

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

THE ETHICS OF AID

BY: ABDETA MAMO

ADVISOR: Dr. WORKINEH KELBESSA

June, 2016

Addis Ababa

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

THE ETHICS OF AID

BY: ABDETA MAMO

ADVISOR: Dr. WORKINEH KALBESSA

**THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES OF
ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTERS OF ARTS IN
PHILOSOPHY**

June, 2016

Addis Ababa

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

THE ETHICS OF AID

BY: ABDETA MAMO

ADVISOR: DR. WORKINEH KELBESSA

APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF EXAMINERS

ADVISOR **SIGNATURE** **DATE**

EXAMINER **SIGNATURE** **DATE**

EXAMINER **SIGNATURE** **DATE**

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost I praise the Almighty ALLAH. Next, I would like to express my heart felt gratitude to my thesis advisor, Dr. Workineh Kalbessa for his tireless encouragement, guidance, constructive comments and useful suggestions. Then, it is my pleasure to extend my greatest and special thanks to my family, particularly my father Mr. Mamo Hiko, my mother Miss. Woyo Kiso, my brother, Mr. Aman Mamo, Muhammad Mamo and my sisters Radia Mamo, Kamaria Mamo and Bedria Mamo for their encouragement and provision of financial assistance, material and moral support, for undertaking this thesis in particular and for achieving the current education level in general.

I am indebted to Nagayo Mamo (Diplomat in minster of foreign affair) who contributed a lot to my intellectual development. I also thank colleagues, Abdo Windisa, Jemal Hussien, Hussien Haji, Adunga Chalchessa, Mufadel Mohammed and Girmaye G/ Hiwot for their unreserved moral and intellectual support.

The encouragement and support that my wife, Aliya H/ Nabo, provided me is always appreciated. Last, but not the least, though I could not afford to thank on this piece of paper, many deserve to be acknowledged. All, who have wished, contributed or expected my success. THANK YOU VERY MUCH!

Abdeta Mamo

June 2016

Definitions of Terms

Aid: refers to the flow of capital or resource from developed countries and multilateral institutions to developing countries. It embodies a relationship between a donor and a recipient with associated, inbuilt problems such as inequality and dependence.

Aid Effectiveness: is refers to success of assistance in achieving economic development and human development or development goals.

Altruism: refers to action which is morally right if the consequences of that action are more favorable than unfavorable to everyone except the agent. It is a reflection of a concern for the happiness of others without having direct material benefit from the activity we perform.

Common sense morality: refers to moral principle claims that we have to balance our own interests with the interests of others. It is pre-theoretical moral judgment of ordinary people.

Deontology: refers an ethical theory theories base morality on specific, foundational principles of obligation. It is the ethical theory that focuses on duty as ethical bases.

Development Aid: refers to the assistance that is given for the development purposes. It is an external aid to low-income countries as offered in clear concessional resource allotments to increase welfare in recipient countries.

Development Ethics: refers to ethical structure which is used to questions for the existence of moral contents in a several development theories and practices. It is the moral justification in the methods and the processes of achieving development.

Development: refers to multidimensional and multidisciplinary concept. It includes both descriptive and normative aspects of human development. It also deals with the overall social well-being, which covers economic, social, political, cultural, attitudinal and spiritual transformation.

Ethical Dilemmas: refers to choice between two options, both of which will bring negative results based on society or personal guidelines. It is also known as moral dilemmas which describe a situation in which there is a choice to be made between two options, neither of which resolves the situation in an ethically acceptable way.

Ethics of Aid: refers to an act of morality that connects developed countries with the developing with the framework of aid. It is also a way that evaluates the moral duty or obligation with regard to the donors and the receivers in the accomplishment of aid.

Ethics: is a branch of philosophy. It is also known as moral philosophy. It asks basic questions about the good life, what is better and worse and other issues related to our obligation. Ethics is a general term for what is often described as the study of morality based upon human conduct.

Justice: refers to the way of treating people equally or fairly. It is legal or philosophical theory by which fairness administered.

Utilitarianism: refers to an action is morally right if the consequences of that action are more favorable than unfavorable to everyone. It provides greatest happiness and pleasure for whole people and hence should be advocated.

Table of Content

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	i
Definitions of Terms	ii
Table of Content.....	iv
Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	vi
Abstract	viii
Chapter One.....	1
1. Introduction	1
1.1. Background of the Study.....	1
1.2. Theoretical Framework	4
1.3. Statements of the Problem.....	7
1.4. Objectives of the Study	8
1.4.1. General Objective of the Study	8
1.4.2. Specific Objectives	8
1.5. Thesis Questions	8
1.7. Methodology of the Study.....	9
1.8. Scope of the Study.....	9
1.9 Significance of the Study	9
1.10. Organization of the Thesis	10
Chapter Two: Development Aid	11
2.1. The Notion of Development.....	11
2.1.2. Development Ethics.....	15
2.2. The Concepts of Aid and Development Aid	17
2.2.1. Definition of Concept Aid	17
2.2.2. Development Aid.....	19
2.2.3. The Contribution of Development Aid to Development.....	21
2.2.4. The Shortcomings of Development Aid.....	23
2.2.5 Arguments against Aid	26

Chapter Three: The Ethics of Aid 34

3.1. The Concepts of Ethics 34

3.2. Ethical Dilemmas and the Issues in the Ethics of Aid 35

3.3. Why Ethics of Aid Matters..... 39

3.4 Critical Assessment of the Moral Importance of Aid 39

 3.4.1 Moral Theories in Support of Giving Aid 39

 3.4.2. Donor Self-Interest 46

Chapter Four: Conclusion 49

References

Acronyms and Abbreviations

ADB	African Development Bank
ADB	Asian Development Bank
AEC	Africa Economic Commission
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DFID	Department of International Development
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organization
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
IBRD	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
IDA	International Development Assistance
IFRC	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
IHL	International Humanitarian Law
IMF	International Monetary Fund
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organizations
ODA	Official Development Assistance
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
OPEC	Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Program

US United States
USAID United State Agency for International Development.
WB World Bank

Abstract

The ethics of aid is the central focus of this thesis. The thesis particularly examines the moral controversies on and the weaknesses of development aid. It shows how aid is highly connected to ethics from the perspectives of applied ethics. It also discusses the arguments for and against giving aid to the poor. I employed qualitative research approach. Accordingly, I have used secondary sources. Literature on aid has been dominated by politics and economics without giving attention to ethics. However, viewing aid as the mere transfer of resources from the rich countries to the poor countries is inadequate. I thus suggested that the developed countries have moral obligations to extend their hand in support of poor and vulnerable nations for the well-being and security of both themselves and others. Ethical justification should be taken into consideration when we give and receive aid. I defended the position that developed nations have a moral duty to provide aid for the developing countries within the ethical frameworks of altruism, justice, utilitarianism and the like.

Keywords: Aid, Development, Development Aid, Ethics, Ethics of Aid.

Chapter One

1. Introduction

1.1. Background of the Study

In this thesis, I explored the moral controversies and the weaknesses of development aid with the philosophical arguments in the ethics of aid. In addition, the thesis critically examines the arguments for and against in giving aid. In order to justify my thesis I saw aid from the perspective of applied ethics.

Before discussing ethics of aid, it is pertinent to define 'ethics' and the concept of 'aid'. As such, Anthony Weston, defines ethics as "the branch of philosophy that focuses on the study of moral values and considers how best to think about moral values and how best to clarify, prioritize, and integrate them" (2006:3). This explanation shows that ethics as an expression of moral standards or principles that governs how we ought to live. In additions, I think, the branch of philosophy named 'ethics' is concerned with questions about how human beings ought to live and the evaluation of what is 'right' or what is 'wrong' in relation to human conduct or human behaviors. Accordingly, many moral philosophers, used to define ethics as a branch of philosophy which helps us to study, analyze, and evaluate moral problems by providing us with deep insights when dealing with moral issues. Hence, as a field of study, ethics provide us with clear and logical theories, conceptual frameworks and guideline for how we ought to live our lives.

On the other hand, the idea of aid is broadly used and accepted as a flow of financial resources from developed countries to developing countries (M.Todro, 1989). This means, it is a kind of economic resource that is transferred from the donor nations to the recipient' nations. In addition to this, the word "aid" becomes popular during the WW II, when the United States introduced the program of reconstruction of Europe through Marshal Plan. However, this kind of aid system is not the same with the current meaning of aid; because, in the past aid was used to deal with a single phenomenon, that is, war (William Clark, 1965: 12). For instance, Ashok Chakravart (2005), defines the concept aid as: "all official concessional flows from bilateral and multilateral agencies, whether a loan or a grant, that can be considered to be developmental aim, evolved in terms of motives and interests of both donor and recipient countries, as well as in terms of goals it was set to achieve" (Chakravart 2005:6).

Having provided this hints about ‘ethics’ and ‘aid’ let me proceed to discuss the concept of “ethics of aid”. The concept of “ethics of aid” began in the 1970s in principle (De Gasper, 1999:5), but the ethical ‘dilemmas’ definition, role and responsibilities which have grown in the 1990s in NGDOs (Non-Governmental Development Organizations) closely match with those seen elsewhere in the caring professions: doctors, nurses, psychiatrists, social workers, priests and so on (Banks,1995 cited in Gasper : 28). In this sense, the ethics of aid began in the 1990s with the work of ethical revival and political philosophers like Rawls and Nozick (ibid). According to Denis Goulet (2005), the ethics of aid is explored in a way that meeting basic need for the very poor must be given attention from the very beginning. Aid from the rich countries is based up on the rationale that we need to pay attention to the urgent human needs. Hence, adequate aid to complement host country’s capacities must be provided by someone in order to meet the least condition of distributive justice in the allocation of the earth’s goods independently of ideological, geopolitical or economic criteria (Goulet, 2005:161-162). I think, from this point of view, understanding the nature of some actions in relation to the distribution of aid is important. It is also important that ethical justification should be given in specific action of aid. Moreover, I argue that, “the ethics of aid” is an act of moral philosophy connects the rich countries with the poor nations with the framework of aid. It is also a way that evaluates the moral obligation with regard to the donors and the receivers in the accomplishment of aid. Indeed, the ethics of aid clearly shows as a bridge that joins the rich nations with the poor nations in the paradigm of aid.

Here to understand the ethics of aid in a brief manner it is better to dig out the aid project with the aims of development and its objective. Every nation struggles for development, because development is an indispensable objective of the majority of the people in the world. Even though economic progress is very important component of development, it cannot be the only constituent factor to decide whether the country is “developed” or “underdeveloped.” Development should involve a profound change in all sectors: economic, social, political, and cultural aspects. Starting from the time that development was considered as “multidimensional” process a number of writers like Denis Goulet and Amertya Sen argued that development must include human wellbeing as a center of its measurement (Sen, 1999). The point is that human wellbeing must be the ultimate purpose of development. “Development must be a guarantee to political stability and assurance of peaceful and responsible institutional behavior, so that

development must include moral aspect and work towards human wellbeing” (Pearson report, 1969: 7). Like that of development ‘aid’ must include moral aspects, and work towards human wellbeing, because what is transferred from rich to poor countries are not only money but also culture, religion and political ideology. These things make aid very complex. And the relationship between the poor and the rich is exploitative and sometimes what the rich countries take is greater than what they give and in every instance they want to defend their own political, economic, and cultural motives. It is clear that what they render is out of their own perceived interests. However, morality requires the donors to develop a good bargaining position of those poor countries to enable them to be competitive with the donor countries (Goulet, 1995: 154 - 155).

On the other hand, the question of development aid and ethics of aid is a timeless and permanent question, which needs to be critical evaluation. Starting from the time of Socrates, who puts human at the center of philosophy, philosophy gives more emphasis for human well-being. This is to mean that philosophy comes back from the question of God to the question of man. One of such human questions is the question of ethics of aid. We are in need of ethical reflection on the matter of development aid because as Samir Amin says, “If aid is not properly given it can be a form of social imperialism” (quoted in Goulet, 1995: 154). Accordingly, the aim of ethical enquiry here may not be to claim that there is a single right answer to an ethical issue, but rather to enrich discussion of what makes something right or wrong and enhance justification of the course of action or aid in use. I think, the reason is that in the name of aid, immoral and illegal acts were done to the poor. “While, it is the subject of a pious literature, and is credited with saintly and humanitarian motives, foreign aid often keeps strange and brutal company” (Hancock, 1989: 182). This thing urges to question the present aid system. It is crucial and timeless to ask a question on the matter of moral obligation, For example, when we see starving children, when people are dying because of absence of food, health care and sanitation and when we see elders without help and at the same time when we see some people spent billions of dollars for one party or movie that could have saved millions of life. These things remind us to ask questions such as “do we have a responsibility to help?” “Should the rich help the poor?” Of course, rich countries should help when people are suffering. However, there are unsettled moral debates in the matter of moral obligation to give aid. Indeed critical studies are needed in this regard to safeguard the right of poor nations and to alleviate them from suffering caused by

“underdevelopment”. Philosophy by its virtue can play a vital role in dealing with these and other related questions on development aid and the ethics of aid. David Crocker (2002), argues that philosophers and non-philosophers must set some standards in giving aid to developing nations. He further argues:

Ethical reflection, whether the work of philosophers or non-philosophers, play not only critical and guiding role but also an interpretative role in relation to social reality and change. An ethic proposes norms for asserting present social institutions, investigating future alternative, and assigning moral obligations. An ethic provides a basis for deciding how agents should act in particular circumstance... How we ‘read’ the situation, as well as how we describe and classify it, will be a function of our value commitment and even our moral sensitivity (2002: 592).

