care aid for developing countries boosts life expectancy, study finds." News Center. N.p., 21 Apr. 1970. Web. 05 July 2017. <<https://med.stanford.edu/news/all-news/2014/04/health-care-aid-for-developing-countries-boosts-life-expectancy-study-finds.html>>.

**Foreign aid for health care is directly linked to an increase in life expectancy and a decrease in child mortality in developing countries, according to a new study by** [**Stanford University School of Medicine**](https://med.stanford.edu/) **researchers.**The researchers examined both public and private health-aid programs between 1974 and 2010 in 140 countries and found that, **contrary to common perceptions about the waste and ineffectiveness of aid, these health-aid grants led to significant health improvements with lasting effects over time.Countries receiving more health aid witnessed a more rapid rise in life expectancy and saw measurably larger declines in mortality among children under the age of 5 than countries that received less health aid, said** [**Eran Bendavid**](https://med.stanford.edu/profiles/eran-bendavid)**, MD, an assistant professor in the Division of General Medical Disciplines** and lead author of the study. If these trends continue, he said, an increase in health aid of just 4 percent, or $1 billion, could have major implications for child mortality.During that period, **life-expectancy figures also grew faster in countries with a greater infusion of health aid,** Bendavid said. Life expectancy rose from 57.5 to 62.3 — an increase of 4.8 years — among the countries receiving the most aid. Among the countries receiving the least health aid, life expectancy increased by 2.7 years, from 69.8 to 72.5 years.Bendavid said **previous experience has shown that, on average, life expectancy has increased by nearly one year every four years in developed countries. But health-aid programs literally cut in half the time it took to reach this goal in developing countries. “In that same four-year span, they increased life expectancy by two years, rather than one year,”** he said.He said the results are not surprising if one considers some of the new health technologies made available to developing nations as a result of foreign aid. **Childhood vaccines, including those for diphtheria, tetanus, polio and measles, have all but wiped out what used to be among the top killers of young children in the developing world. Health aid directed to providing insecticide-treated malarial bed nets also has been credited in recent studies with reducing malarial deaths among young children, he noted. Among both adults and children, aid that has expanded the availability of antiretroviral drugs in the developing world has had a major impact on reducing deaths and improving overall life expectancies, he said. For instance, in a study published in 2012, Bendavid and colleagues found that PEPFAR’s health aid resulted in more than 740,000 lives saved between 2004 and 2008 in nine countries.**

**As evidenced by the number of children and infant lives that are saved through medical assistance, it is clear that there is not only an obligation to other countries, but to those in those countries who are most succeptable to catching disease and illness such as children. The number of lives already saves shows why the moral obligation must remain influential.**

# Contention Three: Tap Natural Resources

**Sub point A: Ridance of the “Resource Curse” (Politcs of Poverty, 2017)**

"Helping poor countries." The Politics of Poverty. N.p., 08 June 2017. Web. 05 July 2017. <<https://politicsofpoverty.oxfamamerica.org/2017/06/helping-poor-countries-rich-in-natural-resources-a-12-step-program-for-donors/>>.

**Twenty years ago, the economic, social, and environmental problems faced by poor but “resource rich” countries were hardly visible on the international aid agenda. Over the last 15 years, international donor efforts from agencies such as the World Bank and** [**IMF**](http://www.imf.org/en/Capacity%20Development/trust-fund/MNRW-TTF)**; bilateral donors such as the UK and Norway; and private foundations have poured hundreds of millions of dollars** into governments, consultants, and civil society organizations **in a bid to stem the “resource curse” and help average citizens benefit from natural resource booms.**

**Sub point B: Norway (Devex, 2014)**

"3 principles for natural resources to become a blessing for development." Devex. N.p., 12 Dec. 2014. Web. 05 July 2017. <<https://www.devex.com/news/3-principles-for-natural-resources-to-become-a-blessing-for-development-85065>>.

**The** [**Norwegian Oil for Development Program**](http://www.norad.no/en/tools-and-publications/publications/publication?key=109578) **has assisted Ghana and many other oil-producing nations in setting up the right structures, the same way the Australian** [**Mining for Development**](http://aid.dfat.gov.au/Publications/Pages/9578_1521_9550_2458_5168.aspx) **initiative is doing with countries rich in minerals. The aim of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development’s** [**Tax for Development**](http://www.oecd.org/tax/taxanddevelopment.htm) **program is to help countries squeeze more tax revenues out of their resources.**

**Without the existence of obligation to development assistance, these types of programs would not exist, and the lives lost due to unsanitary water and lack of medicine would only be higher. Additionally, the ability for other nations, specifically those in development, to capitalize on their natural resources would struggle. By valuing life through the standard of altruism and assistance without expected return, we see it is a clear vote in affirmation.**

# AFF Cards

#### A2: The Aid is a Waste

Climate Change Assistance (Murphey, 2017)

Murphy, Tom. "As US get stingy on foreign aid, Germany calls on others to step up." Humanosphere. N.p., 12 June 2017. Web. 06 July 2017. <<http://www.humanosphere.org/world-politics/2017/06/as-us-get-stingy-on-foreign-aid-germany-calls-on-others-to-step-up/>>.

