

Sumil Shah

AP Language and Composition

Dr. Gingrich

25 February 2019

Preserve Foreign Aid to Save the World

What do most people consider as a valuable asset to the United States? Well, to answer this question, we must consider what people think is valuable. Most people believe our right to open carry a weapon and our massive military capability is valuable, however for something to be considered valuable, it has to have a wide range of positive impacts. So what does the United States have that the rest of the world does not possess? When one thinks of the United States economy, they picture the [American Dream](#) and the monetary investment to countries around the world. The United States of America, the largest economy in the world, has the capability for world peace and world domination, but they *try* to limit themselves to world peace since they are based on the principles of democracy. They can achieve this through [foreign aid](#): the international transfer of capital, goods, or services from a country or international organization for the benefit of the recipient country or its population. As more issues are arising, it comes down to whether the United States, one of the most [significant](#) foreign aid contributors, should continue to provide philanthropic support to the [staggering](#) 93 million people who depend on foreign aid. The United States should continue to proceed with its foreign aid policy because it allows developing countries to resolve their financial, military, and political crises. It also allows the United States economy and its social groups to prosper.

To begin with, we need to consider the [3 billion](#) people in the world that are facing poverty and unemployment. By continuing to provide foreign aid to developing countries, we will be able to provide food and supplies to people who cannot afford it. Currently, there are over 233 million men, women, and children in Africa who are impoverished and face poverty. Many of these people depend on US foreign aid to survive since they have no other alternatives. Africa's dependency means that if the United States were to cut back on giving 40 percent of our federal aid budget to countries in Africa, [2:10,000](#) children would perish daily. Millions of families have trouble putting food on the table, but by providing foreign aid, we will become one step closer to making a family dinner enjoyable again. For developing countries in Africa, this issue is a matter of life or death. Since the United States created government reforms that have been around since the Great Depression Era, we have been able to make sure that most of our citizens get the proper nutrients and care they need to continue to build their life. The United States contribution of foreign aid not only creates long-term prosperous developments in developing countries but also strengthens and grows the US economy since it will allow them to promote American exportation. If Americans strive for "freedom and justice for all," we must continue to aid foreign countries so that everyone has an equal chance to fulfill the life they were destined for.

The US involvement in providing foreign aid is fundamental because it will make the world safer. With [33%](#) of US foreign aid going to military and security issues, there is no doubt that the world has seen a decrease in violence and crime. The United States has provided nations with armaments, proper training, and funding for peacekeeping missions, which is a small cost to pay to help billions of people around the globe. By continuing to aid countries, the United States

will be seen as a god-like entity: It behaves like a god by helping one with issues they are facing. Furthermore, this will allow the United States to strive for what they want to gain. When most countries lend a hand to foreign entities, they usually do it in hopes of gaining something in return. For example, the United States provided South Korea with ballistic missile launchers to show signs of friendship which lead to another foreign ally in case war struck out against North Korea. In the long term, the United States will be able to further strengthen its ties between allies just by conducting aid.

The continual role of the United States in foreign aid will help combat political crises. According to the [Truman Doctrine](#), US foreign aid was a way to keep countries away from communism and radicalized impressment. This act was passed on February 21, 1947, and the United States promised to support any of their allies under threat from external or internal authoritarian forces. With this, the United States supported nations who were threatened by Soviet Communism. As a result of the aid given by the United States, more countries looked towards the principles of democracy instead of communism. This meant that the US would have more world leaders to negotiate with and conduct business.

Despite the ubiquitous benefits that can stem from providing foreign aid, critics claim that we should put less of our funds toward foreign assistance since there is no evidence of this helping poor. They also enumerate that we have many issues that need to be resolved at home. Under President Donald Trump and his new administration, they believe that foreign aid is not worth the [50 billion dollars](#) we spend annually because it does nothing to protect or help our nation's security or economy. They say that these funds should be put to use towards the American people. If this is the case, then approximately every 325 million Americans would

receive 154 dollars to protect themselves. Also, those who argue against foreign aid say that it hurts people in poor countries because the corruption in developing countries slows down growth. However, this would be unnecessary with the US involvement in foreign aid. An astute reader would ask the following: “To what extent are we helping to resolve the issues in our own country?” Likewise, this answer is quite straightforward: The progression achieved in the United States involved in foreign aid has led to less racial tensions arising and a boost in an economical drive. In reality, US involvement in foreign aid has allowed the United States to counter violent extremism in its own country. Recently in 2019, the United States claimed that Juan Guaidó would be the standing president of Venezuela in times on economic and political despair. As a result of this, there have been fewer immigrants applying for travel visas because they were convinced that the crisis would end shortly. This shows how the US involvement in foreign aid will reduce the racial tensions back at home because fewer immigrants are coming into the United States. Due to the slightly smaller percentage of immigrants entering the country, more jobs have been secured for Americans who are hoping to achieve the American Dream and make a proper life without an immense economic burden. Although there is corruption in poor countries, the United States has taken [precautions](#) to prevent this. Since 2000, researchers and policymakers assess the impact of these programs. Due to the new evaluation policy to limit corruption, many positive outcomes were found. This method is now used to determine how much a country will now get in foreign aid funds. As a result of studies which were shown in the [Bill Gates Blog](#), a blog under the supervision of the Bill Gates, a wealthy philanthropic donor, has confirmed the direct correlation between foreign aid and benefits. Bill Gates, who has been trusted by large companies such as Microsoft More Americans are being directly connected with