In the course of time, aid now appears to be the issue of global concern. However, it became so serious in Africa in recent days especially as the continent is facing many problems like disaster, hunger and poverty because it is lagging behind in many ways. Concerning the issue of aid in Africa, Danbisa Moyo (2009), argues that aid does not achieve its objective, it is essentially negative. This implies that aid is not functional in promoting development; it has actually made things worse. For her, aid is not part of the solution, but it is the problem’ in Africa. She again claims, aid itself is what is keeping Africa poor. She identifies corruption as the main impediment of development. From the point of Moyo I think, aid kills the habit of industriousness’ or hard working. This shows that the people are waiting for aid rather than working, having no motivation for work rather than seeing the hands of other.

1.2. Theoretical Framework

The main point of this thesis is, to show the moral controversies and the weakness of development aid within philosophical argument in the ethics of aid. It tries to incorporate how an aid action is highly connected to ethics. In the process of achieving this task I have relied upon a broader theory of ethics that explains not only the real moral principle in goodwill of aid for the developing countries but also shows arguments against aid.

Arguments against aid say that the developing countries or the poor people do not have a right to get aid from the developed nations. Indeed, there are different justifications for those who are against giving aid to the developing countries. In other words, to rationalize their argument, the

opponents of aid giving raise different reasons why the rich countries do not have an obligation to give aid. They also try to influence the rich countries that they should stop their aid. These justifications are categorized as ecological catastrophe, world population trend, liberty of the people and aid effectiveness.

The ecological catastrophes argument focuses on population growth to oppose provisions of aid. According to this line of thinking, population growth is considered as a cancer, and we are spreading this cancer by giving aid that can increase the birth rate of the poor countries. Hence, the solution for the problem is to stop aid. The second justification against giving aid to the developing countries is to ensure the liberty of the people. That is, no one is tolerating to take another's property and no one should force him or her to give his or her property to corroborate the life of others.

The third justification for the argument against giving aid for the poor is the effectiveness of aid. This reflects the fact that aid is not effective and the rich do not have moral obligation to give aid for the poor (Brain, 2011). The reasons for this ineffectiveness of aid are corruption, ill political system, deformed economic policies and social structures (ibid). Finally, the last justification for the argument against aid is world population trend. This perspective pose a serious opposition to stop the aid that flows from the rich to the poor nations, for the reason that assisting those now in poverty will only ensure that more people born to live in poverty in the future and aid fuels for the population expulsion that simply produces more evil in the poor countries. I argue that, from this point of view, aid develops the culture of dependency on the developed nations rather than preserving the poor in the developing countries.

On the other hand, there are a number of ethical theories that supports aid. The ethical arguments that support giving aid for the developing countries are altruism, utilitarianism, deontology and justice. I explore here in a way that the above-mentioned ethical theories defend the view that the developed nations have a moral obligation to give aid for the developing nations.

From the ethical theories, "altruism" is the first ethical theory that obliged someone to give aid. "It is a reflection of a concern for the happiness of others without having direct material benefit from the activity we perform" (Little, 2007:172). This shows that the happiness for the ego of

other regardless of the happiness of individuals. The second, ethical theory that defends giving aid for the developing nations is utilitarianism. It is ethical argument that concerns the greatest happiness as its moral foundation. According to Utilitarianism aid may provide the greatest happiness and pleasure for the whole people and hence should be advocated. This shows that utilitarian ethical theory has constantly been part of the ethics of aid. The third ethical argument in favor of giving aid for the developing nations is “duty theory” or “deontology”. It is the ethical theory that focuses on duty as ethical bases. Consequently, from the deontological point of view, the developed countries have a moral duty to give aid for the developing nations those in need of assistance or aid. The fourth ethical argument is justice or fairness. Justice is the way of treating people equally or fairly. This principle obliged to assist the developing countries because of material inequality between the rich and poor. Thus, this human suffering in the developing countries obliged the rich countries to share out their wealth.

Finally, I try to evaluate arguments for and against aid and then I disagree with an argument against moral obligation to give aid for developing countries and I have same view with ethical argument that can supports giving aid for developing countries in need of aid. Because, aid can reduce human suffering and death that are happening in developing countries. Aid can also significantly decrease if not alleviate worldwide poverty and famine while improving the world economy. It narrows the inequality between developed and developing countries thus ensuring economic justice. In addition, aid could help to reduce impacts of humanitarian and ecological crises such as war, earth quake, drought, flood, migration etc. that are beyond the capacity of a single community.

Therefore, I accept and base my arguments on the theory of aid given by, Denis Goulet, Amartya Sen, Martha Nussbam’s, Peter Singer, Immanuel Kant and others. Ethics of aid from the point of these philosophers goes in the principle of human equality; there is an imperative that present moral obligation or “obligation for benevolence” Kant (1785) and Singer (1972) principle of morally preferable to give aid for the poor to alleviate suffer and promote happiness. Sen and Nussbam argue to give aid for the developing country; we must give emphasis for the ethical framework. In this case, their capability approach is comprehensive to give aid for those who in need. For the purpose of this thesis, the capability approach encompassed both the works of Sen and Nussbam. Accordingly, their philosophical view is based on ethical importance of

one's ability to attain the kind of life they have reason to value, as well as its notion of poverty as deprivation in the capability to live a good life and 'development' is understood as a capability of expansion. I think, the capability approach play vital role to understand one's moral guideline for the flow of resources from the developed nations to developing countries. Moreover, the above-mentioned philosophers agree that the affluent people in the developed world are morally obligated to transfer large amounts of resources to developing nations in need of aid within the ethical framework of altruism (recognition of human reality of other person), utilitarianism, deontology, fairness or justice, non-exploitation and capability approach. These ethical theories provide substitute lenses from which to view and approach the various ethical problems and dilemmas arising in aid practice. I tried to develop my thesis based on the theories of the above stated scholars and I defend the view that developed countries have moral responsibility to give aid for the developing countries.

1.3. Statements of the Problem

When one thinks about aid, the first thing that comes to our mind is the transfer of money or resources from the developed nations to developing countries. Viewing aid as the only transfer of resources or money from the rich countries to the poor countries makes the concept incomplete. However, for me this definition is not comprehensive. Since, the mere transfer of resources or money from the rich countries to the poor countries makes aid meaningless; because, ethical justification or moral reason must be taken into consideration based on the given aid. Thus, this makes the notion of aid a controversial issue.

In addition, the United Nations Charter of Economic Right and Duties declare, "international cooperation for development is the shared goal and common duty of all states. Every state should cooperate with the efforts of developing countries to accelerate their economic and social development by promoting favorable condition and by extending active assistance to them" (quoted in Goulet, 1995: 153–154). Goulet also argues that suitable, fair and equitable transfers of resource are acceptable. Otherwise, this resource transfer may create a condition of "a social control over recipient or unduly favor the economic interest of supplier" (Goulet, 1995: 154).

However, development aid has come under controversies from various quarters, especially in its effectiveness. In addition, the evaluation of aid was related to the narrow definition of economic growth regardless of moral consideration and human wellbeing of recipient countries, because

“aid literature in particular has been dominated by economists but most economists were traditionally separated from ethics”(Gasper,1992: 10). Despite its importance, little attention has been given to the ethics of aid and this is a gap that I tried to explicate in this thesis. Since, moral clarity and ethical analysis are essential to moral judgment, which intern an important component in justifying how, when and where aid should happen. Therefore, this thesis attempts to critically examine the shortcomings of development aid and the major philosophical argument on the ethics of aid based on Goulet’s view and other development ethicists.

1.4. Objectives of the Study

1.4.1. General Objective of the Study

The general objective of the thesis is to critically examine philosophical arguments for and against aid and to argue for the importance of the ethics of aid. In doing this, I discuss the major weaknesses of development aid, and defend the view that the rich nations have a moral responsibility to give aid to the poor nations within the moral principles of utilitarianism, altruism, deontology, justice and non-exploitation.

1.4.2. Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of this study are to:

- examine the major moral dilemma and different philosophical arguments for and against giving aid;
- shed light on issues and problems in development aid and to discuss controversial issues on aid’s role in development and look at the moral principles in support of obligation to give aid;
- Examine the shortcomings of development aid and to show the sources of the problems

1.5. Thesis Questions

In order to realize the above mentioned objectives, there are certain important questions that guide both the initial thesis and the final outcome that could be reached at the end of the study. These questions include:

- Do developed nations have moral obligations to give aid?

- What obligation do citizens of developed nations have to support the poor people?
- What are the moral standards in support of giving aid? Are their arguments against aid morally justifiable?

1.7. Methodology of the Study

This study is based on qualitative research approach. Data is collected from different secondary sources such as books and journal and articles. Although I believe in the vital importance of primary sources, the research findings will rely on a critical analysis of the secondary data. Thus, thesis reviews existing literatures produced by researchers at different places at various times. Different factors necessitated the application of a qualitative method in this study. Financial problem and time constraints prevented me from using quantitative method.

1.8. Scope of the Study

The scope of this study not covered all the areas of development aid and the ethics of aid due to inadequacy of page specification, time and financial constraints. Even though my focus is on the ethics of aid, I tried to discuss the main features and shortcomings of development aid and moral controversies on aid.

1.9 Significance of the Study

After the completion of the study, I hope that the recommendations and conclusions reached have a significant role to play in dealing with issues of the ethics of aid. The thesis findings also have the following significance for the parties who have either direct or indirect interest to it: the output from the research can help policy makers, developmental organizations for aid and corporations to make possible sound decisions regarding the ethics of aid. I also believe that the research output can be used as a research input for those engaged in research on this subject.

1.10. Organization of the Thesis

This study is organized in to four chapters. The first chapter deals with introduction, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, research questions, methodology, scope significance of the study and organization of the thesis. In the second chapter, I critically discussed and relate some important concepts. The understandings of the concept development, development ethics, aid and development aid is analyzed. This chapter also examined the contribution of development aid to development, the shortcomings of development aid and different arguments that justify against giving aid to the poor. The third chapter specifically discusses the ethics of aid, ethical dilemma on aid and issues in the ethics of aid, why ethics of aid matters and the ethical arguments in support of giving aid for the poor. The last chapter provides with the conclusion of the study. It contains the conclusion and recommendations of the study.

Chapter Two: Development Aid

In this chapter, I will discuss some terminologies and concepts that are relevant in conceptualizing the term development aid. I also critically examine the contribution of development aid to development, its shortcomings and different arguments against giving aid for the developing countries. Accordingly, the objective of this chapter is to analyze important terms that will serve as the philosophical concepts for the study of the ethics of aid throughout this thesis. In addition, the concepts discussed under this chapter will provide comprehensive understanding of moral dilemmas in the ethics of aid. Hence, I present four sub-topics, which I expect will help us to understand the nature, dilemmas and topics of development aid. These are: development, development ethics, aid, development aid, and different arguments against aid. These sub-topics can also advance existing perception, understanding of issues under discussion, and justify the significance of the topics in the coming chapters.

2.1. The Notion of Development

Under this topic, a discussion is made on the nature and the concept of development. Actually, there are many controversies in the definitions of development. As a matter of fact, the concept development is difficult and unclear for the reason that it is a different thing to different people. For some people, development is arriving at continuous rates of growth of income per capita. This is to mean that development is merely the rising of economic growth (e.g. traditional approach to development). For others it is seen as a material prosperity or achieving basic-needs for all (e.g., basic needs approach). Others also consider it as a means for freedom from oppression and other constraints. Still, for many people, development is a multidimensional concept that includes personal, social, cultural and spiritual, economic and political improvement. The modern structure of development is relevant to this last definition of development. The present view of development perceives development not as a particular normative framework, but as a multi-dimensional procedure that includes social, economic and political changes for the objective of enhancing people's overall well-being (Goulet, 2006). For the traditional views of development, economic growth or value-neutral economic growth is the same as development. For proponents of this view, economic growth is an end in itself and a solution for all human problems. Until 1970s, since economic growth had been given primacy, tackling basic human problems such as poverty, discrimination, unemployment, income

distribution and environmental degradation were considered as a secondary importance (Michael P. Todaro and Stephen C. Smith , 2012:14).