**Germany wants to start a new global emergency relief fund just as the U.S. announces its intention to leave the United Nation’s Green Climate Fund,** the latest move by the Trump Administration to diminish America’s role in foreign aid.**German Development Minister Gerd Mueller re-upped his call for a 10 billion Euro emergency fund, over the weekend. He cited the rising hunger rates in East Africa as an example. It is a part of a broader hunger emergency where more than 20 million people are at risk of dying from starvation in Nigeria, Somalia, South Sudan and Yemen.** Nearly $5 billion is needed to avert famine.“We need to accomplish this as a world community,” Mueller [said](http://af.reuters.com/article/topNews/idAFKBN1920CZ-OZATP) in an interview with the German newspaper Passauer Neue Presse, according to *Reuters*. **The fund is for emergencies and would be replenished by countries to keep money available for unplanned events. It is in part a response to pleas by the U.N. and aid groups for donor countries to provide money immediately to prevent harm from the potential outbreaks of famine in these struggling regions.**Today, **only about 38 percent of the money the UN says is needed to pay for getting food, water and other supplies to current crises is available, meaning many people are not being helped.** That figure does not include the billions more needed to provide non-food assistance to communities affected by drought and conflict.

Assistance can Stop Poverty, Famine, and Terrorism (Morris, 2005)

Morris, Gabriel Scott. "Philosophical Arguments for Increased Aid to Developing Countries." Vanderbilt Undergraduate Research Journal 1 (2005): n. pag. Web.<<http://ejournals.library.vanderbilt.edu/index.php/vurj/article/viewFile/2719/1149>>.

**Ultimately, I have shown that the adoption of a plan to aid developing countries through an increase in no-strings-attached aid would be mutually beneficial for the developed and developing world. I have shown that an increase in developing country aid would have three main results. First, it would satisfy an imperative and present personal moral obligation for people in developed countries to give increased aid to developing countries as outlined by Kant and Singer. Second, it would reduce significantly worldwide poverty and famine. Finally, the external aid may significantly diminish the presence of diffuse support for terrorism. These three concerns are inextricably linked: a developed-country moral neglect to assist those in need breeds poverty, and poverty with famine in developing countries can breed terrorism.** This is why these three problems must be addressed simultaneously: one cannot be assessed without a consideration of the others. As a corollary to the intertwined nature of these problems, I have shown that a single movement by the developed world can curb the development of problems in all three areas: an increase in developing country aid. A realization of this increased developing country aid could amount to a version of the Marshall Plan for the developing world – a plan that constituted only one-quarter of one-percent America’s GDP but “put the economies of Western Europe back on their feet” (Rostow 1997, 19). If “[the developed world] structure[s] … incentives wisely” when giving aid, as Helena Cobban notes, “folks will [make a decision for world peace against terrorism as they did after the Marshall Plan].”14 However, **this aid should not be limited to monetary assistance alone.** Possible ways to give to developing countries could include direct delivery of food or other goods, a donation of one’s time in affected areas, or a support of necessary medical services. **Ultimately, with an application of this increase in developing country aid, a number of problems that currently plague civilization – such as poverty, famine, and terrorism – could be absolved by the goodwill of a fraction of the world’s population living in the developed world.**

#### A2: Obligation Doesn’t Exist

Moral Duty of Intervention Exists (Singer)

Singer, Peter. "Do Rich Nations Have an Obligation to Help Poor Nations? … Essay." Do Rich Nations Have an Obligation to Help Poor Nations? … | Essay. N.p., n.d. Web. 07 July 2017. <https://www.essaytown.com/subjects/paper/rich-nations-obligation-help-poor/7149>.

**Singer suggests that those of us fortunate enough to live in absolute affluence in societies** where even the poor enjoy general good nutrition, health, and relative longevity **owe an affirmative moral duty to provide more assistance to those enduring lives of absolute poverty in other parts of the world.** He uses **the analogy of the moral obligation to rescue a drowning child at little comparative cost to the rescuer and suggest that the same principle applies to addressing global poverty.** Specifically, the argument is that a **moral duty to intervene to save a stranger exists anytime the act of rescue can be accomplished without substantial cost to the rescuer.** Therefore, while no moral duty necessarily exists to risk one’s life to save a child drowning in a semi-frozen lake after falling through the ice, a moral duty does apply to the act of simply wading into shallow water to do so, perhaps at the price of a ruined set of clothes or schedule. **Singer applies that reasoning to the situation of global (absolute) poverty and outlines the four-step logical basis for the moral duty to intervene on the part of the (absolutely) affluent. First, one should be willing to make nominal sacrifices to prevent great harm to others; second, absolute poverty qualifies as “great harm”; and third, absolute poverty is preventable of rectifiable, at least to some degree, by our action. Therefore, we should do something to address absolute poverty.**

#### A2: Aid is Not in the Interest in Wealthy Nations

**It’s  a Good Thing That Aid Benefits Rich Countries (Lee, 2017)**

Lee, Bruce Y. "Bill Gates Is Right: USAID Is Not Just Foreign Aid, It Aids The U.S." Forbes. Forbes Magazine, 30 Mar. 2017. Web. 09 July 2017. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/brucelee/2017/03/18/bill-gates-is-right-usaid-is-not-just-foreign-aid-it-aids-the-u-s/#15b744e742d6>.

