

UDC 327.73.477

DOI [https://doi.org/10.32689/2523-4625-2024-2\(74\)-14](https://doi.org/10.32689/2523-4625-2024-2(74)-14)

Vladyslav FARAPONOV

Head of the Board, «Institute of American Studies»

ORCID: 0009-0006-0418-7855

AMERICAN FOREIGN AID AS A COMPONENT OF US FOREIGN POLICY SINCE 1945

The article explores the role of American foreign aid as a critical component of U.S. foreign policy since 1945. The debate surrounding U.S. foreign aid has intensified in recent years, particularly in light of the Russia-Ukraine war in 2022 and the attacks on Israel in 2023. These debates often neglect the foundational theories of international relations, such as realism, which argue that donor countries prioritize their strategic interests over the needs of recipient nations. A significant gap in quantitative research addressing these assumptions leads to politicized discussions in donor-recipient negotiations. The existing literature on U.S. foreign aid predominantly highlights the Marshall Plan's success, often attributing it to the United States' role in global development. However, aid priorities have shifted, reflecting domestic policy changes and the political landscape. For instance, the Carter administration emphasized human rights, while the Reagan administration focused on promoting democracy. Despite these overarching trends, the impact of the party controlling the White House and Congress on aid allocation remains underexplored. Additionally, there is a notable gap in the literature concerning the nature and institutional mechanisms through which U.S. aid is administered, mainly how these structures influence aid's effectiveness and strategic orientation. This article analyzes the U.S. aid allocation system through the lens of American foreign policy concepts. It seeks to address the gap in the literature regarding the specific impact of donor strategic interests and the democratic status of recipient countries on U.S. foreign aid policies. The study also examines U.S. foreign aid's historical transitions and contemporary implications, especially in the post-9/11 era. The research reveals that U.S. foreign aid has consistently aligned with national interests, promoting democracy, economic growth, and maintaining a favorable global order. The study emphasizes the significant role of security assistance, which accounts for a substantial part of U.S. foreign aid budgets, and the strategic imperative to support both friendly and unfriendly regimes during the Cold War. The institutionalization of U.S. foreign aid has led to a perception among recipient states that such aid is a reliable and symbolic gesture of support. The study underscores the complexity of U.S. foreign aid policies and their profound implications for global diplomacy. It advocates for more comprehensive research to understand the long-term effects of U.S. foreign aid on recipient countries, particularly concerning economic development, democratization, and political stability. Future research should also explore the role of non-state actors and international organizations in shaping U.S. foreign aid policies and incorporate quantitative analyses to test assumptions about the strategic interests behind aid distribution. Additionally, further studies should focus on U.S. aid's nature and institutional mechanisms, providing a deeper understanding of how these structures impact policy outcomes and international relations.

Key words: *United States, American foreign aid, U.S. foreign policy, strategic interests, democratization, international relations, security assistance, Marshall Plan, Cold War, humanitarian aid, donor-recipient negotiations.*