As the works of Denis Goulet, Amartya Sen, and Todaro show, during this period, high economic growth rates or increase in per capita income and growth of GDP cannot be simply and automatically translated into higher level of meaningful development. It couldn't avoid poverty and hunger, malnourishment, discrimination, unemployment, misdistribution of income, inequity etc., that existed in developed and developing countries, and among national social classes. This is why all development philosophers agreed upon the idea that traditional approach to development (which emphasizes on mere economic growth), has created as many problems as it has solved (Dived A. Crocker, 2004:7).

What should be recognized here is that all the above development concepts are derived from particular value judgments, that is, what is good and desirable and what is not. Accordingly, development is not only about descriptive and quantitative aspects of human life but also about normative (what ought to be and not) and qualitative aspects of human life. Hence, the concept of development should encompass the diversified human changes or transformations as well as avoiding what is bad and undesirable for the conditions of human life. As Todaro and Smith showed it:

Development, in its essence, must represent the whole scope of change by which an entire social system, turned to the diverse basic needs and evolving aspirations of individuals and social groups within that system, moves away from a condition of life widely perceived as unsatisfactory toward a situation or condition of life regarded as materially and spiritually better (2012:16).

According to this all-inclusive approach to development, income and wealth, a mere economic growth is not an end in itself but a means for another human ends. In his popular writing entitled, *Development as Freedom*, Sen state that economic growth cannot be logically treated as an end in itself. Development has to be more concerned with enhancing the lives we lead and the freedom we enjoy (Sen, 1999:14).

According to him, the most important thing for human development is not material fulfillment and wealth or generally speaking what the things a person has (including what these things generate) but what a person is or can be and what he does, or can do. In this regard, to

ensure what Sen calls as functionings, what a person does or can do with the kinds of commodities he/she possess, and capabilities, the freedoms or powers of choosing functioning's, we have to go beyond the availability of commodities, or industrialization, or technological advance, or social modernization.

Unlike the traditional one, the modern conception of development is principally characterized by Goulet's three core-values of good life: sustenance, self-esteem, and freedom. The concept of sustenance is concerned with the ability to meet humans' basic needs such as food, shelter, health, and protection. These basic needs are extremely important for all human beings because, without them, life would be impossible. "By owning things, man becomes superior to what he was. To have helps him to be" (Goulet, 2006:28). Economic growth can improve development due to the fact that increased incomes arguably enlarge the range of human choices and capabilities. According to him, the concept of having enough does not limited to the sole fulfillment of basic needs, but encompasses ensuring all material needs for the purpose of actualizing one's potentialities that are indispensable for self-realization. With respect to this point, he puts quite beyond basic necessities. However, a person who possesses little is a diminished man; he needs to —have more in order to —be more (ibid). Lack of basic needs is widely spread in poverty-stricken countries particularly in developing countries. Therefore, since development without material fulfillments (including basic necessities) is meaningless, economics as a single component of human development must address the problems or miseries that arise from lack of basic needs and other material fulfillments.

Precisely, the difference between traditional and modern conceptions of development is that the traditional concept of development focuses on determining development in terms of economic growth, personal income, technological advancement, industrialization, capitalization, modernization and etc. However, the scope of modern concept of development (broader dimension) goes beyond the scope of traditional one as it incorporates other issues such as human freedom, protective security and transparency guarantees, social opportunities and all together resulted in human freedom (Sen, 1999).

In addition, the concept of self-esteem represents to be a person in the sense that it embodied a sense of worth and self-respect as well as freedom of not to be used as an instrument or tool by others. It embraces people's quest for their authenticity or identity, dignity, respect,

recognition and self-determination (see Todaro and Smith 2012:21). In the period of globalization, since many societies of developing countries have contact with affluent nations, they may suffer from loss or marginalization of worth with respect to their identity, dignity, culture, respect or honor and so forth. Today, due to the fact that worthiness of one country or nation is spuriously attached to material well-beings (money, capital and other material things) and the measure of worth became national prosperity, poor people like Africans can face crisis of their worth, meaningful recognition, dignity, respect, self-determination and the like. These problems can also manifest among the members of a certain society of a single country. The people of a country may consist of different nations and nationalities. The dominant may intentionally oppress, marginalize, unrecognize (or even giving no recognition), disrespect and mistreat certain majority or minority and subordinate classes. Therefore, meaningful development or good life should severely promote all people's or societies' self-esteem or a sense of worth, dignity or self-respect (Sen, 1999).

The last basic constituent of modern development is freedom. It refers to freedom from servitude or various external constraints that debilitate people's capabilities or potentiality to choose among ranges of available human choices. It includes emancipation from various bondages such as social servitude to nature, other people, misery, oppressive institutions, and dogmatic beliefs as well as liberation from alienating material conditions of life. It also embraces political freedom such as personal security, the rule of law, freedom of expression, political participation, and equality of opportunity (see Sen 1999:15-19; Goulet 2006:104). Likewise, the concept of freedom encompasses avoiding all what are often termed as unfreedoms, which include poverty, malnutrition, poor sanitation, tyranny, poor economic opportunities, social deprivations, poor public facilities, intolerance, repressive state apparatuses, lack of education and security, absence of health care, corruption and so forth. In his notion of development as freedom, Sen's central idea is that development is not about mere material fulfillments but about freedom (i.e., averting different kinds of unfreedoms or constraints) that enhances humans' capabilities for carrying out functioning.

As such, freedom or liberation from various human constraints strongly enhances human capabilities and capabilities in turn, enhance the power to carry out a range of human functioning as well as to increase human choices. In his both writings: development as freedom

and capability approach, concepts such as capability, entitlement and rights are highly interconnected. From the above discussion, it has been clear that development is not self-sufficient by itself. This is because development ethics play a vital role to critically assess, the ethical bases of development and it is indispensable for achieving humane and equitable development that is characterized by a productive, healthy and happy human person. Thus, ethical considerations are necessary factors that can ensure comprehensive development. The next topic raises and discusses issues related to development ethics.

2.1.2. Development Ethics

As I proceed to discuss the interaction between ethics and development, it is important to express that development has to be achieved without demolishing the lives of the people for whom it is intended. As I mentioned earlier, the goal of genuine development is enhancing humanity. The meaning of 'development' is all about serving the people. Ethics provides the framework for achieving growth and development without conquering humanity (Goulet, 2006) Of course it is to be expected that the evaluation of the concept exist in mid of controversies. This dilemma arises from the difficulty to measure what is an ethical or unethical action. For instance, certain actions can benefit some groups and harm others. Similarly, an action can be ethical for specific society and unethical for the rest. Having this clues about development and ethics separately, now it is appropriate to explain what development ethics mean and how development ethics related with the notion of aid.

Development ethics can be seen as one branch of applied ethics like that of business ethics, medical ethics, and environmental ethics and the like. Each area of practice generates ethical questions about priorities and actions, rights and responsibilities. Accordingly, development ethics is defined as “a field of consideration, an agenda of questions about major value choices involved in processes of social and economic development, what is good or ‘real’ development?” (Des Gasper, 2009: 4). This is to mean that the definition one gives for the term as an independent discipline that deals with the moral relations between values and development theory on the one hand and ethical question about development thought and practice on the other. In addition, it is inferred as the field of studying ethics and development issues. Similarly, Guelet defines development ethics as:

...an ethical reflection of development issue that concerns the meaning of development, freedom, self-determination, and democracy that evaluated in terms of what is right, what is wrong within development policies. It is an ethical reflection on the ends and means of any developmental endeavor (emphases added on, Goulet, 1995:25).

What the definition explains is the evaluation of what is right and what is wrong, in the crucial areas of development thought and practice. It is a distinct field that systematically reflects on meaning, purpose and acceptability of development.

Goulet further argues that, in the development process moral judgment concerning the good life, the good society, and the quality of relations among people always assist, directly or indirectly, as functional standard for development planners and as guidelines for researchers (ibid). Ethical structure is used to questions for the existence of moral content of several development theories and practices. Accordingly, for him, the central issue in development ethics is the moral justification of the methods and the processes taken in achieving development. In this regard Nikos Astroulakis (2010), claims that development ethics is “a desire to explain the way towards a new development paradigm that investigates development in light of fundamental ancient ethical queries on the meaning of the good life, the foundation of justice in society and the human stance towards nature” (2010:2). This implies that the notion of development ethics includes both historical narratives and the way forward. Accordingly, development ethics can be characterized as interdisciplinary subject.

Moreover, the development ethicists like: (Goulet 1975 and 2006; Dower 1988; Gasper 2006; Crocker 2008), perceived development ethics as both the ethical reflection on the means and the ends of local, regional, national and international development. This definition not only admits the form of a philosophical dialogue, but also presents a space of analysis, evaluation and action regarding the course of societies, with special reference to suffering, injustice and exclusion within societies and among societies at a global scale.

In general, development ethics assumes that development is not limited to traditional straightforward economic growth, but it is value-laden, multidimensional and multidisciplinary process. Because it appeals to normative judgments of social, economic, political, cultural and attitudinal changes, development requires putting ethics on the agenda of development theory,

policy, and practice. An ethical attitude and work culture are indispensable for achieving humane and equitable development that is characterized by a productive, healthy and happy human person. In a broad sense, development ethics adopts ensuring basic needs and other material fulfillment, sanitation, safe drinking water, education and skills, health care, social and political justice, human security, freedom, structural and institutional transformation, grassroots democracy, self-reliance, and healthy and sustainable environment. It also includes avoiding human handicaps such as poverty, hunger, inequity, unemployment and discriminations. The existence of suffering and exclusion that result from gaps in development calls for aid as means of intervention to fill the gaps.

Since development ethics is an explanation part for broader conversation on aid officials and experts from the developed countries and those in developing countries. Therefore, as I have argued in the above discussion, development ethics play a vital role to critically analyze the notion of aid and development aid. In the next section, I will briefly discuss the concept of aid and development aid.

2.2. The Concepts of Aid and Development Aid

2.2.1. Definition of Concept Aid

Under this topic discussion is made on the definition of the term aid and the nature of aid. The definition of the term “aid” is somewhat different and complicated. The reason is that the term has plenty of meanings. In this respect, aid is defined as “the same with economic assistance, economic aid, development aid, development assistance, development cooperation, or economic cooperation” and so on (OECD, 1999). The Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) defined aid as the flow of capital or resource from developed countries and multilateral institutions to developing countries. It is provided by official agencies including, the state and local governments or by their executive agencies. This definition should satisfy two criteria. First, it must be directed to development purpose that excludes military and export credits. Second, it must be highly “concessional” (cited in Forsyth, 2005: 111). This means that aid is a resource or revenue that flows from affluent nation to poor nation in need of aid or assistance. Then, aid shows the relation between the donor and receiver. This is the assistance that connects the rich nations with the poor nations.

Similarly, (Steen Folke and Henrik Nielson, 2006) argue that aid “embodies a relationship between a donor and a recipient with associated, inbuilt problems such as inequality and dependence”(Folke. and Nielson 2006:3). In this respect, aid has a bilateral relation between the donor and receiver, developed and developing nations or poor and rich nations in relation to difference and dependence. Moreover, Carol Lancaster defines Aid as;

--- a transfer of concessional resources from one government to another or forms of government to an international aid agency or governmental organization (which in turn, transfers those resources to the poor countries). Either the resource transfer must be a grant or if a loan, it should carry a grace period, interest rate and repayment terms that provide a grant element at least 25 percent. And, the resource must be provided with ostensible goal of promoting economic development in less developed countries (Emphasis added Lancaster, 1999:36).

From the above definition, it is possible to infer that, aid as a contractual agreement between developed nations or affluent countries and developing nations or developing countries for the transfer of resource. In other words, the resource given in the name of aid based on apparent objective of advancing economic growth in developing or less developing countries. I think the above definition of the concept aid is economist understanding or interpretation of aid.

The next important question is why is aid given for the developing nations or what is the objective of aid? In the process of giving aid for the poor, aid is not distributed randomly or we give it for the people we love, for people we know, people like us, but aid is given for anyone who needs assistance. In line with this issues, (Carr, McAuliffe, and MacLachlan, 1998) claim that ‘aid’ highlights the human potential of feeling understanding with others deprived of the essential resources that the donor himself possesses even though the recipients do not belong to his immediate family or group of kinship (McAuliffe, and MacLachlan, 1998). In simple terms, aid distribution tells us not just to help some people – people we love, people we know, people like us, people who might help us in return – but to help anyone who needs it.