[Many are labeling](http://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-trump-budget-state-idUSKBN16N0DQ) President Donald Trump's recently proposed 28% cut of the State Department's and United States Agency for International Development (USAID) budget as drastic cuts in foreign aid. But the term *foreign aid* is inaccurate and may be misleading. It suggests that what USAID does is all charity work. Nothing could be further from the truth. USAID began in 1961 (with the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 by Congress) when our nation's leaders at the time had some foresight. [President John F. Kennedy explained](https://www.usaid.gov/who-we-are/usaid-history) that "there is no escaping our obligations as a wise leader and good neighbor in the interdependent community of free nations...and our political obligations as the single largest counter to the adversaries of freedom." This all sounds good as a sound bite, but **in addition to altruistic motivations, there's also plenty of selfish motivation behind helping other countries. Doing so creates economic opportunities for the U.S. and makes the world safer for U.S. businesses and Americans. When considering USAID, the focus should not be just on the "AID" but the word "development."** Bill Gates, Microsoft cofounder and co-chair of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, [summarized the dangers of cutting USAID in his op-ed for *Time*](http://time.com/4704550/bill-gates-cutting-foreign-aid-makes-america-less-safe/), opening with: Foreign aid is often in the hot seat, but today the heat is cranked up especially high. The United States government, one of the world’s most influential donors, is considering dramatic cuts to health and development programs around the world. I understand why some Americans watch their tax dollars going overseas and wonder why we’re not spending them at home. Here’s my answer: **These projects keep Americans safe. And by promoting health, security and economic opportunity, they stabilize vulnerable parts of the world.** He went on to explain that **USAID work helps prevent and control epidemics such as the Ebola outbreak and the spread of HIV/AIDS, create jobs for Americans and people around the world, strengthens markets for U.S. goods, and protect Americans such as our military members. In other words, foreign aid actually helps improve the health of Americans.**This is the same reason you try to make friends with people around you, put trash in garbage cans, don't randomly spit and yell insults at work, and actually attempt to improve your neighborhood and workplace. This is also why smart companies make efforts to engage and improve the communities around them. Such work elevates their standing in the community, strengthens their businesses, and creates more opportunities. Do the opposite, make enemies, fail to build relationships, and let health and other threats fester around you, and you risk seriously hurting yourself. **No country, organization or person will ever be powerful enough to succeed or even remain healthy without cooperation or assistance from others. Throughout history, countries have shown that isolationist policies eventually lead to the downfall of kingdoms, dynasties and powerful countries.** As an example, China was once the world's most advanced civilization for a much longer period than the entire history of the United States. But complacency, arrogance and refusal to deal with countries that it felt were inferior (basically every other country in the world) deprived China of opportunities to further grow and strengthen itself, leaving it susceptible to health problems such as opium addiction and foreign control. **The challenge is that not everyone may realize the far-reaching benefits of USAID's programs because its programs involve such complex systems and a plethora of direct and indirect effects (e.g., improving health systems in low- and middle-income countries in Africa reduces the risk of a disease outbreak that could eventually lead to a global pandemic that otherwise would affect all Americans)**. The world is truly global now, highly interconnected by complex systems (e.g., linked economies, trade, food systems, travel). Perhaps there is a need to better demonstrate to the public and other decision makers the far-reaching value of USAID's programs. For instance, our [SPACES (Strategic Program for Analyzing Complexity and Evaluating Systems) consortium](https://www.usaid.gov/GlobalDevLab/about/monitoring-evaluation-research-and-learning-innovations-program/spaces-merl) has been working with various USAID programs and missions via Sophia van der Bijl of the [USAID Global Development Lab](https://www.usaid.gov/GlobalDevLab/about/monitoring-evaluation-research-and-learning-innovations-program) to bring new methods and approaches (such as systems mapping, computational simulation modeling, narrative-based approaches and indicator-based approaches) that help better understand and address complex systems as well as the ramifications of changes and decisions. **Such approaches can better "connect the dots" so that everyone can see how USAID efforts benefit different Americans.**If Trump's proposed USAID cuts go through, they will not make America great. In fact, quite the opposite may happen. Being more isolated will allow other countries to assume world leadership. [According to a Brookings Institute report](https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2016/07/19/chinese-foreign-assistance-explained/), from 2001 to 2013, China more than doubled its foreign aid. Since 2005 and its launch of its “Go Global” strategy, China's foreign aid totals "have grown at an average rate of 21.8% annually." [As the *Guardian* reported](https://www.theguardian.com/global-development-professionals-network/2015/sep/09/foreign-aid-which-countries-are-the-most-generous), U.S. foreign aid, before the proposed cuts, already lags that of numerous European countries (in terms of percentage of the gross national income) such as Sweden, Luxembourg, Norway, Denmark, the U.K., Germany, France and Switzerland. **The myth that the U.S. does not need other countries and just gives foreign aid as handouts is a dangerous one. Complacency and unrealistic self-images are our country's biggest enemy.** I've already mentioned, in a previous Forbes piece, the many signs that a [major pandemic may be on the horizon](https://www.forbes.com/sites/brucelee/2017/02/19/bill-gates-warns-of-epidemic-that-will-kill-over-30-million-people/#79c8f63282f7). Add to that the risk of war and other major problems that could affect your health. Gates plans to meet with Trump on Monday, presumably in part to deliver in person his messages about the importance of funding global health and development. This may include his concluding remarks in his op-ed: **Protecting Americans, preventing epidemics, strengthening markets, saving lives: aid delivers phenomenal benefits, and for a bargain. It represents less than 1% of the federal budget, not even a penny out of every dollar. It is some of the best return on investment anywhere in government. This money is well spent, it has an enormous impact, and it ought to be maintained.** In the end, USAID is an investment, and the emphasis should be on the word development. Not investing in America's established place in the world will eventually make America sick. Let's not be the neighborhood hermit who isn't seen until an ambulance arrives to take the weakened and ill hermit to the hospital.

