

University at Albany, State University of New York

Scholars Archive

Political Science

Honors College

5-2018

Underwhelming Success of United States Foreign Assistance

Yissett Peralta

University at Albany, State University of New York

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarsarchive.library.albany.edu/honorscollege_pos



Part of the [Political Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Peralta, Yissett, "Underwhelming Success of United States Foreign Assistance" (2018). *Political Science*. 27.

https://scholarsarchive.library.albany.edu/honorscollege_pos/27

This Honors Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Honors College at Scholars Archive. It has been accepted for inclusion in Political Science by an authorized administrator of Scholars Archive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@albany.edu.

Underwhelming Success of United States Foreign Assistance

An honors thesis presented to the
Department of Political Science
University at Albany, State University of New York
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for graduation with Honors in Political Science
and
graduation from The Honors College

Yisett Peralta
Research Advisor: Victor Asal, Ph.D.

May, 2018

Abstract

Foreign assistance offers, humanitarian support, military support and financial support to recipients who have faced some form of disaster. In my research I have concluded that the underwhelming success, is to do many things, a countries instability, corruption, but most importantly the time and finances the United is willing or not will to put forth for that country. In analyzing the underwhelming success, one must also factor in the goals and interest of the United States, providing aid to certain countries. In conducting my research and analyzing Iraq, Bosnia and Haiti, the money is not being used in an efficient either by the recipient or even the United States for the benefit of those how need it the most.

Acknowledgements

Thank you to my family and friends who supported me during my time at the University at Albany. Thank you to the professors and staff at the Political Science Department who have guided me to make the right decisions. A special thanks to my advisor Professor Victor Asal who has helped me during this time. Without his help this thesis would not be possible.

\

Table of Contents

Abstract	2
Acknowledgements.....	3
Introduction.....	5
Defining Foreign Assistance.....	6
Factors that Determine Success.....	7
United States History with Foreign Assistance.....	8
Determining United States Success.....	14
Case Studies	17
Conclusion.....	31
References.....	34

Underwhelming Success of United States Foreign Assistance

I. Introduction

Foreign assistance is a term that has multiple subsets, from economy support, trade partnerships, promoting democracy to military assistance. In broad terms, assistance means the voluntary transfer of resources from one country to another. Although in dividing the different terms foreign aid can encompass, the definition expands. My focus for my research is on the underwhelming success of United States's foreign assistance, and the multiple factors are contributing to it, a countries instability, corruption, wartime, money and contribution to the U.S., willing or not to put forth that country are factor's as well. In analyzing the underwhelming success, one must also factor in the goals and interest of the United States, providing aid to certain countries. In conducting my research. I analyze three countries, Iraq, Bosnia and Haiti, all recipients of U.S foreign assistance and unfortunately how foreign assistance has failed to improve a countries economic growth and stability, stable government institutions, human rights, or all three.

The first question I deal with is, what type of aid does the United States offer to other countries, following analyzing the success rate of the foreign assistance and offer explanations why it was not successful. To provide a credible, but simplistic understanding of what foreign assistance is I have decided to use a qualitative case study in analyzing three distant (territorially) and different (economically, governmentally, etc.) countries, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iraq and Haiti. The only similarities between these countries are the fact that they received aid from the United States and the countries experienced tragedy, such as war or natural disasters. The invasion of Iraq forced the United States to implement programs that would rebuild the economy, government, etc. Although, the United States seemingly forgot that the basic principles established

in the West, might not work for countries in the Middle East. Unlike in Iraq was a United States invasion lead to restructuring, in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the United States along with the United States provided financial and verbal support in hopes to restructure and rebuild the country. In Bosnia and Iraq, wars with U.S intention or not caused for significant foreign assistance, but in Haiti, the cause was natural disasters, therefore to provide improvement, the United States provided humanitarian and economic support.

The focus of my research is not to provide an answer on whether the United States should provide foreign assistance or not or even the amount, but the decisions the U.S. make when reforming a country is ultimately in the national interest and security of the United States. While this is fair and an obvious factor has U.S interest and security at the forefront of foreign assistance is neglecting the best interest of the country and the people who are receiving donations. Although, there are those who in a state that aiding in any form is enough, I would respond with the fact that in multiple cases, the United States had left those countries in worse shape than when they arrived because a majority of the programs the United States implements are temporary. The research will be divided into four parts, (1) defining what foreign aid is and its different components, (2) analyzing what successful foreign assistance encompasses, (3) United States history with foreign aid, (4) the components that determine successful U.S foreign assistance, (5) analyzing my three case studies and finally (6) stating my conclusion and remarks.

I. Defining Foreign Assistance

Foreign Assistance is an extension of foreign policy and guided by national interest and security, even though foreign assistance does offer support to certain countries. In the case of the United States the goal for assistance is to “subsidize allies to ensure allegiance, fostering international influence, and finally serving the United States interests and national security”

(Bortolletto, 10). Being a subset of foreign policy, assistance has become a variable of “soft power” that the United States uses to pursue their national interests and security. Colin S. Gray defines “soft power” as the ability influence others, in this case, countries to have similar values and share one's plans and elements in one’s foreign policy for order in security, so the interests of the United States are intact (3).

a. Factors contributing to Successful Foreign Assistance

Past research has analyzed the factors that determine success of foreign assistance and the variables are as follows. Matthew S. Winters states, the ideal relationship between a donor and a recipient “involves a chain of accountability relationships stretching from international donors through national governments and implementing agencies to a set of ultimate end users of the goods and services financed by the aid” (218). For my own research, I will be paying close attention and using Winter’s analysis as a guide in what the United States, does and does not when engaging with another country and providing foreign assistance and how the level of accountability is not where it needs to be in order for foreign assistance to be successful. Using Winter’s own conclusions as a I guide I will then offer assumptions as to why United States foreign is not as successful as it should be. In his research, Winter states five, factors that might make aid more effective, correct incentives for agents to fulfill their responsibilities, assures principles that their agents will fulfill their responsibilities allowing for planning and decision making in this context.