To avoid confusions from the various uses of the term and misinterpretation of it, this thesis follows the definition of foreign aid given by DAC(Development Assistance Committee) which is one of the subcommittees under OECD (Organization for Economic Development and Cooperation). Making up the term “ODA (Official Development Assistance),” which presently has gained international use, referring to and substituting for the term aid, DAC provides a clear

definition of aid or equivalent with the notion of aid. DAC defined aid as the transfers of resource from developed countries and multilateral institutions to developing countries. It is provided by official agencies including, the state and local governments or by their executive agencies. However, I argue that aid is not only the transfer of resource from the developed nations to the developing nations, but it should be given consideration for what is transferred and the interest behind the aid. Hence, aid should include elements such as brain gain/drain due to migration from the developing nation to the developed countries, resource extraction by developed countries in the developing countries and cheap labor force exploited by industries of industrialized states.

2.2.2. Development Aid

The practice of development aid has a long history. The existing pattern is the product of aid projects and institutions established across long range of time. In this regard, (Katarian Tomasveski, 1993) argue that, “the origin of government-to-government aid goes back to the Renaissance that is when the Italian princes used it as a tool of foreign policy” (Tomasveski, 1993:30). Meaning that, the revival of development aid is implicitly related with recollected account of aid.

On the other hand, the modern foreign aid regime began in 1949 when the U.S. government inaugurated economic assistance to the developing nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America (Amstutz, 2003: 208-209). The emergence of modern development aid is broadly traced to the United States president Harry Truman’s inaugural speech in 1949 (Pora Bjarnadottir, 2010). He stated the need to start on a clear and distinct new way for the development and growth for the people that are living in conditions approaching unhappiness.

The objective was to help the ‘free people’ of the world, through their own efforts. This was the first speech by a national leader outlining why and how it was necessary to provide aid to the “underdeveloped” countries (Truman, 2008). In line with Truman’s speech, Gilbert Rist (1997) argues that, this dialogue advanced an entire new way of thinking international relations. The existence of the term “underdevelopment” brought up the idea of the opportunity to develop a country. This new expression was used to rationalize the process of decolonization after the Second World War, allowing access to new markets in the developing countries (Rist,1997: 72-

75). This clearly shows that development aid has been employed as an instrument of foreign policy during the late 1940s.

However, the standard approach of development aid has focused on the purpose for which aid is given. Development aid, as its name indicates, it is the one that is provided for development purpose which includes overall improvement of social, political and cultural life of people. It should work towards human wellbeing and social welfare at large. The most common meaning that centers on the idea of development aid contributes to human wellbeing and development in poor countries (Rogel, Riddle 2007). Accordingly, the aim of development aid is to help the poor nations in their effort to attain development. This type of aid differs from other kinds of aids, because it focuses on overall economic development in the poor countries. It is not particularly designed to reduce poverty. In this respect, development aid is a kind of assistance that the wealthy nations give aid to the poor nations for the purpose of development. Moreover, William Easterly defines development aid as;

... the combination of money, advice, and conditions provided by rich nations and international financial institutions, such as the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (IMF), which is designed to achieve economic development in poor nations (Easterly, 2007:1).

What is understandable from the above definition is that the source of development aid is the amalgamation of currency, guidance and situation supplies by the rich developed nations constitutional like World Bank (WB) and International Monetary Fund (IMF) that is a planed to realize economic development in poor nations. Development aid also comes from the developed countries and some developing countries like OPEC members (ibid).

In giving aid, donors use different channels. The common channels are the multilateral and bilateral channels (Cassen and Associates, 1994: 3). Multilateral aid system gives aid through international and regional agencies indirectly to assist the poor. An international multilateral aid agency includes, International Development Assistance (IDA), which a counts for the largest portion of multilateral ODA and the World Bank soft loan window. Regional agencies include the regional banks like African Development Bank (ADB), Asian Development Bank (ADB) and Inter-American Development Bank. Bilateral aid flows through each countries aid agencies, such

as United States Agency for International Development (USAID) for the US, and UK's Department of International Development (DFID). Two-thirds of aid is bilateral, which flows directly to the recipient countries (Forsyth, 2005: 18-19.)

On the other hand, ODA through multilateral organizations is called "multilateral ODA," while that between a donor country and a recipient country is called "bilateral ODA." Multilateral channel also includes the UN 'family' of specialized agency like UN Development Program (UNDP), and a number of smaller UN agencies like Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) (Cassese and Associates, 1994: 4). Development aid also comes from Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) such as Oxfam and CARE, and private aid agencies by raising funds from public to encourage development in developing nations.

In its application development aid takes two forms; project and program aid. Project aid is the most common form of foreign aid that spends on a particular project such as, road building, supplies for school, health and water. In this aid form, the donors and recipients agree to spend the fund on specific projects. However, program aid is not associated with a specific program. It makes cash available for the entire recipient country; it makes resource freely available to government budget (Forsyth, 2005: 19).

The preceding discussion reveals that the term development aid emerged over long period of time and under significant debates and controversies. As a result, it became difficult to unanimously define it. This in turn led to the existence of various definitions for the term. In the meantime, common elements that developed as the defining feature of the concept emerged. As far as my understanding is concerned, development aid refers to external aid to low-income countries as offered in clear concessional resource, allotments to increase welfare in those countries. It has also been clear that development aid emerges from different sources and flow through different channels. Development aid also varies in terms of its purpose and forms.

2.2.3. The Contribution of Development Aid to Development

Nowadays development aid becomes an international phenomenon and public interest because of its complexity and harsh conditionality attached to it. Despite this, there are critical debates on the impact of development aid. In order to analyze this debate, Lancaster (1999: 4) uses two approaches by acknowledging the risk of oversimplification. These are contextual approach and

instrumental approach. I would discuss these approaches one by one in the following sub sections.

2.2.3.1 Contextual Approach.

This approach investigates the impact of aid in development in the broad economic and political context in which it is provided. It tends to be more theoretical and depends up on theory rather than as practical implication.

Contextual approach also uses state and market's role in development. The mainstream economists, during the 1950s and 1960s, stated that underdevelopment is a result of lack of sufficient capital for saving and investment (Lancaster, 1999: 6-7). Because of the deficiencies in resource in poor countries, they argue that we need economic cooperation by which we can stimulate the economy of “underdeveloped” nations (ibid: 7). The 1980s and 1990s economists also argue that foreign aid can play a role in the development of nations if it is provided to the state as an incentive to encourage good policies and regular reforms. In this connection aid can be effective tool in promoting democracy in developing countries (ibid).

2.2.3.2 Instrumental Approach

The second approach is instrumental which uses empirical evidence to examine the role of development aid (ibid). This approach by using different theories examines the contribution of aid for development. One of the theories is ‘dependency’ theory. According to this theory, the relationship between the capitalist (the “center”) and the “developing” countries (the “peripheries”) is exploitative. Dependency theory viewed aid as a “tool of capitalism to reinforce exploitative behavior and therefore deepen underdevelopment and poverty” (Lancaster, 1999: 4). The advocates of this school view development and other related concepts with development as the inventions of Western capitalists; which intended to create a good way to exercise their power over the developing world. The approach characterizes foreign aid as a tool for the exercise of power by donors.

However, Graham Hancock investigates the role of aid in “developing” nations and he argued that the aid agencies are not working to alleviate the poor from underdevelopment but corrupted leaders with greedy economic motive are worsening the problem of the poor. He further argues, “Aid is not help” and “aid” in the present context is the transfer of resources from poor countries to rich countries. Therefore, he concluded that it should stop now (Hancock, 1989: 189).

In addition to Hancock ideas, Cassen and Associates (1994), in their book *Does Aid Work?* argue that “Most aid does indeed work”. Aid succeeds in achieving its development objective, and contributes positively to the recipient countries economic performance. But, they don’t mean that aid works in every circumstance. The multiple and complex motives of aid may affect its effectiveness (1994: 7). This shows how development aid has its own contribution in the development process when it is used effectively for the proposed occasion. Thus, development aid or the assistance that is given for the development has played a crucial role to development.

From the above discussion, we notice that development aid is a very complicated issue. We came across a number of arguments on the role of development aid. There are opponents and proponents of development aid. It is clear that if development aid is not correctly used and correctly managed as Samir Amin 2005 cited in Goulet says, it might be a tool for social control and its negative impact may outweigh its positive impact so that we should critically examine why aid is not effective and the shortcomings of development.

2.2.4. The Shortcomings of Development Aid

The purpose of development aid is to accelerate the economic development of the recipient countries and to solve problems that are caused by underdevelopment. However, development aid is criticized for not having contributed to economic growth and poverty reduction. Before I discuss the shortcomings of development aid, I want to analyze aid effectiveness, because this understanding enables us to know why aid is not effective and to identify the controversial issues and problems that are attached to aid.

In this respect, aid effectiveness, most of the time is associated with development effectiveness. With regard to developed and the developing nations, the effectiveness of aid is determined by development effectiveness in the region (Cassen and Associates, 1994: 10). For example, Sub-Saharan Africa has been the most difficult environment for development generally and therefore for aid (ibid). When we compare this region with other regions like Asia it is a disadvantageous region because of political instability, weak administrative institutions, smaller proportion of literacy and educated people and external dependency on primary commodity facing highly instable markets. All these factors become major obstacles to development (Cassen and Associates, 1994: 10). But it is right to say that there are common factors that determine

effectiveness of aid like good governance, political stability, honest and capable administration, effective institutions and favorable policy for development.

In addition, Cassen and Associates further argue the factors affecting aid effectiveness both from the donors and the recipients' side (1994: 11-13). From the recipient side most of the time we get the problem of good governance. "Good governance upholds the rule of law and it facilitates effective utilization of resource through non corrupted governance. It also includes accountable and transparent way of governance to promote the general social welfare" (Saba Haile, 2008: 22). Precisely it is to say that the way the country is governed will affect its rate of development and it is obvious that "countries that have enjoyed political stability are more likely to develop than countries that lack this" (Congressional Review of Development Literature, 2003: 5 quoted in Saba 2008: 22).

In addition, good policy is also one of the factors that affect aid effectiveness. A number of scholars argue that the main impediment to growth were misguided government policies. The World Bank announced that aid works only in good environment for development (World Bank, 2002: 89). This shows that regardless of the amount of aid given to the countries, if government policy and administrative capacity is not good, aid may not make any kind of difference in the economy of a country. As result, different donors' motive, aid sometimes fails to achieve its goal. One of the most common causes for the failure of aid is excessive commercial and political motives. Besides this, many projects that are implemented in the recipient countries are technically poor, ill designed and indifferent to the local circumstances and failed to learn from the mistake (Cassen and Associates, 1994: 11-12).

Most aid programs to developing nations were accompanied by donors' motive to pursue high diplomatic recognition such as establishing military bases (Lancaster, 1999: 75-76). Aid in most cases reinforced the political links of dependency. It provided access to the developed nation to control the developing nations. Accordingly, developing nations are forced to follow uncomfortable political system. There is a gap between the interest of government of poor countries and its citizens.

Moreover, development aid because of its failure to give much attention for the interest of citizens' wellbeing and because of lack of procedure to follow up aid effectiveness, aid

sometimes is diverted to non-productive activity to oppress the poor people because, there is always ill political system and lack of patriotism and national unity (Spero, 1977: 142). Development aid can also create negative impacts on the initiative and accountability of the recipient government officials. The basic problem in poor countries is lack of good governance to establish and maintain effective planning budget and program in different sectors. If these activities of the poor government are left to donors, of government of the poor countries, unaccountability to their population is inevitable (Lancaster 1999: 67-68). Greedy economic motives also have a considerable place. The most common requirement of the economic motive of the donors is that the aid given to the developing world should be spent on goods and services that are produced in the developed world. This is most of the time done by putting conditionality on aid. Through tying their aid, donor countries often require the recipient to purchase goods and services from the donors (ibid: 77).

Economically, aid tying is not good for the recipient countries, because it ignores the ‘comparative advantage’ of the poor countries. Besides this, the donors used aid as a means to subsidize their own companies by letting them to ship their goods to poor countries that have no quality. In this connection, the donors do not want to see competing industry and by there, they discourage development (Spero 1977: 144).

Development aid sometimes targets only the economic growth of a country. It ignores the social welfare of the society. Growth in developing nations did not lead to social welfare and seem to aggravate the unequal distribution of income (Spero, 1977: 142). “Aid also creates foreign debt that might never finance by developing nations and it creates distortion in the overall economy” (Pronk, 2001: 620, quoted in Saba, 2008: 19).

In this connection, Saba (2008) tries to show that development aid creates a demand and dependency syndrome. She argues that;

Development aid creates a demand and dependency of aid rather than boosting the economy and substantial increase in available resources. The food producers may not encourage producing more and the business men may not actively engage in business, if aid can cover the economy. Accordingly, it creates distortions in investment and loss of domestic market (2008: 28).