International Aid Strengthens National Security (Chang, 2017)

Chang, Mina. "What's the value in helping other countries?" CNN. Cable News Network, 20 May 2017. Web. 07 July 2017. <http://www.cnn.com/2017/05/20/opinions/value-of-foreign-aid-to-the-us-chang/index.html>.

**By stabilizing vulnerable communities, foreign aid strengthens our national security. It helps combat contributors to instability, which create circumstances non-state actors happily exploit to further their agenda.** There are various non-state groups around the world with several and differing objectives. But groups our government has designated as [terrorist organizations](https://www.state.gov/j/ct/rls/other/des/index.htm) do not respect international human rights and use violence and fear to impose their political, ideological, and religious beliefs to gain power and legitimize their sovereignty. **Security and power vacuums exist in fragile regions that allow for human rights violations.** Illicit trafficking of people, arms and drugs provide safe havens for terrorists and displace innocent people, creating refugees and IDPs (internally displaced people). **Strategic aid promotes economic prosperity while bolstering self-reliance and opening markets and trading opportunities to the United States. The impacted population is better able to contribute as members of local and global society, generating jobs, fueling market economies, holding governments accountable** and serving as first responders to their own needs. So at a cost of less than 1% of our entire federal budget, foreign aid is a bargain, given its ability to bolster our national security.

#### A2: Deficit

Aid Saves Lives and Increases Stability (Simmons, 2017)

Simmons, Ann M. "U.S. foreign aid: A waste of money or a boost to world stability? Here are the facts." Los Angeles Times. Los Angeles Times, n.d. Web. 07 July 2017. <http://www.latimes.com/world/la-fg-global-aid-true-false-20170501-htmlstory.html>.

**The planned amount of American aid for Afghanistan in 2017 is $4.7 billion**, according to the website [ForeignAssistance.gov](http://beta.foreignassistance.gov/), a tool for tracking U.S. foreign assistance spending. Funding to this Asian nation is intended **to support the agricultural sector by creating jobs; build a national education system; assist reproductive health; and establish basic infrastructure, such as schools and hospitals, according to information published by** the U.S. Agency for International Development, or **USAID**. In 2014, Afghanistan received [$7.3 billion](https://explorer.usaid.gov/cd/AFG?measure=Obligations&fiscal_year=2014) in foreign assistance from the U.S., of which more than half went toward conflict prevention and security, according to [USAID](https://explorer.usaid.gov/cd/AFG?measure=Obligations&fiscal_year=2014).

**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.**

Helping to end maternal and child mortality. **At least 4.6 million children and 200,000 mothers are alive today in part because of USAID-funded programs,** agency officials said. Ensuring that people don’t go hungry. The U.S. government’s Feed the Future initiative has helped more than 9 million farmers gain access to new tools or technologies such as high-yielding seeds, fertilizer application, soil conservation and water management, according to USAID. Improving reading instruction and creating safe learning environments for more than 41.6 million children from 2011 to 2015. **Providing access to clean water and sanitation. As of 2015, more than 7.6 million people had received improved access to drinking water and more than 4.3 million people had improved sanitation. Helping to stabilize nations by promoting democracy, human rights and good governance around the world.**