The third factors are whether policies work or not, fourth, generally facilitates transparency about agents’ actions. The fifth and final benefit would be that it helps principals provide correct rewards to agents. Unlike other research, according to Winter, success comes at the ground level with communication with the donor and the recipient. Winters states that assistance is more successful, with higher accountability but also with stable and accountable institutions.

Aid can have a negative and positive impact in developing states. “Aid can release governments from binding revenue constraints, enabling them to strengthen domestic institutions and pay higher salaries to civil servants” (Brautigam and Knack, 255). Although, negative factors, include the country becoming dependent on the donor and needing that country for future endeavors. Sundberg and Bourguignon, similar to Brautigam and Knack study and examine the chain in how foreign assistance affects the development of countries. They argue that the connections scholars want are difficult due to the complexities of the “chain.” They link aid and developmental outcomes into three relationships: donors to policymakers, policymakers to policies and policies to outcomes. In doing so, they can reshape the aid model in country ownership of developmental strategies and aid allocation based on monitor able results.

The research done by scholars conclude that the GDP of the country, the amount of capital the UN uses, the involvement of other organizations can help determine the success or failure of a peacekeeping operation. Yes, these scholars have done great research in determining where peacekeeping operations are done and variable that can increase the chance of successful, but while they look at the economy country, research has not delved into the type each countries type of government.

II. U.S History with Foreign Assistance

Foreign Assistance has been a part of United States foreign policy, since the formulation of the Marshall Plan after World War II. In 2017, the United States planned to give over \$44 billion, obligated to give over \$26 billion and ended up giving \$28 billion in assistance to countries around the world. According to the Department of State, most of the aid is in support of peace and security and health each getting about \$6 billion. The goal of foreign assistance to provide opportunities for countries to have a stable and growing economy, government, human rights,

health, development, etc. Although has been made evident that even with all the support little to no progress has been made to in a countries economic development and democratic growth.

Foreign assistance first took its form in the United States after World War II with the Marshall Plan the United States has been involved with foreign aid and military intervention around the world. Lead by Secretary of State, George C Marshall provided technical and financial assistance to most European countries. Successfully, the plan allowed those countries to rebuild their infrastructure, stabilize the region and strengthen their economy. Foreign assistance officially became a part of foreign policy under the Kennedy Administration, in 1961 with the USAID or United States Agency of International Development, before this most foreign assistance were under the State Department. Over the past 50 or so years United States foreign assistance has transitioned, in terms focus and where aid is intended what type of promotion the United States wants to occur. In the 1970's USAID shifted their focus to not only financial assistance but aid intended to increase basic human needs, from health, education, food, nutrition and human resources development.

The hope of foreign assistance is to provide countries with opportunity with growth in their economy and if need be a success democratic transition. Beginning in the 1980's, the USAID wanted to increase and promote basic market principals in hope to restructure developing countries and creating an open and free market. The USAID did so by committing to broad based economic growth, emphasizing employment and income opportunities through a revitalization of agriculture and the expansion of domestic markets. During this decade development activities happened through private voluntary organizations (a charity or other organization that provides assistance and is eligible for aid from the USAID, but must register to apply for the support) and shifted from individual projects to large programs.

In the 1990's the USAID shifted to sustainability and democracy and looking to promote development and helping countries improve their quality of life. For maximum success, the USAID had specific assistance programs about a countries economic conditions. Therefore developing countries would receive an integrated package of assistance; transitional countries would receive help in times of crisis and countries who received little support from the USAID received more support from non-governmental organizations.

Beginning with the 2000's the focus of the USAID was war rebuilding, specifically in Iraq and Afghanistan. The USAID provided both countries a chance for rebuilding the government, infrastructure, civil society and basic services, like health care and education. Developed countries like the United States have implemented specific strategies to promote democracy by aiding governments, political parties, and nongovernmental groups through different Foreign aid is defined under international relations as a donation or transfer of resources from one country to another. Aid can serve many functions, a sign of approval of a form of government, a donation to the military that is under conflict, reward the behavior of a government, or donation because of a natural disaster. The Department of State categorized foreign assistance into nine different sections, (a)economic development, (b)democracy, human rights and governance, (3) Humanitarian assistance (4) Health, (5) Program management, (6) multisector, (7) environment, (8) peace and security and finally (9) education and social services. Knack in his journal article "Does Foreign Promote Democracy" states that foreign aid can promote democracy by strengthening forms of government, provisions and an expectation of benefits when a nation lends out a loan and finally the improvement of education and the increase per capital income. The USAID over the past fifty years has shifted from financial assistance, to government and free market building and increase in basic human needs. Therefore, for the second part of the paper I

will be discussing the different ways the United States provides foreign assistance, (1) economic assistance, giving countries sums of money that will hope to improve a transitioning institution, (2) military assistance, providing countries weapons from an internal or external adversary channels.

a. Economic Assistance

The research done by scholars conclude that the GDP of the country, the amount of capital the UN uses, the involvement of other organizations can help determine the success or failure of a peacekeeping operation. Yes, these scholars have done great research in determining where peacekeeping operations are done and variable that can increase the chance of successful, but while they look at the economy country, research has not delved into the type each countries type of government.