Moreover, development aid is also criticized because of its failure to appreciate the indigenous knowledge of the recipient countries. For example, the donor favors those countries in which donors' culture, religion or language is already established. This can be showed as the outcome of aid. For example, promotion of the use of a particular language in academic life of the students and adhering to the particular religions and culture of the developed nations (Lancaster, 1999: 77). In this regard, the donors do not appreciate the culture, religion and language of recipient countries. In this case, development aid is used as a means to substitute indigenous knowledge or foreign skills that are irrelevant to the life of the poor people.

2.2.5 Arguments against Aid

The arguments against aid implicitly have a connotation that the poor people in the developing country do not have a right to get development cooperation from developed nations. This implies that developed nations do not have any obligation to give aid for underdeveloped nations. Indeed, the act of development aid most of the time goes simultaneously with our conception of development and it can be justified and attacked with reference to our moral principle that we are following.

In this respect, Cees J. Hamelink (1997) argues that the question of development aid is unavoidable in political, economic and social issue (Hamelink, 1997). Based upon the given paradigm of philosophy, a number of arguments are given to defend the view that rich countries have no duty to give aid to the poor countries.

Accordingly, to justify their argument the opponents of aid give different reasons as to why the rich countries do not have an obligation to give aid. They have try to persuade the rich countries that they should refuse their aid. I will examine some of reasons below. There are different arguments that states that developed countries do not have obligations to give aid to the developing countries. These are; world population trend, ecological catastrophe, beyond the domain of our responsibility, liberty of the people and aid effectiveness.

2. 2.5.1 World Population Trend

It is obvious that currently the greatest problem of our world is population growth that becomes the major cause and a great impediment in the struggle to alleviate the poor from absolute poverty (Geoffrey McNicoll, 1999). In addition, an objection is given to refuse aid that goes to poor nations, because helping those currently in poverty will only ensure that more people are

born to live in poverty in the future and aid simply fuels the population explosion which simply produces more evil in the poor countries. Therefore, they argue that they should not give aid to the poor countries (Dower, 1991:276). In this respect, this objection sometimes adopts a policy of “triage.” This term comes from medical polices adopted in war time, with too few doctors to cope with all the casualties (Singer, 2003). The wounded were divided into three categories; those who would probably survive without medical assistance; those who might survive if they received assistance but otherwise probably would not, and those who even with medical assistance probably would not survive (Singer, 2003: 609). Analogically, the proponents of this school argue that this policy should apply to countries; accordingly we would aid those countries where our help might make the difference between successes and failure in bringing food and population imbalance (ibid).

Similarly, adopting this policy means cutting off assistance to these countries and allowing famine, disease, war and natural disaster to reduce the population of those countries. The proponents of this argument propose that “we have to check population in poor countries by rising death rate - that is, by increasing malnutrition and related diseases by widespread famines; by increasing infant mortality; and by epidemics of infectious diseases” (ibid: 670). They further argue that when our capacity to help is finally unable to cope, the suffering will be greater than it would be if we stop the help now. Therefore, I think, what is concluded from the above argument shows it is morally wrong to give aid for the poor.

However, this approach has attracted wider critic from scholars and policy makers. The policy of “triage” first was adopted during war time to use the limited medical equipment and human resource to save people who could be survived and its very name indicates to us the assignment of degree of urgency to wounds or illness to decide the order to treatment of a large number of patients or casualties. But, the policy that was implemented to population problem is illogical, immoral and inhumane. The analogy between the war time and this world’s capacity is not correct. According to some studies, the world can produce ample food to feed its inhabitants and according to some estimates, the world can feed ten times as many (Singer, 2001: 662).

Having this point in mind, one can ask a question that why are people constantly hungry? It is because of lack of distributive justice and lack of sense of humanity between nations and because of exploitative economic, political and social structure that exists now and in the past. Singer

added to this argument. He claims that the problem is not the world cannot produce enough food but it is because of the lack of equal distribution and the consumption driven life style of Westerners. He says, “The poor people only consume 180s kilos of grain a year but North Americans consume 900 kilos of grain a year” (2003: 602). He further argues that this gap is caused because the affluent nations feed grain to animals and “if we stopped feeding animals on grain and soybeans the amount of food saved would if distributed to those who need it be more than enough to end hunger throughout the world” (Singer, 2003: 602).

Moreover, Garrett Hardin has also supported an objection to give aid. He formed allegory that those rich countries are like the occupants of a crowded lifeboat a drift in sea full of drawing people. The allegory is as follows:

So here we sit, say 50 people in our lifeboat. To be generous let us assume it has room for 10 more, making a total capacity of 60. Suppose the 50 of us in the life boat see 100 others swimming in the water outside begging for admitting to our boat or for handouts... if we take them all into our boat, then the boat swamps everyone drowns justice, complete catastrophe (1974: 1).

The above metaphor inferred that it is better to save some than all. Hardin argues that the people in the lifeboat should leave the people in the water to die or to get a solution for their own problem. Therefore, he concludes that the rich countries have no obligation to give aid for the poor people. He also states in his book entitled “Lifeboat Ethics” that case against helping the poor. In addition, he came-up with the argument against offering aid for the needy.

On the other hand, the strict ethics of “lifeboat ethics” becomes stricter when we consider the reproductive rate of the people outside the boat and inside the boat. The doubling time for people inside the boat is 87 years whereas the people outside of the boat double themselves in 35 years. Therefore, the only way that Hardin proposed as a solution is to eliminate the population of poor countries by leaving them to die by crop failure and famine. He argues that the rich countries should not give aid to the poor countries because if poor countries constantly receive food, the rate of their population would increase (Hardin, 1974: 5).

However, I disagree with Hardin’s arguments regarding assisting the poor in developing countries, for the reason that our world is becoming one community through globalization, because of globalization all countries are viewed as part of one political, economic and social

community. I think it is not logical to think that the rich countries are absolutely separated from the poor countries like that of Hardin's lifeboat. The political, economic, social and environmental problems of one country now- a-days can be considered as part global problems. I think what Hardin and his followers missed is the interdependence or mutualism of one country with the rest of the world.

2.2.5.2 Ecological Catastrophe

The other major argument against giving aid is an ecological disaster. This argument states that population growth is considered as a cancer, and we are spreading this cancer by giving aid which can increase the birth rate of the poor countries (Warren M. Hern, 1993). As such, his argument states about avoiding aid and the solution is to cut-off aid for the poor. On the other hand, by giving aid, we are threatening the future generation. For example, Hardin argues that "humanitarian is our intent, every life saved through medical or nutritional assistance from abroad diminishes the quality of life for those who remain and for subsequent generations" (1974: 7). He said that there is a failure to consider the fundamentals of human ecology in the well-intended humanitarian effort.

In addition, Alan Gregg, a vice president of the Rockefeller Foundation associated the growth and the spread of humanity over the surface of the earth to the spread of cancer in the human body, remarking that "cancerous growths demand food but and far as I know they have never been cured by getting it" (quoted in Hardin, 1974: 6).

Similarly, this kind of inclination is also reflected among self-professed deep ecologists like Davell For man who believes that 'famines are natures' 'population control' and immigration into the US should be restricted in order to preserve "our" ecological resource (quoted in Bookchin, 1994: 230). Hardin further said that we should follow "close door" policy to save what we have because unrestricted immigration moves people to food thus speeding up distraction of the environment of the rich countries. One of the proponents of deep ecology called Devall Forman said the following:

When I tell people how the worst thing we should do in Ethiopia is to give aid-the best thing would be to just let nature seek its own balance, to let the people there just starve they think this is monstrous... Likewise, letting the USA be an overflow

value for problems in Latin America is not solving a thing. It's just putting more pressure on the resource we have in USA (quoted in Bookchin, 1994: 230).

In line with the above point, Malthus in his essay tries to show that population grows geometrically whereas our resource grows arithmetically. He claims that “hunger, poverty, disease and untimely death are inevitable precisely because the population and food supply increase at different rates. Hence, war, famine and plagues (Malthus later added “moral restraint”) were necessary to keep population down” (quoted in Bookchin, 1994: 235).

On the other hand, the Neo-Malthusians considered human being as “fruit flies” but human reproductive behavior is profoundly conditioned by cultural values, standards of living, social, traditional, gender relations, religions belief, socio-political conflict and expectation ((Bookchin, 1994: 235). Demography is not only a mere number of a given population. It profoundly involves different and complex political, economic and social interpretation of the given population. Both Malthus and Hardin think that they must let nature to balance the population. Both of them fail to go beyond this means.

2.2.5.3. Beyond the Domain of Our Responsibility

Some writers object to the idea that the developed nations have a duty to give aid for distant people (Dower, 1991). They argue that even though they have a duty to care for others, this duty is limited to some special geographical areas. Our duty to care does not extend to “other” communities. They claim, “Charity begins at home” by which they argue they have no duty to distant people (ibid). They do not want to consider suffering outside of their border, because this suffering belongs to other community. The argument further states that “our duty is bounded by our social relation they have towards one another within the community (ibid: 279).

Beside the above point, Dower argues that “charity begins here” presupposes aid also ends here. The claim that “we have only a duty to help people in our society” begs a question on what is a society and question of restricting morality in the given area.

Nowadays there is a sense not to restrict our citizenship in a given community. Dower asks us to look at the present condition of our globe. He says “we need only look at world trade, global institutions and environment interdependency. The world is therefore actually, and not potentially a moral community, we are global citizens even if we have not yet acquired our

global soul” (1991: 180). Therefore, aid must be seen and given as an expression of our moral responsibility towards our fellow citizens.

2.2.5.4 Liberty of the People

The other argument that is used to refuse aid to the developing nation is the liberty of the people. It states that “people are morally entitled to what they possess and therefore have no duty to throw it away” (Brain. 2011). No one is permitted to take another’s property and nothing should force him or her to give his or her property to sustain another life. The supporters of this claim argued that to tax its people to finance “welfare” program or overseas aid program is immoral and illegal (ibid).

In another way, they argued that foreign aid is a kind of involvement in the affairs of poor countries which is immoral and attacking the liberty of the people. Further, they argued that they have no way to know what the poor people’s need. There are a number of complex things that they should consider like culture, religion, language and social structure. Since it is difficult to determine these things, it is better to refrain themselves from involvement. This objection to give aid faces a radical objection from a “negative action” thesis (Dower, 1991: 281). This thesis depends upon the question that the moral significance of the distribution often drawn between “doing” and “letting happen”. Both libertarians and those who support “our obligation is restricted for our community” in one way or another way let people to die by misery. The “negative action” thesis show us that “if killing is wrong, i.e., causing a person to die, then what is so different about letting someone die, i.e., not acting to prevent the death where one could have intervened? Is not one’s failure to act part of the casual chain that led to the person’s death”(Dower, 1991:281)? Therefore, letting people suffer would seem morally equivalent to killing them. The general idea of “negative action” thesis is that we are responsible at least a degree for the evils they can prevent as well as for the evil we actually cause (Dower, 1991: 281).

I think, the very notion of liberty is explored in a way that one is free to the degree that nobody interferes with one’s activity. Therefore, libertarians strongly disagree that they are not morally obliged to give aid for the developing countries and the moral obligation to give aid is against individual freedom. However, I argue that in case of liberty which is giving aid to poor is

possible only to the extent that when individuals are volunteers in the acts of aid providing. This means without enforcing the freedom of individuals there is a possibility of aiding the needy.

2.2.5. 5. Aid Effectiveness

The other reason some writers give to support the idea that we have no obligation to give aid is aid effectiveness. They argue that since foreign aid is not effective the affluent nations have no moral duty to throw away their wealth for something useless (Brain, 2011). The reasons they give for aid's ineffectiveness are corruption, political system, deformed economic policies and social structure (ibid). Furthermore, they argue that aid is used to perpetuate problems in poor countries because in most cases the finance is used to strengthen the power of corrupted governments. Therefore, pragmatically it is immoral to give aid.

Similarly, one of the proponents of this argument is the Zambian Economist, Dambisa Moyo (2009), who claimed that aid itself is what is keeping Africa poor. She argues that development aid simply doesn't work, but filled the treasure of the elites (ibid). She identifies corruption as the main impediment of development. Aid creates a sense of dependency in the rich countries and creates material inequality between the elites and the "mass". According to this view they claim that they should not give aid to the poor countries. The way out according to Moyo is to balance the budget of Africa and other developing continents. This recommendation includes inciting foreign investment, taxing money sent home from abroad, issuing government bonds and increasing export and substituting import (Brain, 2011). Even though Moyo identifies corruption as the cause of underdevelopment, she did not work to solve this problem. She simply argued that the rich countries should stop giving aid to poor countries because it is not effective in alleviating the poor from absolute poverty.