# \*\*\*NC\*\*\*

**I stand in firm negation that Wealthy Nations have an obligation to provide development assistance to other nations.**

**Since the resolution cites the word “obligation” we will look to Merriam Webster Dictionary’s definition as first, “ something (such as a formal contract, a promise, or the demands of conscience or custom) that obligates one to a course of action,” second, “ a debt security (such as a mortgage or corporate bond),” and third as, “a commitment (as by a government) to pay a particular sum of money”.**  "Obligation." Merriam-Webster. Merriam-Webster, n.d. Web. 06 July 2017. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/obligation>. **Because none of these definitions, we can evaluate the resolution through a monetary scope. Meaning wealthy countries carry an obligation to provide this monetary assistance. However, defintion three requires a particular sum of money and because there is no agreement with all wealthy nations to determine this sum, the obligation does not universally exist.**

**Thus, today’s debate can be evaluated through the value of ‘Autonomy’ with the value of ‘Social Progress’.**

**Autonomy: (of a country or region) the right or condition of self-government, especially in a particular sphere, a self-governing country or region, freedom from external control or influence.**

**Social Progress: is defined as an increasing capacity of a society to meet the basic human needs of its citizens, establish the building blocks that allow citizens and communities to enhance and sustain the quality of their lives, and create the conditions for all individuals to reach their full potential.**

**Because the perceived obligation of wealthy nations to provide developmental assistance is often harmful and ineffective, the best way to achieve autonomy is through deleting the obligations and aids that prevent social progress.**

# Contention One: The Obligation Does Not Exist

**Sub point A: Assumption of Obligation by Rich Eliminates Pressure on Local Rich (Barry, 1980 Tanner Lectures)**

Barry, Brian. "The Obligations of Rich Countries and World Poverty ." (n.d.): n. pag. Web. 6 July 2017. <<http://www.um.edu.mt/europeanstudies/books/CD_CSP4/pdf/bbarry.pdf>>.

Humanitarianism has its roots in utilitarian ethics while human rights thinking owes more to Kant. They are thus drawn from the two main schools of western thought in the last 250 years. But my conclusion is that they both have the same implications. **In the first instance the state, and also relatively rich people within the country** (whether the country itself is rich or poor) **have an obligation to tackle poverty, but if they cannot do it (or cannot do enough) the obligation devolves on to rich states and relatively rich people in other countries.** What if some countries fail to contribute their fair share of aid? It would be nice if we could come up with some form of sanctions imposed by other states, such as exclusion from the WTO. But the worst offender is the United States, and it would not leave the WTO viable if it were expelled. I suggested earlier that, if the nearest bystander to the drowning child fails to act, the obligation devolves on the next, and so on. **But that is a finite, one-off obligation.** How far are more altruistic states obliged to offset the failure of others to pull their weight? One answer is that the others should contribute what would be their share of the right total. **But we do not really have much idea how much aid could be absorbed productively except by trial and error, so we do not know what the right total is.** There is a parallel problem that arises in poor countries. I said that the obligation to aid cuts in whenever those in a country cannot contribute enough (through taxes or voluntarily) to do what might be done about poverty. But what if the rich in a poor country fail to contribute what they could? I suggested that the analogy of parents and wealthy people in a country does not carry over because they cannot be punished and cannot be displaced without consequences that cannot even be anticipated. But we are pulled two ways on this. On one hand, we feel drawn to saying that the compatriots of the poor have the first obligation to help, and to conclude from this that if they do not help even if they could that reduces the claim on others. A possible argument from moral hazard might be made for this position. That is to say, **if it becomes established that failure to act locally will be compensated for by outside aid, that eliminates the pressure on the local rich.** But the trouble is that the local rich do not do much in a number of countries even where outside aid is skimpy, so more outside aid would not displace local aid. **On the other hand, then, it seems unfair that outside aid to the poor should be held hostage by the rich in their own country. We might support this by appealing to the cosmopolitan thought that rich people generally have an obligation to aid poor people generally, and the failure of the local rich to act no more negates the obligation of others outside than does the failure of some rich countries to contribute a fair share to aid reduce the obligations on others.**

**Sub point B: Very Little Lasting Success for Aid (Dichter, 2003)**

Dichter, Thomas W. Despite good intentions: why development assistance to the third world has failed. Amherst: U of Massachusetts Press, 2003. Web. 6 July 2017. <<https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=spKMqdku3-IC&oi=fnd&pg=PR9&dq=obligation+to+development+assistance&ots=R6unX0do_T&sig=FNpgZJLs8GiEDOlMV2d0fxM1uNg#v=onepage&q=obligation%20to%20development%20assistance&f=false>>.

**For more than fifty years the international development assistance industry has tried to alter the conditions behind these dismal numbers with hardly any lasting success to show for it.  Few development insiders are willing to entertain the possibility that there may no longer be any really good reason for this industry to exist at all. To suggest this would mean taking a look at development as an industry, as having its own imperatives, as having its own survival at stake,** more, increasingly, than the survival of its putative raison d'etre- the poor people of the underdeveloped nations. This last proposition- that **aid has become a business whose main stake is its own survival- begins to explain why there has been so little apparent learning or fundamental change in how things are done, despite all the evidence of failure, all the studies (countless retellings of the “operation was a success, but the patient died” sort) and the many expensive evaluations and retrospective looks at this half century of work, the majority of which show depressing if not always negative results.** That the World Bank in 1992 (almost fifty years after its founding in 1944) had to remind itself that “sustainable impact,” “on the ground,” is the determinant of success is a big clue to the almost willful myopia within the industry. While **it is true that behind the development assistance programs of many of the industrial nations there has often been selfish national interest, former colonial loyalty, and/or political conditionality, especially at the height go the cold war.**