The United States has given over 32 billion dollars in economic assistance to foreign nations, and of that amount, the USAID has used almost \$18 billion (<https://www.usaid.gov/>). The USAID is a government agency responsible for administering civilian foreign aid to different countries. The agency was first created by President John F. Kennedy through executive order, and most of the programs run through the USAID is authorized through the Foreign Assistance Act, which restructures U.S foreign assistance programs, separating the military from non-military aid. The purpose of global assistance is to provide economic development into those countries, with of course a capitalist system as the base. Although other incentives that economic assistance should provide is peace, security and development and humanitarian relief. According to the USAID the United States has donated at least \$25 billion to these countries, but the results with economic development, human rights, health, poverty, etc. have been dismal.\$5.1 billion to Haiti, \$1.7billion to Bosnia and at least because there is likely more 18 billion dollars to Iraq.

b. Military Assistance

There are alternative ways foreign assistance can be given, beginning with military assistance. The United States, since 2014 has given over \$10 billion in military assistance. Military aid can be distinguished in three different programs, foreign military financing, which is the use of U.S. defense military, services, and training. The goals for the FMF is to promote national security by either contributing to regional and global stability. Another goal of the FMF is to strengthen military support for democratically-elected governments and to contain terrorist's threats, which in the end will provide a closer relationship between U.S. and recipient nations. The second peacekeeping operations which fund support for non-U.N. operations and training when a nation is in crisis. The goals for the PKO's would be promoting the involvement of regional organizations during conflicts and have leverage support for multinational efforts during the crisis of a nation. The last program would be the International Military Education and Training program (IMET), self-explanatory, offers military training to foreign military officials. The goals for IMET would be to encourage defensive relationships, promote interoperability with U.S and coalition forces, and expose foreign civilian and military forces to democratic values, military professionalism and international norms of human rights (Mott, 2002). Multiple research has either concluded that aid has either decreased economic transition or have increased the chance of transition. Therefore, Professor Bermeo analyzes why aid will be successful or unsuccessful and concludes it is due to the characteristics of the donor.

c. Military Intervention

Military assistance usually includes offering weapons and other items to one's allies, but in some cases, the United States has taken upon themselves to intervene into countries for the protection of U.S national security and interest. Military intervention is the coordinated actions of

a state or non-state actor, and usually a response to a developing situation and can be combat or non-combat in nature. There are five types of military operations, theater, describing operations over a large area and there is a national commitment to the conflict. Campaign battle covers a more limited geographic and operational commitment. A battle is a section of a campaign that will have a specific military goal or objective and use of force. Engagement is describing a tactical combative event for a specific area and strike is a single attack on a specific target. Pickering and Kisangani research the political social and economic consequences of foreign military intervention and conclude that military interventions into non-democracies can democratize the states, there is economic growth and societies and governing structures are less affected (374). James Meernik in his articles “United States Military Intervention and the Promotion of Democracy” studies the success of military interventions and compares the effects on a country that has been intervened and a country that has not been. He concludes that there is the lower success of democracy promotion through military intervention where the country experiences an increase in democracy. Although, it seems he only compares countries that are already experiencing types of democracy.

The third part of the research paper I will be discussing the effects of United States foreign assistance and provide evidence as to why the system the United States has in place has not been giving countries similar success as compared to previous examples such as the Marshall Plan after the Second World War. Beginning, with Iraq, a country that has become integral in the United States Foreign Policy over the past thirty years with the rise of Saddam Hussein and after with the growth of the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, better known as Isis. Even with the millions of dollars poured into the country, there have been little signs of improvement regarding institution building, free market and fundamental human rights.

The next part of the paper I will be discussing and analyzing research done by other scholars on what determines success in foreign assistance and how the involvement of both the donor and the recipient are vital in the success rate. Nicholas Rost and J. Michael Grieg write in their text the, countries tend to rely on allies or other countries with similar ethical value instead of international organizations like the United Nations. This benefits the United States because aiding countries that are allies only enhances the support they have from the recipient country and the national interest and security of the United States. They came to four conclusions, first would be the state's interests, humanitarian emergency, costs and risks when deciding to intervene and finally and countries will most likely intervene when they know the greatest opportunity for success. Their research design consisted of focusing on the population of civil wars and every year they constructed a civil war dyad with the country the civil war is taken place and the states in the international system. (Rost and Grieg, 2011,179-80).

III. Determining the Successful United States Foreign Assistance

a. Economic Growth

As stated and described the USAID, one of the main goals for the United States is to ensure economic growth in the recipient countries, with a capitalist approach. Therefore, the stability of Iraq, Haiti and Bosnia and Herzegovina economies are factors that determine whether foreign assistance is helping improve a countries economy with growth, low inflation and increasing its involvement in the world economy as well. The four factors that contribute to economic growth are natural resources, investment in human capital, investment in physical capital and entrepreneurship. "Economic growth is measured by the increase in a country's total output or real Gross Domestic Product (GDP) or Gross National Product (GNP). The Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of a country is the total value of all final goods and services produced within a country over

a period” (2016). In his text, *Political Regimes and the Effects of Foreign and Economic Growth*, Muhammad N. Islam studies the relation between Economic Growth and Political Regimes and if foreign aid can be successful or not. According to Islam, on average assistance can have little to no impact on growth, but it varies by regime type. For example, in tinpot countries the likelihood of foreign aid be effective is slim, while in totalitarian countries aid is effective.

b. Government Stability

The difference between the United States and European view of democracy promotion can first be seen with how each viewed the revolution in Eastern Europe and the aftermath of post-communism in the 90’s. The United States regarded the situation as a bottom-up movement where society overthrew the communist, autocratic regimes. In this case, the United States assumed factors, such as people want a democratic transition, they will approve the leaders the citizens choose and that it is a bottom-up phenomenon, which turned out to be wrong (Kopstein, 86-88). There are two types of foreign aid conducts into other nations, economic assistance and military assistance. Although, before discussing whether aid or military assistance has helped a country transition into democracy and become economically stable and what factors can affect success, one must decipher, what are the characteristics of an effective transition to democracy?

One of the goals of the United States is for national security and interests to be kept intact, and a way for it to occur would be incorporate democratic institutions in countries that receive foreign assistance from them. Therefore, a variable in determining the success of United States foreign assistance is if the recipient country is experiencing the peaceful and thriving transition to democracy. Research provided by Danica Fink-Hafner and Mitja Hafner Fink determines what constituent a thriving democracy and development. According to these scholars and past research, a “successful transition to democracy” is used in cases “where the first peaceful transition change

in power based on democratic elections was formally followed by cycles of democratic elections” (1604). In their research, they have defined variables that are determinants to a successful transition, socioeconomic factors (wealth, ethnic structure, characteristics of civil society, transition), institutional choices (constitutional, electoral, proportional representation) and external factors (foreign support). (2009). Coincidentally the factors that determine a successful democracy also determine a successful foreign assistance program.

c. Human and Civil Rights

According to the Department of State, the protection of human rights has been a foundation stone since the establishment of the United States. One of the central goals for U.S. foreign policy has been promoting basic human rights that are stated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Examples of things that the United States seeks to accomplish include, holding governments accountable for obligations, promote greater respect for human rights. Examples of the latter include, freedom from torture, freedom of expression, freedom of the press, women’s rights and children’s rights. United States foreign policy also aims to promote the rule of law and have officials seek accountability for their actions.