Development aid, as I have tried to show earlier, should work to solve the problem of good governance, deformed policies and problems that are attached with development. If not, what is the point of development aid? Moyo failed to understand that corruption and other related problems of good governance will continue even though the rich countries cut-off their aid. She did not give a place for what "good aid" but it is an aid that fuels corruption can do in the poor centuries.

According to some critics like Madeleine Bunting, Moyo's "proposal to phase out aid in five years is disastrously irresponsible, it would lead to the closure of thousands of schools and clinics across Africa and the end of ... emergency food supplies on which millions of lives depend" (Bunting, 2009: 3).

The above discussions reveal that the scholars who argue against aid have proposed that aid should be cut-off for various reasons. The reasons among others include, balancing population growth reducing ecological catastrophe, limiting domain of responsibility, for the liberty of people and avoiding negative impacts of aid. However, the proponents of this view tend to justify the consequences that lack of aid would cause to humanity and nature surroundings. I will discuss the argument for aid and the criticism for this objection in the next chapter.

In this chapter, I have tried to illuminate the importance of some concepts basic to the entire thesis. Based on Goulet's definitions, I have stated that development should be understood as a multidisciplinary concept. It encompasses both descriptive and normative aspects of human development. I have argued that development must include ethical reflection on the strategies, policy and other techniques that facilitate economic progress and human wellbeing. In this regard, development must be a guarantee to political stability and assurance to peaceful and responsible institution. The other important concepts that have been discussed in this chapter are the concepts aid and development aid. In additions, in this chapter, I have discussed the contributions of development aid to development and the shortcomings of development aid.

Moreover, I have discussed different arguments against aid including ecological catastrophe, world population trend, liberty of the people and aid effectiveness. In the next chapter, I will discuss the ethics of aid, the ethical dilemma in aid and the arguments for giving aid for the poor in the developing countries.

Chapter Three: The Ethics of Aid

In the preceding chapter I have discussed the concept of development aid, including its development, scopes and objectives. I also discussed the concept of aid, its historical development, constituents and principal aims. The main objective of this chapter is to critically analyze the ethics of aid. In doing so, it would highlight the essence and features of ethics and critically examine major issues under the ethics of aid and so as to indicate what moral controversies each of them have. It would also explain important issues in the ethics of aid and ethical principles in support of aid.

3.1. The Concepts of Ethics

Ethics is a branch of philosophy. It is also known as moral philosophy. It asks basic questions about the good life, what is better and worse and other issues related to our obligation (Miller, 1948). Accordingly, ethics is a general term for what is often described as the study of morality. In addition, etymologically the word ethics comes from the Greek word *ethos*; which is equivalent to 'morals'. It "typically begins with what is a rather deep-rooted part of everyday practice, i.e. the making of moral judgments and the thinking of moral thoughts" (Francis Snare 1992:8). Ethics is also defined as the systematic reflection on what is moral (James Rachels, 2003). In this definition, morality is the whole of opinions, decisions and actions with which people express what they think is good and right. So, in short, to think ethically, you need to systematically reflect on what people think is good and right. I think, what is inferred from this analysis is that morally right action is determined in terms of what brings gratification to oneself. This implies that in philosophy, ethical behavior is that which is "good" and "right."

Moreover, the field of ethics involves systematizing, defending, and recommending concepts of right and wrong behavior. Philosophers today usually divide ethical theories into three general subject areas: meta-ethics, normative ethics, and applied ethics (Snare, 1992). Meta-ethics is ethical theory that investigates where our ethical principles come from, and what they mean. It asks whether they are merely social inventions, and whether they involve more than expressions of our individual emotions. It provides answers to these questions by focusing on the issues of universal truths, the role of reason in ethical judgments, and the meaning of ethical terms themselves (*ibid*). Normative ethics on the other hand, takes on a more practical task, which is to

arrive at moral standards that regulate right and wrong conduct. This may involve articulating the good habits that we should acquire, the duties that we should follow, or the consequences of our behavior on others. Finally, applied ethics involves examining specific controversial issues, such as abortion, infanticide, animal rights, environmental concerns, homosexuality, capital punishment, or nuclear war, aid controversies and the like.

3.2. Ethical Dilemmas and the Issues in the Ethics of Aid

Under this topic, I would briefly explain the moral controversies in action and in the ethics of aid. Before analyzing the dilemmas in aid, it is important to discuss philosophical foundation for these ethical controversies.

In the world that we live, every society has different moral codes that enable it to differentiate what is wrong and what is right. These moral codes oblige us to raise a question about moral quality of the choice that we make in our day-to-day activity. The main problem in our choice of moral codes can be determined by a number of factors that surround us or in a condition that we are involved. In every instance of our activity, we are forced to ask questions such as “what kind of choice is morally defensible?” “How should we act?” “What standards should we follow?” And “how should we treat the problem around us?” The popular usage of morality enables us to judge about right and wrong (Hamelink, 1997: 11). What each of us needs in order to deal with ethical dilemmas is not a set of answers provided by someone else, but a set of skills that enable us to arrive at answers and make decisions for ourselves. This is important partly because it enables us to take greater control of our lives and partly because we do not yet know all the ethical questions which are likely to face us (Anne Thomson, 1999: 1).

In order to better understand the term ethical dilemma, it would be important to consider some definitions of the concept. According to Your dictionary, “ethical dilemma can be defined as a choice between two options, both of which will bring negative results based on society or personal guidelines”. It is also known as moral dilemmas which describe a situation in which there is a choice to be made between two options, neither of which resolves the situation in an ethically acceptable way.

As it can be understood from this definition, ethical dilemma happens in a situation where one agrees and disagrees; it is the trouble of deciding between two alternatives which are adverse.

Similarly, Oxford dictionary defines ethical dilemma as “a situation in which a person must choose between two courses of action of approximately equal moral importance, so that the choice necessarily entails the transgression of an important moral principle.”

From the above definitions, it has been clear that ethical dilemma occurs while making a decision that can result in negative consequences by comparing it with other similar choice that must be ignored. In short, it involves taking risks and accepting controversial alternative over the other. In this regard, provision of aid to the poor also poses such moral dilemmas. That is examining the rightness and the wrongness of aid issue is very difficult, as it involves dividing public opinion and controversial donor interest. Some say that giving aid to the poor is right; others would say that it is wrong. That is why aid issues are said to be under the ethical dilemmas.

To make clear how ethical dilemmas practically happen in aid, it is important to look at concrete examples. European Union has been supporting poor countries in Africa for a long period. However, it withdraws from some countries due to sanctions laid by international organizations and United Nations Organs. One of such countries that are recently under sanction is the state of Eritrea. As a result of the sanction, EU has withdrawn its aid program to Eritrea. This in turn has resulted in increased migration from that poor country to EU itself which put the latter under ethical dilemma as to whether to restore aid and stop the exodus or to sustain the sanction and pressurize the government of Eritrea.

Since recently, EU has started to revise its policy and implement limited and targeted approach that allows provision of some projects in Eritrea in order to save the EU from the migration crisis it is facing. This choice is made after entering the ethical dilemma of sustaining sanctions or lifting the sanction and providing aid to Eritrea by the EU which clearly shows how the dilemma occurs in practical examples.

Having discussed ethical dilemma I can now proceed to discuss issues that can be raised under the ethics of aid. As Gasper (2004) shows it the issues in the ethics of aid explained in the following passage:

Major issues in the ethics of aid includes at least the following conditions: first, whether and why such aid should exist, and in what circumstances, if any; second, the quantities of aid to be offered by, or required from, specific richer agents, and from which agents; third, for which countries; fourth, for which sectors and uses; fifth, questions of how to conduct aid work, about the manner and conditions under which aid is provided; sixth, how to evaluate aid projects and programs (2004, 28-29).

From the above discussions it is possible to infer that ethics of aid requires the reasoning and inquiry regarding rationale, the context, amount, destination and the approach used while providing aid. I would briefly discuss these issues below.

The first major issue that can be raised under the ethics of aid is the question “why should aid exist or why aid is given?” According to Little, the reason the need to provide aid to the poor arises from humanitarian point of view. This implies that the developed nations should give assistance to poor by the virtue of being human. It is also shows the necessity of aid is derived from the extreme condition of human suffering that is associated with poverty and inequality that exist in the many parts of the world (Little, 2003). In line with this point, Kant argues that aid given to the poor should be seen as “obligation of benevolence” (Kant quoted in Little 2003: 172). I think this shows that it is unethical for the people to live with circumstances of extreme deprivation. For example, as Little argues, when a person is in a situation of extreme deprivation and has a capacity to reduce that deprivation, he or she have a prima facie obligation to provide aid (ibid). He further argues that individuals who live in developed world generally have moral obligations to help the needy. Hence, such persons have natural obligation to give aid for the poor in the developing nations.

In addition, I claim that, aid is not only given from the point of humanity only; but also given from environmental perspectives; since the developed nations affect the environment by emitting and releasing huge amount of carbon dioxide to the environment. This adversely affects African economy that is based on seasonal rain. Thus, developed nations should compensate for the poor, because of the polluting the environment which in turn poses a great challenge to livelihood of people in developing countries. In addition, industrialized nations must pay for past injuries they committed during colonialism, imperialism and slave trade.

But the question is “how much aid?” The reflections of this question inferred from two perspectives. These are donors and recipient (Little, 2003). In this regard, from the perception of developed countries or the donors we can ask how much percentage of income (GDP or personal income), is reasonable to expect to be provided as aid (ibid). For example, the United Nations has recommended that OECD nations should contribute 0.7 percent of their GDP to official development assistance. Religious group sometimes advocate a practice of “paying- offering 10 percent of one’s income to charitable purpose (ibid). Similarly, Singer (1972) supports the principle of giving up to the point at which marginal utility of the last donation is equal for self and other (cited in Little, 2003). This rationale would have driven individual’s income down to the level of that reasonably rich citizen of a developing country. So Singer’s principle is logical and persuasive.

On the other hand, the second view on the quantity of aid is from the donor’s point of view. According to Little (2003) the individuals give some weight and recognition when they make decision on expenditure. In other words, personal and familial consumption is legitimate priority and recognition of human reality of others in the ethical necessity. I think, what is understandable here is the question how much aid from donors point view depends on the limitation of resource that not satisfies the need and wants of the poor. This means there is scarcity of resources to provide sufficient aid to the poor.

Generally, the discussion on how much aid should be given for the developing nations does not answer how much the exact quantity of aid should be. It rather suggests that an ethical person will make the ethical plan and decision under the condition that the expenditure profile should result from the consideration that gives weight to both personal and extra personal need. Therefore, there is no ethically accurate answer for the question how much aid rather than an imperative suggestion to give weight to the curiosity of others.

The third important issue in the ethics of aid revolves around the question “for which countries aid is given”. From common sense, there are some objective criteria that make a given state/community eligible for aid. Among others, absolute poverty, natural disaster, famine, civil war and drought are some of the common reasons that make a given nations to ask for and get access to aid from the international society. Thus, aid should be given for the needy people in poor nations or for those affected by sudden natural or man-made disaster. Stemming from this I

argue that we do not give aid for the people we know, people like us and people we love but aid is given for anyone who needs assistance. So, the actual deprivation and vulnerability of people in poor or affected areas of the world justifies the ethics of aid.

3.3. Why Ethics of Aid Matters

The reason to ask “why ethics of aid matters” is to analyze the moral concern of aid action. Here I want to examine aid from the perspective of applied ethics. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, applied ethics is a branch of ethical theory that discusses moral and controversial issues. Accordingly, giving and taking aid could be taken as controversial ethical issue since it could be evaluated in terms of right and wrong. For example, when Mr. X says giving or taking aid is right or wrong; the very statement of Mr. X could be moral statement. This is for the simple reason that, the given action is evaluated in terms of right or wrong. Depending on this point, it is possible to bring aid issues under the views of applied ethics.

3.4 Critical Assessment of the Moral Importance of Aid

There are a number of moral considerations that can be used to justify my argument that the developed nations have a moral obligation to give aid to the poor. This implies that the developed nations have a moral duty to improve the life of the poor in the developing countries. According to Little, these moral duties resulted from altruism or the ego of other, justice and past injustice (2003:185). Specifically, this moral obligation implies that those nations in the developed world have to give material support to improve the condition of life in the developing nations (ibid).

As I mentioned earlier in chapter two there are different arguments that defend the position that developed countries do not have a moral obligation to give aid for the needy in the developing nations. Here, I will briefly discuss different moral theories that support giving aid for the poor in the developing countries.