**As Evidenced by these contentions, this assistance is not obligation, and serves as a pursuit to appeal to personal interest and business rather than life or well-being.**

# Contention Two: Assistance is Often Not Assistance

**Sub point A: Assistance Effects Development in the Wrong Way ( Glennie, 2011)**

Glennie, Jonathan. "Giving aid to poor countries is hardly a great act of generosity." The Guardian. Guardian News and Media, 14 June 2011. Web. 06 July 2017. <<https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/poverty-matters/2011/jun/14/aid-is-hardly-an-act-of-great-generosity-effectiveness>>.

[**Aid**](https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/aid) **has mixed impacts, can harm as well as help development and takes the focus away from other more important things rich countries should be doing to spur development. African governments should set out medium-term plans to reduce aid dependency, while rich countries need to switch from traditional forms of aid-giving to supporting global goods (like clean energy, vaccinations, security) in new ways.Aid is not actually a great act of generosity. Aid buys things donors want (such as political support and economic advantage, whether directly for donor businesses or indirectly through policy change). The other things rich countries need to do to really show solidarity with the poor will require if not more generosity (as we can turn them to our economic advantage)** then certainly greater risk: accept fairer trade rules, adapt rapidly to climate change and resource scarcity by limiting our consumption, accept the employment consequences of a more just arms trade, clamp down on tax havens and force our international companies to abide by social, environmental and accounting norms (to name a few). The UK has created a hugely unequal society in which bankers go home with millions while one London council has started to [charge children to visit playgrounds](https://www.theguardian.com/society/2011/may/12/tory-council-charge-children-playground).

**Sub point B: Assistance Promotes Corruption (Martin, 2014)**

Daniel Martin, Daily Mail Whitehall Correspondent. "Confirmed: Our foreign aid fuels corruption - Official watchdog's verdict on aid spending that Cameron has defiantly ring-fenced." Daily Mail Online. Associated Newspapers, 31 Oct. 2014. Web. 06 July 2017. <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2815115/Confirmed-foreign-aid-fuels-corruption-Official-watchdog-s-verdict-aid-spending-Cameron-defiantly-ring-fenced.html>.

The **billions Britain pours into foreign aid are actually doing harm by making corruption worse in many parts of the world, a damning report reveals.It says projects funded by UK cash are increasing opportunities for bribery.**In some areas, they are even pushing poor people ‘towards corrupt practices’.After we spent millions on a scheme to tackle police bribery in Nigeria, locals said they were even more likely to have to pay backhanders, the report found.It concluded that **huge amounts of UK aid money is being wasted because we are either funding corrupt programmes directly** or not doing enough to tackle the culture of bribery in many countries.**The findings come just days after it emerged human rights abuses in Ethiopia – where security forces are accused of burning, torturing and raping citizens – had got worse during a four-year period when the UK gave the country more than £1billion.** The report was carried out by the Independent Commission for Aid Impact, the watchdog set up to scrutinise the Department for International Development. **In Nepal, it said the poor were being ‘pushed towards corrupt practices’ by having to pay bribes or forge documents to receive funding through a local governance project backed by British aid.**

# \*\*\*NEG Cards\*\*\*

**Developed Countries Take Advantage (Naomi, 2010)**

Naomi Y.N., NG. "Do developed countries have an obligation to help poor ones?" South China Morning Post. N.p., 27 Apr. 2010. Web. 09 July 2017. <http://www.scmp.com/article/712693/do-developed-countries-have-obligation-help-poor-ones>.

**We live on the same planet, and use the same resources. But developed countries have taken advantage of the unfair distribution of resources to help their citizens become very wealthy.** The rich have an obligation to help poor countries who were exploited by their colonial rulers. The United States had a head start with its vast natural resources. **But many countries in Europe, such as Britain, became rich due to their colonial reign in Asia. They expanded their empire to include poor, resource-rich nations in Asia. They exploited the region's cheap labour, with workers getting little in return for their hard work.** Hong Kong was different though. **Britain ruled Hong Kong for more than 150 years and I think both sides benefited. Today, the city is an international financial centre with a strong economy. But some countries did not benefit from colonial rule. It is wrong to allow outsiders to influence the development of a country. This could lead to serious problems. A developed country faces various difficulties when choosing who to help. First, its choice could leave a lot of people unhappy and damage its relationship with other countries. Second, allowing foreigners to have a significant influence on a nation could lead to negative consequences. Some donors do not have the best intentions. They could use their power for their own advantage. This could lead to corruption and financial loss in the less developed country. Third, a developing nation may become dependent on foreign aid. And some donors might charge a hefty interest for their financial assistance.** This could pose a bigger headache than not receiving aid at all. Rich countries have to be careful when helping poor nations. It involves a lot of politics so the rich have the right to choose the recipient and ensure the aid does not get into the wrong hands.