Before analyzing the different countries, I will first talk about the situations that foreign assistance should produce in recipient countries. Economically, for there to be stability, there should be constant output with low and stable inflation. Over time, with a capitalist system there should be an increase in competitiveness, but during this time the government should contribute to the economic growth of the nation to provide entrepreneurial opportunities for all citizens. An important factor in having a stable economy is to have a stable system of governance because effective institutions ensure stability and effective job creating and supporting the private sector.

IV. Iraq, Bosnia, and Haiti

The next part of this research will consider both the history of why foreign assistance was needed and the recipient's relation to the United States. Secondly, one will consider the economic, social and political development of these countries and see if there has been any improvement. For my research, I will be using Mill's approach of difference, in other words comparing three countries do not have similar population, ethnicities, form of government and the only similarity is the reason for assistance, war or a natural disaster and received support from the United States.

The purpose of the three case studies is to provide examples of how United States foreign assistance does not offer permanent support and outcomes, instead only temporary because the United States is focused on its one national interest and security, and the economic assistance government provides through the USAID is to third party representatives instead to the direct government. When restructuring government, the United States is also in favor imposing government officials who are in the best interest and supportive of the United States, instead of the recipient country's citizens.

a. The United States and Iraq

Before the analysis of after of United States assistance, there also must be an overview of the relationship between the United States and Iraq and how the toxic and unstable relationship formed, beginning with the Eisenhower administration. During the Johnson administration, there was an improvement in diplomatic relations, but the result of the Six Day War Arab countries, including Iraq ended diplomatic relations, resulted in a few contacts between the countries until 1972. Allegations were made that the United States was involved in a failed coup attempt, involving a coalition of Iraqi factions, including Kurdish opponent Ba'ath Party, but the CIA and state department have denied the claims. Israeli and Iranian officials tried to persuade the Nixon administration that the March Accord was part of a Soviet plot to free Iraq's military for aggression

between Iran and Israel, but the United States refused. Relations between Iraq and United was strained forever with the Iran-Contra affair, which was when President Reagan and his administration in 1985 supplied weapons to Iran in hopes of releasing American hostages in Lebanon, otherwise known as the Iran Hostage Crisis. The Gulf War resulted in the United States and Iraq breaking off diplomatic relations once again from 1990-2003, until the overthrowing of Saddam Hussein in 2003 and the creation of an American-aligned government because of the belief of Iraq having weapons of mass destruction. At the time of the intervention the system of government in place in Iraq was an authoritarian dictatorship, and in 1970 Saddam Hussein came under control as the president and Revolutionary Command Council (RCC).

i. Intervention

Before beginning with the intervention, as described by the Department of State, there are different goals for foreign assistance in each era. During the Bush Administration, the main goals of foreign assistance were economic growth, democracy, conflict prevention, humanitarian assistance and global health (Tarnoff). The argument President George W. Bush and his administrations have in invading Iraq in 2003 were to disarm their weapons of mass destruction and further arguments of civil rights allegations against the Saddam regime and create a new democratic regime. "A liberated Iraq can show the power of freedom to transform that vital region, by bringing hope and progress into the lives of millions" (Dodge 243). Bush even stated the goal after retrieving the nuclear weapons, "The stated policy of the United States is regime change. ... However, if Saddam were to meet all the conditions of the United Nations, the conditions that I have described very clearly in terms that everybody can understand, that in itself will signal the regime has changed" (Dodge 243). Initially, there was high approval for the invasion of Iraq, not only because of recent event of September 11th but for the belief of a non-democratic country not

having weapons of mass destruction and the possibility announcing of having any nuclear weapons. According to Sovacool and Halfon, the United States concentrated on planning war in Iraq for nine months, but only devoted four weeks in reconstruction.

The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) had planned to spend over \$3.2 billion in 2004 on projects related to energy, infrastructure, power, water, sanitation, telephone communications, rehabilitation of the educational system, establish a healthcare system, agricultural development, and the construction of ports, bridges, airports and rails. The agency was The CBO (Congressional Budget Office) estimated that it would total \$1-\$4 billion a month and others even estimated the cost could be higher than a \$100 billion. By the end of 2005, the US Congress established a budget of \$18.4 billion on the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund, resulting in most of the projects to be cut or depleted. According to James Scott and Carle Steele in their journal article “Sponsoring Democracy,” there is a success in foreign aid but specifies that there is a higher chance of success when the aid packages are specific. About the reconstruction of Iraq, the USAID began with clear and specific goals, but after the budget they received was limited, they had to generalize their goals and programs. The Iraq War trickled into the Obama Administration, but the President had made a vow to decrease the number of U.S military soldiers in Iraq. After the withdrawal of U.S troops in 2011 there was still political instability, and in February 2011 there were increased protests in the Arab Springs but did not topple the government. At this point the Iraqi government there is still political instability, and many groups feel their rights are not respected (Socavol and Halfon, 2007).

b. Government Stability

President Bush goal when entering Iraq was to not only dismantle the present regime but also replace it with a new one. Toby Dodge quotes Bush in his article, “State and society in Iraq ten

years after regime change: the rise of a new authoritarianism,” “We will actively work to bring the hope of democracy, development, free markets, and free trade to every corner of the world” (243). Dodge also quotes Robert Dahl on how a new democracy can be termed successful with fair elections, voting rights, protection of human rights and the absence of the un-elected authorities affecting the new government (243).