Владислав Фарапонов. АМЕРИКАНСЬКА ЗОВНІШНЯ ДОПОМОГА ЯК КОМПОНЕНТ ЗОВНІШНЬОЇ ПОЛІТИКИ США З 1945 РОКУ

Стаття досліджує роль американської зовнішньої допомоги як важливого компонента зовнішньої політики США з 1945 року. Дебати навколо американської зовнішньої допомоги останнім часом загострилися, особливо у світлі війни між Росією та Україною у 2022 році та атак на Ізраїль у 2023 році. Часто ці дебати не враховують основоположні теорії міжнародних відносин, такі як реалізм, які стверджують, що країни-донори в першу чергу переслідують свої стратегічні інтереси, а не потреби отримувачів допомоги. Існує значний брак кількісних досліджень, які б перевірили ці припущення, що призводить до політизованих дискусій у переговорах між донорами та отримувачами. Існуюча література про американську зовнішню допомогу переважно висвітлює успіхи плану Маршалла, часто приписуючи йому роль Сполучених Штатів у глобальному розвитку. Проте, пріоритети допомоги змінювалися з часом, відображаючи зміни у внутрішній політиці та політичному ландшафті. Наприклад, адміністрація Картера робила акцент на дотриманні прав людини, тоді як адміністрація Рейгана зосереджувалася на глобальному просуванні демократії. Незважаючи на ці загальні тенденції, вплив партії, яка контролює Білий дім і Конгрес, на розподіл допомоги залишається недостатньо дослідженим. Крім того, у літературі існує значний пробіл щодо природи та інституційних механізмів, через які здійснюється допомога США, і того, як ці структури впливають на ефективність і стратегічну спрямованість допомоги. Ця стаття має на меті проаналізувати систему розподілу допомоги США через призму концепцій зовнішньої політики США. Вона прагне заповнити прогалину в літературі щодо впливу стратегічних інтересів донора та демократичного статусу країни-отримувача на політику зовнішньої допомоги США. Дослідження також розглядає історичні переходи та сучасні наслідки зовнішньої допомоги США, особливо в контексті періоду після подій 9/11. Стаття показує, що зовнішня допомога США постійно узгоджується з національними інтересами, такими як просування демократії, економічного зростання та підтримання сприятливого світового порядку. У статті підкреслюється значна роль допомоги у сфері безпеки, яка становить суттєву частину бюджетів

зовнішньої допомоги США, та стратегічна необхідність підтримки як дружніх, так і недружніх режимів під час холодної війни. Інституціоналізація зовнішньої допомоги США призвела до сприйняття серед країн-отримувачів цієї допомоги як надійного та символічного жесту підтримки. Дослідження підкреслює складність політики зовнішньої допомоги США та її глибокі наслідки для глобальної дипломатії. Воно закликає до більш всебічного дослідження для розуміння довгострокових наслідків зовнішньої допомоги США для країн-отримувачів, особливо щодо економічного розвитку, демократизації та політичної стабільності. Майбутні дослідження також повинні дослідити роль недержавних акторів та міжнародних організацій у формуванні політики зовнішньої допомоги США та включати кількісні аналізи для перевірки припущень про стратегічні інтереси, що стоять за розподілом допомоги. Крім того, подальші дослідження повинні зосередитися на природі та інституційних механізмах допомоги США, надаючи глибше розуміння того, як ці структури впливають на результати політики та міжнародні відносини.

Ключові слова: США, американська зовнішня допомога, зовнішня політика США, стратегічні інтереси, демократизація, міжнародні відносини, допомога у сфері безпеки, план Маршалла, Холодна війна, гуманітарна допомога, переговори між донорами та реципієнтами

Problem statement. There is great debate in the American public and establishment about whether the U.S. should provide substantial foreign aid to other countries. This debate has intensified after the outbreak of the Russia-Ukraine war in 2022 and the devastating attacks on Israel in 2023. However, these debates do not always consider the implications of international relations theories that influenced the genesis of U.S. foreign aid as it is known today. Many researchers highlight realism, a significant international politics theory, suggesting that donors primarily pursue their strategic interests rather than addressing recipients' needs. There is a significant lack of quantitative research to test these assumptions. Consequently, such scientific discussions often turn into political discourse in donor-recipient negotiations. Typically, the opposition party in the United States argues that the donor state is not obligated to support a recipient state in need.

Analysis of Research and Publications. Most literature on U.S. foreign aid concentrates on the successes of the Marshall Plan, assuming it has been the key reason for the United States contribution to developing foreign states. Another portion of existing literature shows that U.S. aid priorities shift with changes in domestic discussions on foreign policy, especially regarding democracy promotion and the internal politics of recipient countries. For example, during the Carter administration (1977–1981), there was a focus on human rights compliance among aid recipients. In contrast, the Reagan administration (1981–1989) emphasized promoting democracy globally and supported transitions from autocracy towards democracy [3].

Further scholarly work highlights the evolving focus on the democratic nature of aid recipients, culminating in the 1990s. Despite these overarching trends, each U.S. administration, whether Republican or Democrat, has adjusted its approach to foreign aid. Notably, Latin America has been a region under the microscope, where many initial modifications to the U.S. aid

allocation system were made. The particular impact of the party controlling the White House and Congress on the volume and focus of aid remains relatively unexplored in scholarly research, indicating a need for further studies to understand how political affiliations influence U.S. foreign aid policies and their implementation. Additionally, a third portion of the literature suggests that donor interest prevails. However, very few previous studies conceptualize donor security or strategic interests. The main components of the U.S. national interest matrix consist of four elements: defense and security of the United States, economic development, a favorable global order, and the promotion of fundamental American ideological values [9]. The core assumption motivating the U.S. as a donor is that the recipient country is sufficiently essential in all these four paradigms to warrant economic or other types of assistance without necessarily being an ally of the U.S.