#### A2: Assistance Helps Develop Poor Nations

**Poor Nations Develop Rich Ones, Not the Other Way Around (Hickel, 2017)**

Hickel, Jason. "Aid in reverse: how poor countries develop rich countries | Jason Hickel." The Guardian. Guardian News and Media, 14 Jan. 2017. Web. 06 July 2017. <https://www.theguardian.com/global-development-professionals-network/2017/jan/14/aid-in-reverse-how-poor-countries-develop-rich-countries>.

**In 2012, the last year of recorded data, developing countries received a total of $1.3tn, including all aid, investment, and income from abroad. But that same year some $3.3tn flowed out of them. In other words, developing countries sent $2tn more to the rest of the world than they received.** If we look at all years since 1980, these net outflows add up to an eye-popping total of $16.3tn – that’s how much money has been drained out of the global south over the past few decades. To get a sense for the scale of this, $16.3tn is roughly the GDP of the United States **What this means is that the usual development narrative has it backwards.** [Aid](https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/aid) is effectively flowing in reverse. **Rich countries aren’t developing poor countries; poor countries are developing rich ones.** What do these large outflows consist of? Well, some of it is payments on debt. Developing countries have forked out over $4.2tn in [interest payments](http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/DT.INT.DECT.CD?locations=XO) alone since 1980 – a direct cash transfer to big banks in New York and London, on a scale that dwarfs the aid that they received during the same period. Another big contributor is the income that foreigners make on their investments in developing countries and then repatriate back home. Think of all the profits that BP extracts from Nigeria’s oil reserves, for example, or that Anglo-American pulls out of South Africa’s gold mines. **Multinational companies also steal money from developing countries through “same-invoice faking”, shifting profits illegally between their own subsidiaries by mutually faking trade invoice prices on both sides. For example, a subsidiary in Nigeria might dodge local taxes by shifting money to a related subsidiary in the British Virgin Islands, where the tax rate is effectively zero and where stolen funds can’t be traced.** GFI doesn’t include same-invoice faking in its headline figures because it is very difficult to detect, but they estimate that it amounts to another $700bn per year. And these figures only cover theft through trade in goods.

A2: The Money is Helpful

The Money Doesn’t End up Where it Ought to (Plumer, 2013)

Plumer, Brad. "Wealthy nations pledged billions to help the poor adapt to climate change. Where did it all go?" The Washington Post. WP Company, 18 Nov. 2013. Web. 06 July 2017. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2013/11/18/wealthy-nations-promised-billions-to-help-the-poor-adapt-to-climate-change-where-did-it-go/?utm\_term=.391b32bd0f88>.

**In recent years, many of the world's wealthier nations** — including the United States, Germany, Britain, and Japan — **have promised billions of dollars in aid to help developing countries adapt to the impacts of global warming and switch over to cleaner energy sources. In 2009, these nations pledged $30 billion in "fast start" climate finance over the next three years, with a promise to scale that up to $100 billion per year in aid from both public and private sources by 2020.** But that latter pledge now looks increasingly unlikely — and it's one of the big sticking points at the [ongoing U.N. climate negotiations in Warsaw](http://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/at-climate-change-summit-in-warsaw-countries-look-to-lay-foundation-for-global-pact/2013/11/11/ee891286-4b0a-11e3-ac54-aa84301ced81_story.html) this month.So it's worth asking: What does this climate aid actually look like? Where has it all gone so far? And are wealthy nations *really* going to put up $100 billion per year in climate finance in the years to come? Here's a breakdown:--2010-2012: The first $35 billion in climate aid. **Between 2010 and 2012, the world's wealthy nations say they provided $35 billion to help poorer countries adjust to climate change, as promised** at Copenhagen. (You can see a full breakdown of these pledges from the World Resources Institute [here](http://www.wri.org/publication/mobilising-international-climate-finance).)**The vast majority of that aid — $27 billion — came from five countries: Germany, Japan, Norway, Britain, and the United States. And most of it went toward clean energy, efficiency, and other mitigation projects around the world. Only a small slice, about $5 billion, went toward helping poor countries prepare for the actual impacts of climate change,** like droughts or heat waves. Critics have pointed out, however, that these climate pledges didn't always add up. Oxfam International [has argued](http://www.oxfam.org/en/grow/pressroom/pressrelease/2012-11-25/climate-fiscal-cliff-developing-countries-if-doha-no-new-money) that most of the aid wasn't "new and additional" — much of it was foreign aid that *already* existed but was simply repackaged under the auspices of climate change. T**he United States, for instance,** [**says it provided $7.5 billion**](http://www.state.gov/e/oes/climate/faststart/c48618.htm) **in "fast start" climate finance between 2010 and 2012, spread out across more than a hundred countries. But Oxfam says** that total includes existing development aid approved by Congress that the State Department says produced "climate co-benefits." **It also includes loan guarantees through the Export-Import Bank that are primarily intended to benefit U.S. companies.**

### Why Trying to Help Poor Countries Might Actually Hurt Them (Swanson, 2015)

Swanson, Ana. "Why trying to help poor countries might actually hurt them." The Washington Post. WP Company, 13 Oct. 2015. Web. 07 July 2017. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2015/10/13/why-trying-to-help-poor-countries-might-actually-hurt-them/?utm\_term=.a67eea36b6d5>.