Therefore, to have the free and fair election in Iraq the United States run Coalition Provisional Authority (CPA), had put in the foundations for the political system in Iraq by having regulations and restriction that limited the power of the state in hopes for democracy could succeed. National elections were held in early 2005 for an interim government where a new constitution was voted on and at the end of 2005 were full elections. Independent and international groups voted the election were free and fair in contrast to present Iraq. Dodge concludes that Iraq has succeeded in three of the four text, except for the establishment of basic human rights. Therefore, the question remains that even if Iraq as of 2013 passed three of the four tests, is it a success or does the inability for the country to have success in human rights affect (244). It is obvious the War on Iraq had a devastating effect on the state’s economy and now with the country now in the “rebuilding” process one must ask if the Iraqi economy improved or is in peril. The new constitution which now controls the economy, through the public sector which controls 69%, but also increasing the role of the private sector has been difficult because the state is creating an economy with a democracy with the totalitarian/authoritarian structure of the economy (Hussain, 2014).

As stated in the United State Agency of International Development, one of the main goals for United States foreign assistance is to promote and possible implement democratic institutions. Therefore, it is acceptable to assume that a successful and sustaining democracy is a factor proving

the success of foreign assistance. The United States since the invasion of Iraq, have tried to implement a democratic government/institution, but unfortunately, it has been unsuccessful for multiple reasons. Before discussing the failure of the United States to put a self-sustaining democracy one must first discuss the government itself and its institution. The federal government of Iraq is defined under the current Constitution as an Islamic, democratic, federal parliamentary republic. The federal government contains, executive, legislative, and judicial branches, as well as numerous independent commissions.

The Iraq government has been plagued by internal and external issues that are increasing problem with the already unstable government. Since the invasion, the United States of Iraq established a democratic system of government, but since then the government has gone through several stages. Since the United States believes in a bottom-up phenomenon, meaning that the people should begin revolutions and begin protests to have a stable democratic government. Although the United States does not realize that many people, especially those in the Middle East do not prefer democracies. The Coalition Provisional Authority (CPA) officially transferred sovereignty to an interim Iraq government. In the present the Iraqi government is Shia-led, but since they came into power after the invasion has been struggling to keep power. Since then the country has enjoyed only brief periods of respite from high levels of sectarian violence. The violence has affected the country from rebuilding the economy that has been going on because of conflict and sanctions.

c. Human Rights

One of the main goals of the United States when offering foreign assistance is to promote human and civil rights, but ever since the invasion of Iraq, the travesty that has occurred in Iraq has increased. Democratic and Economic instability and the rise of the Islamic State (ISIS) has

increased the failure of the human rights, possibly since the United States retreated from Iraq. An unstable government is in direct relation to human rights as well. The fractured government has drawn concerns to the rule of law and the ongoing concerns of justice with the lack of due process and free and fair trials. Although beginning in 2016, ISIS operations to regain Mosul displaced over 45,000 Iraqis. According to the United States Assistance Mission multiple airstrikes, explosions, gunfire, suicides had killed at least 9,153 Iraqis (hrw.org). The United Nations released a report from July to December of 2016 stating “that there was a minimum of 9,969 civilian casualties, including at least 4,143 persons killed and 5,826 wounded, because of the armed conflict, terrorism, and violence in Iraq” (11). Not only has there been violence from outside groups, but the UN also received reports the Iraqi government was committing violations against citizens, from the destruction of private property, kidnapping, and murder.

d. Economy

According to the Department of State, the manner of United States assistance towards Iraq has changed with a shift of large-scale infrastructure projects, to a focus on capacity building, long-term development, assistance to groups that are weak and vulnerable. Iraq has an abundance of natural resources, in fact, the country has a large abundance of natural gas and petroleum reserves, and having the second largest in the Middle East. Two-thirds of the Iraq economy is dependent and powered by oil production.

According to the Watson Institute at Brown University states that Congress since the War on Terror has given Iraq over \$61 billion, but a majority of assistance has been spent on military and security purposes and little of that money has been spending to improve Iraqi economic and social development. While this example pertains to Afghanistan, similar projects occur in Iraq as well. The Watson Institute provides an example of a power plant being installed. The USAID funded

over \$280 million a year for the installation of a power plant, equaling more than third of the government's tax revenues, but the power plant will only provide electricity to 2% of Afghans. Even when money is spent on economic and social development, there are only short-term projects that will be successful for a few years, such as new school buildings, teacher training, but what is the point of all these buildings if the source of the problem as not be solved. Even with the over \$61 billions of money given by the United States to Iraq, their economic development and growth that proves the worthiness of giving this substantial amount of money.

The economic system in Iraq depends on and is dominated by the oil sector and besides that 95% is depended on foreign exchange earnings. In present-day 20%-25% of Iraqi people (27m million) live below the poverty. According to article uploaded on Reuters, one in four Iraqi children live in poverty, and over 4 million need some assistance. The United Nations has verified there have been over 150 attacks on education facilities and 50 attacks on health centers since 2014.

d. The United States and Bosnia

Compared to Iraq, Bosnia and Herzegovina is a more liberal democracy and has several levels of political structuring, but unlike many countries B&H is split into two entities, the Serb Republic, which covers 49% of the territory and the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, covering 51%. The Bosnian War was an internal conflict between 1992-1995, after the separation from Yugoslavia in 1991. After the Slovenian and Croatian secession, the Socialist Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina passed a referendum for independence 1992 which was recognized internationally. To give context, the population of the country included most Muslim Bosnia's (44%), Orthodox Serbs (32.5) and Catholic Croats (17%). The Bosnian War began because the Serbians and Croatians living in Bosnia wanted to annex territory for their people respectively.