Novelty of Research. The primary purpose of this article is to analyze the U.S. aid allocation system in light of American foreign policy concepts. This study attempts to address the gap in the literature regarding the specific impact of the donor's strategic interests and the democratic status of the recipient countries on U.S. foreign aid policies. By focusing on the interplay between donor priorities and recipient needs, this research comprehensively explains how political affiliations and control influence U.S. foreign aid allocation. Furthermore, it explores the historical transitions and contemporary implications of foreign aid, especially in the context of the post-9/11 era and the ongoing global political dynamics.

The primary purpose of this article is to analyze the US aid allocation system in light of American foreign policy concepts.

Main text of the article. The first substantial scholarly discussion on the topic is associated with Hans Morgenthau, who argued that bilateral aid is one of the fundamental goals of international politics, not merely a tool, as later authors

studying the issue post-1980s have suggested [8]. He broadly asserted that “international aid is one of the genuine innovations that has occurred in modern international politics” [7, p. 63]. According to Morgenthau, a prominent representative of the realist school, international aid was conceptualized as fulfilling the duty of wealthy nations towards poorer ones [8]. Thus, he was one of the first to emphasize that aid is integral to US foreign policy. He criticized politicians and scholars who questioned the necessity of American assistance to other countries. Morgenthau identified six main types of aid: humanitarian aid, food aid, military aid, bribes, prestige aid, and economic development aid. He contended that even humanitarian aid provided to countries affected by natural disasters could be politicized depending on the political context of the recipient country. However, he did not specify the circumstances under which this might occur.

In the 1960s, after US foreign aid became more institutionalized with the creation of the United States Agency for International Development, the number of recipients of US aid also grew [11]. With the end of the Cold war and the 9/11 attacks, the US government had to reshape its foreign aid policy priorities and promote US partnership with the foreign aid allocation. At the same time, Washington did not hesitate to aid non-democratic regimes. The vast majority of the existing literature argues that this was the case. However, it usually lacks quantitative data argument [2]. Generally, every US administration following the Truman Administration that executed the Marshall Plan took the experience of previous administrations into account. Some researchers argue that US foreign aid emerges directly from the material hierarchy of the post-war world. That argument has an empirical perspective as well. Many scholars point out that in the Cold War, the United States viewed foreign aid as an ideological instrument to win the hearts and minds of those states that could be allies or potential allies to Washington or at least do not fall into the Soviet sphere of influence. Overall, examining the role of US aid since 1945 shows that it has ultimately led to the growth of the global economy, aligning with the paradigm followed by the Truman administration in designing international aid policies after World War II. Consequently, some researchers view aid as establishing or maintaining hegemony [5; 6].

Research on U.S. foreign aid often emphasizes the donor’s strategic and political interests, overshadowing recipient countries’ needs. Historically, U.S. foreign aid has been aligned with its national interests, including promoting democracy, economic growth, and maintaining a favor-

able global order. The conclusion of the Cold War and the onset of the third wave of democratization intensified scholarly discussions about the scope and focus of bilateral aid programs. A substantial body of literature posits that democratization is a critical determinant in the allocation of U.S. foreign aid. The underlying hypothesis is that donor priorities often outweigh recipient needs in decisions concerning military and economic support. Indeed, during the Cold War, the U.S. provided more aid to countries with security agreements, regardless of their humanitarian needs [4]. This trend persisted into the post-Cold War era. However, the level of democracy and humanitarian needs of the recipient countries began to play a more significant role in aid allocation decisions from 1992 onwards. U.S. aid policy has evolved to incorporate strategic and humanitarian considerations, with democratization emerging as a crucial factor in recent decades. This study supports the hypothesis that U.S. foreign aid is influenced by both the donor’s strategic interests and the recipient’s democratic status. During the Cold War, strategic alliances were the primary driver of aid allocation. However, in the post-Cold War era, promoting democracy has become an increasingly important criterion. This shift reflects a broader trend in U.S. foreign policy toward supporting democratic transitions and consolidations worldwide [10].