Deaton, an economist at Princeton University who studied poverty in India and South Africa and spent decades working at the World Bank, won his prize for studying how the poor decide to save or spend money. But his ideas about foreign aid are particularly provocative. **Deaton argues that, by trying to help poor people in developing countries, the rich world may actually be corrupting those nations' governments and slowing their growth. According to Deaton, and the economists who agree with him, much of the** [**$135 billion**](http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/development-aid-stable-in-2014-but-flows-to-poorest-countries-still-falling.htm) **that the world’s most developed countries spent on official aid in 2014 may not have ended up helping the poor.**

The effect wasn't limited to Africa. **Many economists were noticing that an influx of foreign aid did not seem to produce economic growth in countries around the world. Rather, lots of foreign aid flowing into a country tended to be correlated with lower economic growth**, as this chart from a paper by [Arvind Subramanian and Raghuram Rajan](http://www.nber.org/papers/w11513.pdf) shows.

"My critique of aid has been more to do with countries where they get an enormous amount of aid relative to everything else that goes on in that country," Deaton said in an interview with Wonkblog. **"For instance, most governments depend on their people for taxes in order to run themselves and provide services to their people. Governments that get all their money from aid don’t have that at all, and I think of that as very corrosive.**"

**Like revenue from oil or diamonds, wealth from foreign aid can be a corrupting influence on weak governments,** “turning what should be beneficial political institutions into toxic ones,” Deaton writes in his book “The Great Escape: Health, Wealth, and the Origins of Inequality.” **This wealth can make governments more despotic, and it can also increase the risk of civil war, since there is less power sharing, as well as a lucrative prize worth fighting for.**

### Assistance is Misused (Simmons, 2017)

Simmons, Ann M. "U.S. foreign aid: A waste of money or a boost to world stability? Here are the facts." Los Angeles Times. Los Angeles Times, n.d. Web. 07 July 2017. <http://www.latimes.com/world/la-fg-global-aid-true-false-20170501-htmlstory.html>.

**U.S. aid shouldn’t go to countries that harbor terrorists** who want to harm Americans, such as Pakistan, where Osama bin Laden had taken refuge not far from a Pakistani military compound before U.S. intelligence discovered him there. **The U.S. has drastically cut aid to Pakistan in recent years, but the South Asian nation still received** [**$383 million in 2016,**](http://beta.foreignassistance.gov/explore/country/Pakistan) **according to U.S. government data, and $742,200,000 is planned for Pakistan in fiscal year 2017. There is too little accountability for those who abuse U.S. aid through theft or misuse. Foreign aid encourages corruption and conflict and stifles the will to pursue free enterprise, because recipients become dependent.**A saturation of food aid can undermine opportunities for local agricultural markets to develop.

### Assistance is Abused (Simmons, 2017)

Simmons, Ann M. "U.S. foreign aid: A waste of money or a boost to world stability? Here are the facts." Los Angeles Times. Los Angeles Times, n.d. Web. 07 July 2017. <<http://www.latimes.com/world/la-fg-global-aid-true-false-20170501-htmlstory.html>>.

**Millions of dollars worth of antimalarial drugs provided by the U.S. government are being stolen and resold on the black market in Africa,** according USAID’s office of inspector general, which monitors the agency. The U.S. government fights malaria in 19 African countries through a program called the President’s Malaria Initiative.

**In January, the inspector general’s office reported that an investigation it launched in the West African nation of Guinea led to** [**the arrest of eight people**](https://oig.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/pressrelease_01192017_guinea_arrest.pdf) **on suspicion of illegally selling USAID-issued antimalarial drugs** in public markets of Conakry, the country’s capital. U.S. funding for combating malaria has exceeded $72 million since fiscal year 2011 and amounted to $15 million in fiscal year 2016, according to the office.

Last year, the monitoring agency announced the relaunch of its Make a Difference Malaria hotline to make it easier for Nigerians to report stolen, counterfeit or resale antimalarial drugs. The hotline offers rewards of $100 to $10,000. A similar program is underway in Malawi, according to the office.

**USAID’s funds have also** [**fallen victim to money laundering**](https://oig.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/pressrelease_02082017_african_man_arrested_laundering.pdf)**. In February, the agency announced the arrest of a South African doctor, Eugene Sickle,** who served as deputy executive director of the Wits Reproductive Health and HIV Institute program. **Sickle is being investigated for his alleged role in a fraud scheme that targeted funds from USAID,** which since 2012 has awarded grants **worth nearly $77 million** to help strengthen treatment programs for HIV/AIDS patients, according to the agency.
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