Besides the ethnic tension between the main three ethnic groups, other factors included the Nationalist leader of Serbia Slobodan Milosevic was pushing for a “Greater Serbia”, leading the Croats and Muslims to Bosnian independence in fear of acquisition of their own land. With the cofounder of the Serb Democratic and the President of the Republic of Serbia, Radovan Karadzic, Milosevic, and Bosnian Serbs began a “cleansing” in large areas of Bosnia where non-Serbians resided. On April 6th, 1992, the Serbs began their conquest towards Sarajevo and those who were against the siege (Muslim, Croat and Serb residents were cut off from food, water, and utilities. For the next three years’ food was scarce, and more than 12,000 residents from Sarajevo were killed. During this time entire village was destroyed and thousands of Bosnians were forced to move to detention camps where they were raped, tortured, starved and killed. First international involvement came from NATO in 1992 whose goal was to the establish long-term peace during and after the Bosnian War. There was a deployment of United Nations peacekeepers, and NATO assisted the UN in monitoring compliance with the Sanctions established under UN security council resolutions 713 and 757. Between 1992-1993

United States’ and Bosnia’s relationship began after 1992 when the country separated from Yugoslavia. Over the following years, Bosnia and Herzegovina experienced conflict within their people, from the Bosnian Muslims to the Croatians and Serbians. Although the conflict ended in 1995 with the United States participating in the creation of the 1995 Dayton Peace Agreement. Since the United States has been involved in maintaining the peace agreement and donates millions of dollars in supporting the countries reconstruction, humanitarian assistance, economic development and military reconstruction (state.gov). According to the Institute for Stabilization and Transition, the country has been experiencing, A Political, economic and humane turmoil that

is in remembrance of the war in the 1990's. Political and economic dysfunction and fading European and American interest the future of the country is bleak.

i. Economic Stability

The purpose of United States assistance is to provide the county with the opportunity to be a presence in the European and Euro-Atlantic institutions, strengthen their multiethnic democratic institutions and increase the prosperity of foreign investors. The amount of money given by the central government to Bosnia and Herzegovina is unclear, but the range is between the World Bank target of \$5 billion and \$15 billion. Either way with that amount of money there should have been an improvement in Bosnia's overall stability, from morally to financially. The United States provided Bosnia with some assistance in promoting tolerance and acceptance and supported marginalized and vulnerable groups. Economically they created 600 loans worth over \$162 million to help rebuild businesses and 312 of the guaranteed loans provided over 5.400 local jobs for the Bosnian people. Since the war and support from the United States, the country has become a bicameral legislature with a three-member presidency representing the different ethnic groups as stated above. Since the foreign aid donations, Bosnia has created a large private sector and limited wealth creation with high social spending only benefiting the wealthy. The overall economy is based on consumption rather than production, which means instead of exporting their goods, they are importing from other countries. Although with all the help and support from the United States the economy recently has not seen its benefits. During the height of United States assistance in 1995 Bosnia and Herzegovina's GDP growth was an annual 20.8%, but as of 2016, it went down to 3.056%. Therefore, Bosnia has experienced a gradual but drop in annual GDP growth over the past 20 years.

Since the end of the war the economic and social development is not where it should be, economically the country is very much dependent on the private sector with a limited creation of private wealth. Public expenditures amount up to nearly half of the GDP and with state-owned businesses and corruption are added in the public sector amounts up to nearly 70% of the Gross Domestic Product. Although even though there is a lot of public spending, it not helping the poor as it should, because these public institutions are helping the wealthy as much as and maybe even more than the poor. In general, the Bosnian economy is based on consumption rather than production, meaning that most of revenue and products come in from importing countries rather than exporting. During the post-war recovery period, the country did not create any foundational systems for economic growth. During the recent aftermath the countries financial inflow was because of foreign assistance by the United States and international organizations resulting in an average of 20% of the GDP, and in the present, the consumption rate remains at over 100 %. With the public-sector accounting for 70% of the GDP, the export sector accounts for the other 30%, one of the lowest in Europe and is an account for the countries weak competitiveness, because of a poor business climate, the high cost of employment.

These imbalances have resulted in the country splitting into a small productive population with many of the citizens living off money transfers from the government or relatives. A majority of the population live off informal activities, remittances and social welfare with only a 1/3 of the population have a job and 1/4 being formal. Ironically during a time where agricultural jobs are decreasing around the world, in Bosnia, it is the one job that remains the best option for many Bosnians who do not have a job and cannot afford live in the city. Haiti has an agricultural economy where most of its exports depend on bananas, cocoa, and mangoes. Manufacturing wise, the country has also moved.

ii. Government Stability

In the past couple of years, the country has attempted to enter the European Union, and it would have been a historical landmark, but the anti-constitutional referendum from one Bosnia and Herzegovina's two political institutions brought down what would have been an uplifting event. The Republic of Serbia introduced a referendum to impose "Day of the Republic of Serbia," but the day as stated by Senior European officials, publically stated its unconstitutionality because it imposes a discriminatory nature towards the Croats and Bosnians in the country. In the Dayton Accords, signed in 1995 with the support from the United States, the decisions made are final and binding, therefore imposing this national day "a drastic violation of the Accords, the demolition of the rule of law and a threat to the stability and survival of the state, but also seen as a possible rehearsal for a future referendum RS's secession" (2017). Milorad Dodik, the President of The Republic of Serbia, disregarding the statements made by senior European officials and imposing laws blatantly disregarding the Dayton Accords, delegitimizes state institutions and the central government.

iii. Human Rights

Due to multiple ethnic groups within the country, there have been enormous amounts of ethnic and religious discrimination. At this point, the constitution requires political candidates to be from three ethnic groups, Bosnian, Serbs, and Croats, meaning they exclude Jews, Roma and other minorities. The European Court of Human Rights ruled that in 2016 the arrangement in the constitution violated the European Convention on Human Rights. Other forms of discrimination and violations of human rights, according to the Ministry for Human Rights and Refugees, the number of displaced persons at the end of 2015 was 98,324.