According to the Congressional Research Service, there are several critical rationales for US foreign assistance programs:

- National security concerns include military and physical threats to American welfare.
- commercial interests, which include a way to promote U.S. exports and improve the environment in which U.S. businesses operate.
- humanitarian concerns as a response to crises and disasters, reducing poverty and diseases [1].

This article will dwell upon security assistance, which is one of the most substantial parts of US foreign aid budgets. As with many other types of US foreign aid, Congress has the power of the purse, which in this case refers to money allocation, and the executive branch, the Administration, is responsible for delivering the assistance to the recipient state. The number and range of US security programs are enormous. First, there are nonmilitary security assistance programs that the U.S. State Department administers. These include programs like International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement (INCLE) and several programs called Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR). The Department of Defense administers the latter program, and the State Department runs the Nonproliferation, Anti-Terrorism, Demining and Related Programs (NADR) [1].

The U.S. Department of State is one of the key actors in delivering military assistance programs. The State Department is in charge of three major pillars of US aid that the Department of Defense Security Cooperation Administration implements: foreign military financing (FMF), International Military Education and Training (IMET), and Peacekeeping Operations (PKO). It can be inferred from the existing literature that the United States gradually widened the number of recipients of military aid. By 1990, the United States had provided military aid to many more countries than during the Cold War's culmination [2]. However, it's not the amount of aid that defines the successes of American assistance worldwide; it's nature that matters. For example, during the Cold War, all American Administrations strengthened friendly, but more importantly, unfriendly regimes in a way that undermined those regimes but did not strengthen them. In particular, it refers to military aid to military autonomy and chances for a potential internal rival to the ruling regime. Thus, that strategy reduced the number of military coups, for example. At the same time, the Soviet Union mostly backed up the ruling parties in the regimes, which only strengthened subordinate ties between the army and the ruling party in most recipient states. Nevertheless, much research suggests that without the Cold War, the United States might never have initiated aid programs for other states. At the same time, when every decade passed, aid from the United States was perceived as a temporary diplomatic measure, and by 2000, it was quite an expected element in interstate relations. Of course, the major reason for continuing that aid was the emphasis on improving the quality of life and reducing poverty in recipient countries [7]. US foreign aid has become an institutionalized memory in US relations with other states, and many states assume that they can rely on US aid as a symbolic and meaningful gesture of support.

Implications. This study's implications are profound for understanding the dynamics of U.S. foreign aid policies. By dissecting the strategic interplay between donor priorities and recipient needs, the research sheds light on the evolving nature of U.S. foreign aid. This understanding is crucial for policymakers, scholars, and practitioners engaged in American politics and international relations. It advocates for an enhanced scholarly focus on the legislative dimension of U.S. policy determination and urges a more collaborative inter-branch dialogue to foster a coherent, balanced, and effective policy framework. The study underscores that U.S. foreign aid has historically been aligned with its national inter-

ests, including promoting democracy, economic growth, and maintaining a favorable global order. The conclusion of the Cold War and the onset of the third wave of democratization intensified scholarly discussions about the scope and focus of bilateral aid programs. This shift reflects a broader trend in U.S. foreign policy toward supporting democratic transitions and consolidations worldwide [10]. According to the Congressional Research Service, there are several critical rationales for U.S. foreign assistance programs: addressing military and physical threats to American welfare, promoting U.S. exports and improving the environment in which U.S. businesses operate, and responding to crises and disasters by reducing poverty and diseases [1]. This article focuses on security assistance, a substantial part of U.S. foreign aid budgets. Congress holds the power of the purse, allocating funds, while the executive branch is responsible for delivering the assistance. The range of U.S. security programs is extensive, including nonmilitary security assistance programs like International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement (INCLE) and Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR). The Department of Defense administers CTR, while the State Department runs the Nonproliferation Anti-Terrorism Demining and Related Programs (NADR). Furthermore, the U.S. Department of State plays a crucial role in military assistance programs, overseeing three major pillars of U.S. aid: foreign military financing (FMF), International Military Education and Training (IMET), and Peacekeeping Operations (PKO) [1].