3.4.1 Moral Theories in Support of Giving Aid

Several related moral principles are raised to support the obligation to give aid. This obligation to give aid is in most cases derived from the moral importance of humanity. In this section I want to demonstrate why the rich countries should give aid. Even though there are a number of reasons why the wealthy countries are obliged to give aid, we can mention two arguments that have

normally been used in support of transfers of aid from the developed countries to developing countries. One set of arguments is based on the economic and strategic self-interest of the donor country. A second set of arguments is based on the ethical or moral responsibility of the residents of wealthy countries toward the residents of poor countries. I will begin with the moral reason.

3.4.1.1. Altruism

The first moral principle that obliged someone to give aid is altruism. Altruism is an expression of a concern for the welfare of others without having a direct material benefit from the activity we perform (Little, 2003: 172).). Beside Little's claim, other scholars from the humanist school claim that aid is about altruistically aiming to help poor people in other countries (Busby, 2007; Stokke, 1989). In relation to the above point there are a number of people and groups who are working for the good of others, especially religious groups. They argued that human beings have a biological imperative which pushes them to behave in an altruistic manner (Wise Geek, 2011). Altruism, most of the time, is misunderstood by a number of writers. In this thesis, I employed 'altruism' to mean an expression of kindness or belongingness to other people without having a direct material benefit. We can get some benefit from the activity we perform but we are working regardless of the consequence. One who behaves in an altruistic manner may get a psychological satisfaction (Geek, 2011). I think this kind of reward is unavoidable from human nature.

Similarly, the notion of altruism totally opposes the argument from liberty with regard to aid. Since, from the libertarian point of view, giving aid is against the freedom of the individual. However, altruism is a moral principle that can be used to argue that the wealthy countries have a moral obligation to give aid for the developing countries. Instead in giving aid the wealthy countries are then required to express unselfish concern. In this case, altruism is a binding moral principle (Little, 2003: 172). Therefore, the above moral principle is the one that justifies or strengthens my argument that the developed nations have a moral obligation to give aid to the poor in the developing countries.

3.4.1.2. Justice

The very idea of justice lies in treating people equally and fairly. Justice requires us to do things without discrimination. This principle obliged the rich people to be fair in their economic order and in their international relations (Craig, 1998: 153). Justice, which obliged the rich countries to

assist the poor countries, arises from three related reasons. The first reason is the material inequalities that exist between the rich and the poor. In the rich countries, there is abundance of materials whereas in the poor countries people are suffering because of lack of food. This human suffering in the developing countries obliged the rich countries to distribute their wealth (Little, 2003: 172-173). In addition to the above point, there is the point that “the ethical frame of reference for debate on aid is the promotion of the greater justice within and among nations” (Goulet, 2005: 1).

However, this argument claims that both the moral and rational arguments that have been forwarded to support moral obligation for distribution of resources apply to individuals or families and not to collectives such as nations (Richard N. Cooper, 1977). I think the very notion of justice indicated as the point of reference for the structure of aid action especially in it is distribution. This implies that justice as to be a principle that defends the view that the developed nations have moral obligation to give aid for the developing nation. Thus, justice arguments are often invoked in connection with aid to the developing world. Regarding this point Little argues that, “the property of developed or the rich countries in the contemporary worldwide economy depends unavoidably on the contributions, resources, and labor of persons in developing countries” (2003: 172). And in this inclusive world the economic systems are becoming more cooperative. This cooperation requires us to fairly distribute what we get in the cooperation (ibid). As Little argues the second motive for the developed nations to be just shows that:

The rich countries to be just are the present exploitative nature of economic order. This current economic order treats the poor people unjustly. What the poor countries produce are primary goods and the rich countries produce technological equipment. This creates imbalance in the wealth of the rich and poor countries. Even sometimes the present economic order and international labor division are considered as a means of exploitation. The “non-exploitative” principle obliged us not to exploit the poor countries (2003:172).

Moreover, the main problem in the current system of development aid is exerting unfair conditionality that provides a power to wealthy countries to exercise their power on poor countries. If the wealthy countries continue to exert unfair economic power over the poor countries, the human condition in the poor countries will deteriorate. So the “non-exploitative” principle urged the wealthy countries to refrain themselves from exploitation of the poor (ibid).

The third reason why the rich countries are required to be just is because of the past action. The past injustices that exist between the rich countries and the poor countries obliged the rich countries to give development aid to restore the victims of the past. This argument often points out through the "New Economic Order" discourse of the 1970s was that there should be compensation by the affluent nations to poor nations for past injustices stopping from political power and economic exploitation (Singer,1997). This principle which requires us to restore the victims of the past is known as "restorative justice" (Little, 2003: 173). Clearly, the historical record shows that most of "underdeveloped" nations are colonized by "developed" nations. The poor country's resources have been forcibly extracted and exported to the colonial power like Great Britain and France. Thus, this entitlement strongly suggested that the rich countries have amoral obligation to restore the past victims.

Because of the past injustice writers like (Little 2003 and Streen 1976, cited in Gasper, 1992) argues that poverty is not an exclusive responsibility of the poor countries. The poverty of developing countries is systematically related to the past action and the wealthy nations are partly responsible for the underdevelopment of the poor countries. Accordingly, Little claims that the wealthy nations have responsibility to restore the past victims and to give assistance to the poor countries. He says, if we come to the conclusion that the poverty of developing world is systematically related to the wealthy of the First World and that the deprivation of specific persons is the necessary condition of the affluence of other persons - and if we judge that the results have come about through unfair or exploitative circumstances, then we have a strong obligation to correct the effects of injustice and to restore the current victims of these injustice to something like the condition they would have attained in the absence of the past injustice (2003: 173). As result, the rich countries of the world should share some of their resources in order to support the poor countries as a means to restore justice that has been created by actions of the rich countries in the past.

3.4.1.3. Common Sense Morality

This moral principle claims that we have to balance our own interests with the interests of others. Morality requires us to have moral duties to other people and we also have “a natural duty” to others because they are people who could be helped or harmed by our action. The Common sense morality claims that, “other people’s interests count from a moral point of view” (Rachels, 1996: 545). One of the proponents of this school of thought is James Rachels, and she argued that morality requires us “to care about the interest of other people for the very same reason we care about our own interests” (ibid). Our interests are comparable with the interest of others. She claims that:

It is understandable of course that we look out for our own interests and no one can be faulted for attending to his own basic needs. But at the same time the needs of others are also important, and when we can help others - especially at little cost to ourselves - we should do so (1996: 549).

As Rachels claims, we should consider the interest of others regardless of our proximity. All human beings are similar in the sense that all humans need good things. It is clear that no one needs to be starved and died. If I am in need to get clothed, so do others. Therefore, she concludes that we have to give aid and our morality must include some recognition of the needs of others.

I argue that the above ethical theory justifies the view that the developed nations should provide aid to the poor in the developing countries; because they have moral obligation to meet the interests of others in need. In this regard, common sense morality is the right way for those who have to share with those who have not. They have human experience in their interaction with others in need that they seek support from them in their way of life. According to this ethical theory, helping the needy starts from the home to the neighbor and finally it goes up to state and global level. Therefore, I think, this ethical theory is relevant in encouraging others to help the poor nations in the Third World countries.

3.4.1.4. Utilitarianism

This moral theory holds utility or the greatest happiness principle as its foundation. The actions are right and wrong in proportion to how much happiness they generate. “By happiness is the intended pleasure and the absence of pain, by unhappiness, pain and the privation of pleasure” (Mill, 1996: 525). This moral principle claims that “all people are equal and therefore all suffering in the world should be equal” (ibid: 525). In addition utilitarian theory is argued as maximizing the good, while reducing suffering by improving the quality of life of others.

In line with the above ideas, Singer argues that we can use this moral principle in the ethics of aid. He claims that “constant poverty, cyclone and a civil war have turned a great number of people into destitute refugees; nevertheless, it is not beyond the capacity of the nations to give enough assistance to reduce any further suffering to very small proportions” (1990: 247). In this regard, the loss of life and displacement caused by war in Syria, Yemen Iraq and subsequent migration crises across Mediterranean sea is a good example.

In connection to this, Singer argues that we should prevent any kind of misery in the world. But in doing so “we should not sacrifice any of comparable moral significance to ourselves.” We should not cause further suffering in affluent nations. To make the claim, “we should not sacrifice any of comparable moral significance” more clearly he gives us an example of a child drawing in a pond. He says “I am walking past a shallow pond and see a child out in a pond. This means getting my clothes muddy, but this is insignificant while the death of a child would be a very bad thing” (2003: 667). Stylish clothes, expensive dinners, a sophisticated stereo system, overseas holidays, large houses, cars, and others have not comparable significance to the reduction of poverty by giving money without affecting our “comparable moral significance” (Little, 2003: 667). In saying this he assumed that absolute poverty which causes that death for million people is bad and he assumes that it is in the power of the affluent nations to give aid by which they avoid pain from poor people and maximize happiness. In doing so, the affluent nations do not sacrifice any “comparable moral significance” to themselves. So that the affluent nations have an obligation to help those people in absolute poverty and by this we can maximize the happiness of our brothers. If the affluent nations fail to do so, they would be morally wrong and responsible for the loss (Lopez, 2009). By the same saying, I can say that it is morally

wrong for European countries to refuse to accept the refugees from Middle East and African countries. Accordingly, utilitarian theory has always been part of the ethics of aid.

However, Singer's argument to give aid can be found in our practical life. Nowadays because of globalization, no one is an island that the suffering of one community belongs to other communities. Some problems that are recognized as local problems are getting an international recognition. In general, there is the sense of "global society" among the people. Accordingly, one country can involve in what is happening in other part of the world. He further argues "the suffering and death that are occurring some were now are not inevitable or not unavoidable in any fantastic sense of the term" (1990: 247). Anyone who considers the equality of people, justice and fairness does not hesitate to involve in poor countries to help them. He says "it makes no moral difference whether the person I can help is a neighbor's child ten yards from me or a Bengali whose name I shall never know, ten thousand miles away" (Singer, 2003: 249). From this he concludes that there is no possible justification for discrimination on geographical ground.

I think, what Singer wants to argue in general is that, if it is in our capacity to prevent any kind of evil, we have to prevent it. Unless we held responsible for the evil and our action is similar with killing people because we are letting people to die by suffering caused by absolute poverty. Accordingly, all people who have a capacity to contribute to the alleviation of poverty must contribute their part. In doing so they should not sacrifice any "comparable moral significance." The question is all about why we would allow people to death when we could save them.

3.4.1.5 Deontology

Deontology is an ethical theory that focuses on duties, characterized by principles concerning specific kinds of acts as a foundation for moral conduct. This theory states that ethical action is defined by the act regardless of the potential consequences of the given action. Within this idea of morality, the ethics aid relates respect as an end in itself and we are duty bound to help others (Schwartz et al. 2010).

The German Idealist philosopher Kant believes that by applying reason peoples could act morally without outside aid, notably, without religious interference or guidance (Kant cited in Veronique Fraser, 2013). Similarly, Kant argues that the only thing of fundamental moral worth

is the Good Will. The Good Will depends upon human beings choosing to do something because it is a moral duty and that duty is determined only by reason (Kant, 1993). According to Barnett, (2011), “the ethics of aid came to determine moral justification in Kantian based imperatives in which actions are: (1). intrinsically good regardless of consequence, and (2). required as a by-product of humanity” (cited in Veronique Fraser, 2013: 26). He argues the principles that serve as the foundations for aid action and the rhetoric surrounding human rights thus have their basis in a Kantian conception of duty (ibid). Accordingly, (Fraser, 2013) states that aid often directly formulates this Kantian notion of duty-based imperatives, in which actions are intrinsically good apart from their consequences.

In his *Ground work of the Metaphysics of Morals* (1785), Kant establishes a necessary condition of moral equality among all rational beings. Kant writes that “the human being ... exists as an end in himself,” and should be treated as such, as one among equals (quoted in Gabriel S. Morris, 2005: 4). Moreover, the duty for each person to act rationally “applies to every person ... and indeed to all in equal measure” (ibid). Kant defines a moral obligation for the promotion of equality among people. It is this bases developed by Kant on which virtual human equality becomes a moral necessity. In this regard, I think, Kantian argument on the equality for all rational beings justifies the view of developed nation have a moral duty to assist to the needy in the developing countries.

In short, I argue that, the analysis of ethical arguments that supports the view that the developed nation gives aid to the poor; having deep awareness of sympathy for other suffering, the act of compensating for service loss or injure and response to disaster and urgent needs.

3.4.2. Donor Self-Interest

Efforts to advance a suitable basis for giving aid have not been restricted to ethical arguments and their rationalizations. There has been an argument about the self- interest of the rich countries to give aid in reducing poverty and enhancing economic development in poor countries. It is the argument that defends the view that developed countries should give aid to the developing countries. This theory implies that “it is clear that the rich countries give aid for the reason of enlightened self-interest” (Little, 2003: 174). This argument is often brought in formal and general statements in defense of developed nation’s assistance budgets (George Shultz,

1984). The giver self-interest argument has also been made by the critics from the left who declare that aid influences negatively political and economic development in the developing countries (Teresa Hayter, 1980). In relation to this point the empirical evidence indicates that contributor self-interest plays a relatively great role in bilateral aid while recipient need plays a larger role in multilateral aid (Alfred Maize and Machiko Nissanke, 1984). This analysis implies that when developed countries have a special interest in the developing countries.