Besides, displaced persons and others, journalists continue to face threats and intimidation, in the first nine months of 2016 the national journalist's association registered 40 cases of violation of media freedom and including, physical attacks, two death threats, 6 cases of pressure, 3 cases of defamation and cases of verbal threats. There has also been acts of sexual orientation and gender identity, the Sarajevo Open Centre the lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender rights organization documented 23 cases of hate speech and incitement to violence. The reaction to incident authorities is inadequate. Beginning of 2014 there was no progress in police investigations, attacked a film festival that Sarajevo Open Centre organized.

V. The United States and Haiti

Iraq has an authoritarian government, Bosnia and Herzegovina is a liberal democracy with limitations while Haiti governmental system is semi-presidential. The United States and Haiti have had a donor-recipient relationship for quite some time now, but in the case, for my research, we will be analyzing the assistance after the 2010 earthquake. Similar to Iraq and Bosnia and Herzegovina the reason why Haiti is an interest for the United States is that of its location, state of violence, instability affecting the region, etc. It consists of a multiparty system where the President of Haiti is head of the state, chosen directly from popular elections. The prime minister acts as the head of the government and is chosen by the president and a majority party in the National Assembly. The economic system in Haiti has based off a free market economy with tariff-free access to the United States, its major trading partner in many of its exports and low labor costs. Unlike Iraq and Bosnia and Herzegovina did not aid in rebuilding the government, but they did provide a significant amount of economic assistance which can be a factor in a stable democracy and human rights. Similar to Iraq and Bosnia and Herzegovina, the United States provided

significant assistance, but it neither long-term, organizing and providing sufficient support for the Haitian citizens.

i. Economic Stability

Unlike Iraq and Bosnia, economic assistance from form the United States began mostly because of the earthquake in 2010. The relationship between the United States and Haiti began decades ago. Due to the earthquake, the United States has given over \$5.1 billion to Haiti to support life disaster relief temporarily and long-term recovery as well as reconstruction and development programs. Even though Bosnia and Herzegovina and Iraq were not either first world countries or world powers before their wars and the United States Assistance, there was economic growth and development. Haiti on the other hand was and still is even after the billions of dollars poured into by the United States is still a developing country. Although it would seem unfair to put all the blame on the lack of efficient U.S. foreign assistance, it is legitimate to criticize the fact that after assistance, specifically economically there was no improvement.

Trade is significant for the Haitian economy to stay afloat, the combined value of exports and imports equal to 72% of the GDP. The government openness to foreign investment is below average. The Haitian government's openness to foreign investment is below average, and the small undeveloped financial sector does not support the private sector. Most financial transactions are handled informally, and credit new entrepreneurs are constrained.

According to the Department of State, United States has created over 13,000 jobs, especially in the apparel industry at the Caracol Industrial Park. The park is associated with the Inter-American Development Bank, the Haitian government, and the private sector. The United States government has also funded the construction of power plant in Northern Haiti which provides 24/7 assistance to the Caracol Industrial Park and the present it has provided electricity to 11,000 households.

Although this is helpful, in comparisons there are 10.85 million people living Haiti and when comparing to the number of households the plant electricity output is minimal.

ii. Government Stability

Presently the government in place in Haiti is a semi-presidential republic where the President serves the head of state and the Prime Minister the head of government. The President is appointed by the public, and then the Prime Minister is appointed by the President, and they hold executive power together. The rest of the government is divided into three branches, legislative, executive and judicial. The judicial system performs poorly due to old penal and criminal procedures, lack of judicial oversight and widespread corruption. In recent years, the Haitian government has improved but remains fragile due to period position vacancies from the prime minister to cabinet positions. In 2017 because of the government's instability prevented Haiti from resolving basic needs for their citizens. Only after a year of political gridlock was when President Jovenel Moise was elected.

iii. Human Rights, etc.

The United States committed over \$5 billion to Haiti after the earthquake, and with donations, the number only increases. Five years since the earthquake over 85,000 people still live in displacement camps which are plagued with deplorable conditions and diseases. To give context over 1.5 million people were displaced after the earthquake, but of that 95% many of them do not have permanent housing, and at least 200,000 Haitians live in the hillside slums, also known as Canaan-Jerusalem. One might ask that There is a disconnect between the private and public aid in how to increase humanitarian support in preventing disease outbreaks, etc. Once again bringing about the relationship between the donors and recipients, Jake Johnson of the Center for Economic Policy and Research states, “You have donors disburse money, but that doesn't mean all that money

is spent on the ground. If the expectation was to build back better and transform Haiti's public sector, then yes, by any measure it's been a failure" (2017).

One of those failures includes the housing programs; a government audit found that the USAID underestimated how much money would be needed for settlements and moved the budget from \$59 million to \$97 million. With the increasing budget, they also cut the goal of 15,000 homes to only 2,649 (2015). A quote from Haitian resident Jean-Louis Wilner who states, "I'm worse off than after the earthquake" (2015).

VI. Conclusion and Recommendations

Author of *The Big Truck that Went By How the World Came to Save Haiti and Left Behind a Disaster*, states that while aid may have good intentions, unfortunately, there are bad sets of policies, with only short-term fixes. Essentially my research points to the fact that while intentions may be real in wanting to implement a democratic government because it gives a voice to the people and offering an economic assistance to improve a country's economy, but as the United States has done many times, the policies and programs are short-term fixes to long-term problems. The point of my research is not to conclude that the United States should stop foreign assistance, because that would not only be immoral and unethical but eliminate an essential fabric in our foreign policy and the United States own character has the number country in the world. Although, the point of my research is to offer the consequences of the United States while aiding, essentially acting in the country's own national interest and security. Even with the assistance, unfortunately, it does not offer direct assistance to Iraq, Bosnia and Herzegovina's government, economy and people. While it is vital, there are consequences that recipient countries are not facing the effects.

In comparing all the case studies, United States past relations with other countries affect how the U.S deals with conflicts and pursue it in a different direction. One then questions could it be a

result of the time relations and the power United States and viewpoint of the country affect how the United States deal with other country's relations. One, the United States and Iraq did not have the best relationship, the U.S did poor in countless of money, granted one can argue that the war and Iraq's transition to democracy were a failure. Two, it is important for the United States that democratic institutions succeed, but in many cases, democratic institutions are not what the people want, and instead of initiating a democratic system of government, it seems forced. One must also evaluate other factors that possibly have resulted from either military intervention or foreign aid, which has to do with the fact that the terror attacks on September 11th had a big effect as to why the United States decided to intervene militarily because there believed there was a threat to the country's national security. Although one thing is clear, the relationship between countries affects if a state would want to intervene militarily.