The evolution of U.S. foreign aid reflects the strategic imperative to support friendly but often undemocratic regimes during the Cold War, a strategy aimed at preventing military coups and maintaining regional stability. The institutionalization of U.S. foreign aid over the decades has led to a perception among recipient states that U.S. aid is a reliable and symbolic gesture of support. The study highlights that the U.S. might never have initiated aid programs for other states without the Cold War. However, aid from the U.S. has become an expected element in international relations, emphasizing the improvement of life quality and poverty reduction in recipient countries [7]. This study supports the hypothesis that U.S. foreign aid is influenced by both the donor's strategic interests and the recipient's democratic status. During the Cold War, strategic alliances were the primary driver of aid allocation. In the post-Cold War era, promoting democracy has become an increasingly important criterion.

This evolution signifies a pivotal shift in the traditional political power dynamics within the federal government, impacting the operational

dynamics of the U.S. political system, the balance of power, and the formulation of comprehensive policies addressing internal and external challenges. Future research should focus on several key areas to further understand the dynamics and impacts of U.S. foreign aid. One crucial area is the impact of domestic political changes in the U.S. on foreign aid policies. This includes examining how shifts in the political landscape, such as changes in administration and party control of Congress, influence aid allocation and priorities. Additionally, the long-term effects of U.S. foreign aid on recipient countries, particularly concerning economic development, democratization, and political stability, need to be explored. Another important aspect is the role of non-state actors and international organizations in shaping U.S. foreign aid policies.

Investigating the interplay between governmental agencies, NGOs, and international bodies can provide a more comprehensive understanding of how foreign aid is conceptualized, implemented, and perceived globally. Lastly, future research should incorporate more quantitative analyses to test the assumptions about the strategic interests behind aid distribution, offering empirical evidence to support or challenge existing theoretical frameworks. By examining these dimensions, the study provides a nuanced understanding of contemporary American political structures and their implications on global diplomacy. It contributes significantly to political science and legislative leadership discourse, offering practical insights for navigating the complex interplay of domestic politics and international relations in the 21st century.

Bibliography:

1. Congressional Research Service. Foreign Assistance: An Introduction to US Programs and Policy. 2022. 38 p. URL: <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R40213> (date of access: 25.05.2024).
2. Casey A. E. Up in Arms: How Military Aid Stabilizes – and Destabilizes – Foreign Autocrats. New York: Basic Books, 2024. 323 p. (date of access: 15.05.2024)
3. Carothers T. Aiding Democracy Abroad: The Learning Curve. Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1999. 412 p. (date of access: 17.06.2024)
4. Eberstadt N. U.S. foreign aid policy: a critique. New York: Foreign Policy Association, 1990. 64 p.
5. Hattori T. The moral politics of foreign aid. *Review of International Studies*. 2003. Vol. 29, no. 2. P. 229–247. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0260210503002298> (date of access: 24.06.2024).
6. Hobson J. M. The State and International Relations (Themes in International Relations). Cambridge University Press, 2000. 266 p. (date of access: 17.06.2024)
7. Lancaster C. Foreign Aid: Diplomacy, Development, Domestic Politics. University of Chicago Press, 2010. 288 p.
8. Morgenthau H. A Political Theory of Foreign Aid. *American Political Science Review*. 1962. Vol. 56, no. 2. P. 301–309. URL: <https://doi.org/10.2307/1952366> (date of access: 17.06.2024).
9. Nuechterlein D. E. America overcommitted: United States national interests in the 1980s. Lexington, Ky : University Press of Kentucky, 1985. 238 p.
10. Olivé I., Pérez A. Aid Power and Politics. Taylor & Francis Group, 2019.
11. Faraponov V. Role Of The House Speaker In Determining U.S. Policy Priorities. *Scientific Works of Interregional Academy of Personnel Management. Political Sciences and Public Management*. 2024. No. 6(72). P. 74–80. URL: [https://doi.org/10.32689/2523-4625-2023-6\(72\)-11](https://doi.org/10.32689/2523-4625-2023-6(72)-11) (date of access: 20.06.2024).