new suppliers and consumers; as a result, there is a growing economy in the United States. The continual support of the United States in foreign aid is fundamental because it benefits the United States in ways which we would not expect.

Every country has something that distinguishes them from the rest of the world; in the United States, it is our contribution to foreign aid. United States should continue to proceed with its foreign aid because it not only allows countries outside of North America to resolve their malnourishment, military, and political crisis but it also allows the United States to get what they want, while massively benefiting the US economy and community. Not only would this create world peace and friendliness, but it would also provide the United States with what they are trying to achieve. The world we live in today is rapidly evolving, and more issues are coming to the surface. We need to come together as privileged American citizens to bring us one step closer to reveal the benefits that are products of foreign aid. We, the United States, a country based on the principles of democracy, need to lobby for more of our budget to go towards foreign assistance because it is a would be a sin if we did not care for others who are on the brink of death. We need to conjoin together with our fellow citizens and convince our congressional district leader to advocate for more money to be spent on foreign aid. As the greatest nation on this planet, we should not hesitate to ponder about this simple question. If we aim to provide everyone with the equal treatment they deserve, we must aid countries to ensure that the future is in good hands. Together we must rise, together we must stand up for what we believe in and together we must continue the US involvement in foreign aid.

Mentor Texts

Editorial 1:

The first writer whose style I have incorporated into my editorial is Gardiner Harris. The article from the New York Times called [*U.S., Supporting Mexico's Plan, Will Invest \\$5.8 Billion in Central America*](#) provides a well-developed argument about how to end poverty and other disastrous issues in Central America. There are many strategies Gardiner Harris used which was integral to my editorial on foreign aid. The main argumentative strategy that struck me was his use of statistical evidence to show the vast amount of funds needed to fulfill Mexico's and the United State's promise to reduce the rate of poverty and violence. For example, in the third paragraph of his editorial, he shows that these administrations will fulfill their pledge by "committing \$5.8 billion in private and public investments" (Harris). This indicates that the author backed up his thesis using reliable sources which the audience could further look into if necessary.

I was also influenced by the simplicity of Gardiner Harris analysis and claim. For instance when he mentioned how they were going to raise the money to resolve their cause, he clearly said that it would come from the taxpayers and would be used "solely for ending the poverty, violence, and drug trafficking that are driving thousands of people in the region to undertake the difficult trek to the United States" (Harris). Overall, the straightforward use of argumentative strategies, especially logos, played a significant role in the creation of my editorial.

Editorial 2:

The second article which contributed to the creation of my editorial was called [Senate Votes to End Aid for Yemen Fight Over Khashoggi Killing and Saudis' War Aims](#) and it was published by the New York Times. Although the main authors of this editorial were Julie Hirschfeld Davis and Eric Schmitt, Gardiner Harris was a major contributor in the making of this. This editorial strictly covered the congressional hearing of ending aid to Yemen. By utilizing this editorial, Gardiner Harris syntax was derived into my editorial to provide concise and clear written communication. For example, the author of *Senate Votes to End Aid for Yemen Fight Over Khashoggi Killing and Saudis' War Aims* changes up the sentence structure to change the reader's mood through word choice. In the editorial, Gardener says that “Today, we [will] tell the despotic regime in Saudi Arabia that we will not be part of their military adventurism.” This produces the mood of courage because it shows that the United States will stand up against the wrongdoings of Saudi Arabia. In *Preserve Foreign Aid to Save the World*, I used varied my sentence structure to change the mood of the reader and provide a call to action for the audience to take action on. Due to the use of parallel syntax in my editorial, I was able to change my reader's mood.

The author also organized the structure of the article by the different arguments he was making to show the Senate's decision to end foreign aid. Within the precise structure of the editorial, the reader would be able to understand the flow and logic of the author's claim. Also, the author used logos to appeal to the audience with reason rather than emotion. By incorporating

the style of Gardiner Harris into my editorial, I was able to make my argument more convincing to the point where the reader would want to side with me and ultimately take action.