In the case of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Haiti, a big factor as to why many of the programs and foreign aid did not work is because they underestimated the amount of money that was needed, resulting in a reduction in plans to rebuild. Also, many of the plans that were enacted were only temporary and not permanent solutions to a long-term problem. Economically both countries are dependent on exports and imports and support from their allies, which is something that the United States does not support and a factor that reverses economic growth. Democratically both systems of government are not stable and in fact are or once was on the verge of unraveling. The unstable governments do not help the humanitarian efforts that need to be fixed, such as discrimination of certain ethnic groups in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the poverty in Haiti.

Therefore, my recommendation does not include stopping and stalling foreign aid, but in fact, create programs that are long-term that does not include a dependency on the United States. In fact, the programs that are in place which are only temporary, but require dependency from the

United States because they only work for a short period. Concluding, it is important for the United States to have interests in their national security when providing foreign assistance, but as the cases of Iraq, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Iraq show, that problems are still in place because the problems the U.S creates are only temporary, creates more problems, requiring the United States to provide more assistance, therefore, more money and time. Constantly providing money, time and volunteers only affects the United States national interest and security.

References

- Bräutigam, Deborah A., and Stephen Knack. "Foreign aid, institutions, and governance in sub-Saharan Africa." *Economic development and cultural change* 52.2 (2004): 255-285.
- Bermeo, Sarah Blodgett. "Foreign aid and regime change: a role for donor intent." *World Development*, vol. 39, no. 11, 2011, pp. 2021-2031.
- Berrebi, Claude, and Véronique Thelen. "Dilemmas of Foreign Aid in Post-Conflict Areas." *Dilemmas of Intervention* (2011): 291.
- Boone, Peter. "Politics and the effectiveness of foreign aid." *European economic review* 40.2 (1996): 289-329.
- Bourguignon, François, and Mark Sundberg. "Aid effectiveness—opening the black box." *American economic review* 97.2 (2007): 316-321.
- “Challenges Can Derail Bosnia and Herzegovina from Path of Stability, Security Council Told | UN News.” *United Nations*, United Nations, news.un.org/en/story/2017/05/557642-challenges-can-derail-bosnia-and-herzegovina-path-stability-security-council.
- Dodge, Toby. "State and society in Iraq ten years after regime change: the rise of a new authoritarianism." *International Affairs* 89.2 (2013): 241-257.
- Dollar, David, and Victoria Levin. "The increasing selectivity of foreign aid, 1984–2003." *World development* 34.12 (2006): 2034-2046.
- Fink-Hafner, Danica, and Mitja Hafner-Fink. “The Determinants of the Success of Transitions to

- Democracy.” *Europe-Asia Studies*, vol. 61, no. 9, 2009, pp. 1603–1625.
- “Haiti.” *World Bank*, www.worldbank.org/en/country/haiti.
- “Home.” *Iraqi Research Foundation for Analysis and Development*, www.irfad.org/iraq-gov.
- “United States and Iraq Establish Principles for Future Relationship, Agree to Negotiate Implementing Agreements During 2008.” *The American Journal of International Law*, vol. 102, no. 1, 2008, pp. 155–158.
- “Iraq.” *World Bank*, www.worldbank.org/en/country/iraq.
- Islam, Mohammad Nazrul. "Political regimes and the effects of foreign aid on economic growth." *The Journal of Developing Areas* 37.1 (2003): 35-53.
- Meernik, James. "United States military intervention and the promotion of democracy." *Journal of Peace Research* 33.4 (1996): 391-402.
- Morgenthau, Hans. "A political theory of foreign aid." *American Political Science Review* 56.2 (1962): 301-309.
- “Opening Up Old Wounds - Political Instability in Bosnia and Herzegovina.” *MIR*, 12 Nov. 2016.
- Pickering, Jeffrey, and Emizet F. Kisangani. "Political, economic, and social consequences of foreign military intervention." *Political Research Quarterly* 59.3 (2006): 363-376.
- Rinke, Andreas. “No Time for Golf as Merkel Braces for Tough Talks with Trump.” *Reuters*, Thomson Reuters, 20 Apr. 2018.
- U.S. Department of State*, U.S. Department of State, www.state.gov/f/budget/.
- U.S. Department of State*, U.S. Department of State, www.state.gov/j/drl/hr.
- Scott, James M., and Carie A. Steele. “Sponsoring Democracy: The United States and Democracy Aid to the Developing World, 1988—2001.” *International Studies Quarterly*, vol. 55, no.

1, 2011, pp. 47–69.

Sobel, Richard. "Trends: United States Intervention in Bosnia." *The Public Opinion Quarterly* 62.2 (1998): 250-278.

Sovacool, Benjamin, and Saul Halfon. "Reconstructing Iraq: Merging Discourses of Security and Development." *Review of International Studies*, vol. 33, no. 2, 2007, pp. 223–243.

Tarnoff, Curt, and Larry Nowels. *Foreign Aid: An Introductory Overview of US Programs and Policy*. United States Congressional Research Service. Library of Congress, 2004.

U.S. Department of State, U.S. Department of State, www.state.gov/f/budget/.

U.S. Department of State, U.S. Department of State, www.state.gov/j/drl/hr.

Winters, Matthew S. "Accountability, Participation and Foreign Aid Effectiveness." *International Studies Review*, vol. 12, no. 2, 2010, pp. 218–243.

"What Does Haiti Have to Show for \$13 Billion in Earthquake Aid?" *NBCNews.com*, NBCUniversal News Group.

"World Report 2017: Rights Trends in Iraq." *Human Rights Watch*, 12 Jan. 2017.