Indeed, the current global economic system creates interdependency between different nations regardless of its weight of dependency. Since a more just world is a safer world, and since the poor countries think that they are treated unjustly in different political, social and economic affairs, the rich countries must do something to solve this problem. The problems in the poor countries directly or indirectly affect the security of the rich countries. Thus, for their own interest “the rich countries are obliged to design a smooth process of economic growth, poverty alleviation and improvement of the circumstance of justice in the developing world” (Little, 2003: 174).

What is inferred from the above analysis is that the problem of the poor in one way or other affects the life of people in the developed world. For example many developed countries refuse to give aid for poor countries such as Eritrea due to sanction. Through gradual process this countries affected by many problems like; hunger, unemployment and migration to other countries. As result, people migrate in huge number from these countries to developed nation and create many challenges there. I argue that had developed countries helped the poor in their countries, such problems would not have happen. Therefore, the problem of the poor in one way or on other ways is the problem of the rich as well and assisting the needy is a global problem and it also needs global solution from the developed countries, hence, global solutions to global problems.

In short, the analysis of the argument from donor self- interest justifies the view that affluent nations give aid to the poor nations from the view of mutuality, development aid and cooperation in maintaining international human security.

Generally, the preceding discussion revealed that different ethical theories that defend the view that developed nation have a moral obligation to give aid for the developing countries. It also shows that how these ethical arguments justify the reason why aid is given for the developing countries.

In this chapter, I have discussed the ethics of aid. I have showed the moral importance of aid. In this regard, I have critically examined major issues under the ethics of aid and I have looked at the nature of moral dilemmas on aid. I have also discussed the important issues raised in the ethics of aid and moral principles that support my claim in giving aid to the poor in developing countries. Finally, I have argued that the developed nations have moral obligation to provide aid for the poor and vulnerable needy in the developing countries within the ethical frameworks of altruism, justice, and utilitarianism, common sense of morality and deontology.

Chapter Four: Conclusion

In this thesis, I examined the ethics of aid. I showed the moral controversies on aid and the weaknesses of development aid. I have discussed argument for and against giving aid for the developing countries. Accordingly, I have argued that, the question of the ethics of aid and development aid is enduring and consistent question which needs to be reevaluated and answered frequently, because development is an indispensable objective of most of the people in the world.

The concept of development, as discussed in second chapter is more of multidimensional and multidisciplinary concept. It includes both descriptive (quantitative) and normative (qualitative) aspects of human development. It also deals with the overall social well-being, which covers economic, social, political, cultural, attitudinal and spiritual transformation. Indeed, the very idea of development lies in the heart of human wellbeing. If we agree that development promotes the wellbeing of human being, it would be irrational to restrict it to a particular place, to a particular group of people or to a particular race. Authentic development, as a number of writers like Denis Goulet and Amertya Sen argued, must include ethical reflection on the strategies, policy and other techniques that facilitate economic progress and human wellbeing. In this regard, I have argued that ethical consideration has an important role for a genuine development.

In this same chapter, I have discussed the concept of aid. It is seen as a transfer of resource from the rich nations to the poor nations. However, I have argued that aid is not only the transfer of resource from the rich to the poor nations, but the interest behind the aid should be given attention. In addition, I have discussed the notion of development aid. The term development aid emerged over a long period of time following significant debates and controversies. As a result, it became difficult to unanimously define it. This in turn has led to the existence of various definitions of the term. As I have showed earlier, development aid is the assistance that is given for the development purposes. It is an external aid to low-income countries as offered in clear concessional resource, allotments to increase welfare in those countries. I have argued that development aid should be regarded as a collective human action to create a more just and safe world. In order for these things happen, rules, norms, and methods should play an important role to guide ourselves in overall development process.

Different theorists have different interpretations of development aid. There are supporters and opponents of development aid. The opponents argued that “development aid” and other related concepts with “development” are the invention of Western capitalists who intended to create a good way to exercise their power over Third World countries. Therefore, they stated that development aid has not played a positive role in developing countries, but it makes them poor and weak. They also argued that development aid creates dependency. But the supporters of development aid argued that development aid can positively contribute to the development of recipient countries. They further argued that development aid can be a means to alleviate poverty and enhance democratization. Thus, the supporters concluded that aid indeed is useful.

Similarly, the World Bank worried that development aid works only in the conducive economic, political and social policy. I would also like to state that we have to be very careful when we receive development aid, because development aid can be spoiled by different factors such as leadership styles, political system and policy options.

In the same chapter, following Carol Lancaster, I have tried to scrutinize the shortcomings of development aid in to three areas i.e., economic, political and social problems. Economically, development aid most of the time is criticized because of it is free to alleviate the poor from poverty. The donors, by using different conditionality, forced the recipient countries to purchase goods and services from donor countries. Some writers like Spero argued that conditionality that is attached to development aid most of the time does not consider the “comparative advantage” of the recipient countries. In this regard, I have maintained that the political reasons of donor countries are not suitable to poor countries. These pressures create an interest gap between the government and the poor people and ultimately create ill political system and lack of patriotism and national unity. This is because of lack of intensive study about the problems of the poor countries and failure to identify the real problems of the poor. In addition to the political and economic problems, development aid sometimes is used to substitute indigenous knowledge by foreign experience. This can be exemplified in the use of particular language and adherence to particular culture and religion.

Logically, when we think about these problems at the same time we are required to identify the source of these problems. In this regard, Cassen and associates stated that the source of this problem arises from two approaches. The first problem comes from the donor countries and the

second one comes from the recipient countries. The recipient countries most of the time suffer because of lack of good governance and the failure to implement what they proposed and to enforce their policy confidently. But why did they fail? I think that there is a lack of skilled manpower, good governance, confidence and good policies.

When we critically examine these problems they are not genuine problems of the poor people. The donor countries have contributed to the problems of poor countries. Most of the donor countries want to benefit more than what they give. I have argued that the political, economic and religious motives make aid ineffective. In this regard I have stated that the problems from the donor countries come because of their failure to understand what development is all about and the role of development aid.

Moreover, I have presented different arguments against providing aid for the needy in the developing countries. Some writers state that the poor people in developing countries do not have the right to get aid from the developed countries. In contrast to this view, there are writers who argue that “we have no moral duty to help the poor countries.”

In the third chapter, I examined arguments that were forwarded to defend the view that developed nations have a moral/ethical obligation to provide aid for the needy in the developing countries. I have also examined the ethical dilemma on aid from the perspectives of applied ethics. This implies that, giving and taking aid could be taken as a controversial ethical issue, since it could be evaluated in terms of right or wrong and good or bad. Further, there is the question whether saving people’s life or building a military base is more important. In connection to the question of priority, there are two related answers. The first reason is morality is essential to assist the people who suffer because of underdevelopment and poverty. The second reason is the self - interest of donors that necessitates donors to give aid to poor countries, because the problems in poor countries may directly or indirectly affect the long term security of the rich countries.

I have argued that the main reason to give aid is moral necessity. This may raise a question that what kinds of moral theory is justifiable regarding the action. There are several moral theories or principles that help us to argue that the developed nations have ethical or moral obligation to

give aid to the poor. I have argued that we can use different moral codes that obliged us to give aid.

In general, in this thesis I have tried to show two things. The first one is many people live in absolutely poor countries and suffer from hunger, malnutrition and widespread disease. The second one is, there are people who live in absolutely affluent countries which have a capacity to alleviate the poor from poverty. Then I have scrutinized the question that do the rich countries have moral duty to give aid to poor countries? And should moral standards play a role? Some groups argued that we have a moral duty to assist whereas some other groups argued that we have no moral duty to assist the poor people.

It is hoped that policy makers, nongovernmental organizations and researchers can benefit from the findings of this thesis. Ethical considerations should be given attention when we give and accept aid.

As I have tried to show earlier, the question of the development aid and ethics of aid is very complex. In this regard, this thesis does not aim to provide a final solution. It reflects on the ethics of aid by identifying the major elements that are involved in the ethics of aid. It also raises issues that help to shape our understanding regarding the concept. Thus, the whole aim of the study has been to examine the perceptions, controversies and challenges that ethics of aid involves. It stresses that development aid should be guided by ethical principles. It also suggests that further research should be conducted by focusing on the impact, effectiveness, rationality and feasibility of the ethics of aid in the world.

One of the limitations of this thesis is a lack of specific case study that might have substantiated my conclusions. It would have been better to utilize a quantitative methodology in support of my argument. However, lack of finance and time limitation hindered me to conduct such a research. It is one of my future objectives to apply what I have failed to conduct in the present work.

References

- Amstutz, Mark. (2005) "International Ethics: Concepts, Theories and Cases in Global Politics" 2nd ed. Maryland: Row man and Littlefield.
- Ashok, Chakravarti. (2005). Aid, Institutions and Development: New Approaches to Growth, Governance and Poverty. Northampton. Edward Elgar Publishing
- Astroulakis, Nikos. (2010). "The Development Ethics Paradigm: Ethical Goals and Strategies" Working Paper for the Euro Memo: 16th Workshop on Alternative Economic Policy in Europe, Department of Economics, University of Crete PP 1-20
- Bookchin, Murray. (1994) "Social Ecology versus Deep Ecology", in Van De Veer, Donald and Pierce, Christain. (eds.). The Environmental Ethics and Policy Book: Philosophy, Ecology, Economics. Belmont: Wodsworth, Inc., pp.228-238.
- Brain, Monkey. (2011). "World Hunger and Poverty- Should We Help?" Available at <http://www.squidoo.com/worldhunger>
- Brain. K. (2012), "What is aid?" From Aid to Development: The Global Fight against Poverty, OECD Publishing.<http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264123571-4-en>
- Bunting, Medeline. (2009) "The Road to Ruin" Available at http://www.guardiana.Co.uk/books/2009/feb/14/aid_africa_dambisa_Moyo
- Busby, J.W.(2007) "Bono Made Jesse Helms Cry: Jubilee 2000, Debt Relief, and Moral Action in International Politics". International Studies Quarterly, 51(2): 247-275.
- Cassen.R et al. (1994) Does Aid Work? Report to an Intergovernmen-tal Task Force. Oxford: Clerenden Press.
- Clark, William. (1965)"What is Aid", in Conference on Public Policy Problems of ForeignAid. Institute of Public Administration. Dar Es Salaam: Oxford University Press, pp.12 – 15.
- Cooper, Richard N. (1977), Panel discussion on "The New International Economic Order," In The New International Economic Order: The North-South Debate, ed. Jagdish N. Bhagwati (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press,), pp. 354-85

- Cortina, Adela. (2007). "Development Ethics: A Road to Peace". The Hellen Kellogg Institute for International Studies. Working Paper #339
- Craig, Edward. (ed.). (1998) Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Vol. 5. London and New York: Routledge.
- Crocker, David. (2002) "Hunger, Capacity and Development", in Lafollette, Hugh (ed.). Ethics in Practice: An Anthology. Basil: Black Well publishing, PP.591-602
- Crocker, David. (2004) "Development Ethics: Source, Agreement and Controversies international Development ethics". Ethics in Practice: An Anthology. Basil: Black Well publishing. pp. 1-23.
- Dower, Nigel. (1991). "World Poverty", in Singer, Peter (ed.). A Companion to Ethics. Basil: Black Well, pp. 273-283.
- Easterly, William (2007) "Was Development Assistance a Mistake?" The American Economic Review, 97 (2): 328-332.
- Finn, Tarp. (2009) "Aid Effectiveness (UNU-WIDER'sNote)" Available from http://www.un.org/en/ecosoc/newfunct/pdf/aid_effectiveness_finn_tarp.pdf (accessed on the 20.01.2016)
- Folke .S and Nielson. H (2006). Aid Impact and Poverty Reduction: Danish Institute of International Studies. New York. Palgrave Macmillan press,
- Forsyth, Tim. (Second chapter. ed.). (2005) Encyclopedia of International Development. London and New York: Routledge
- Gasper, Des. (1992) "Development Ethics. An Emergent Fields? A Look at Scope and Structure With Special Reference to the Ethics of Aid" ISS working paper series, No. 134.
- Gasper, Des. (2009) "Development Ethics and Human Development", HDR Networks, Issue 24, Institute of Social Studies, The Hague

- Gasper, Des. and Truong, T. (2005) “Deepening development ethics: From economism to human development to human security”, The European Journal of Development Research, 17 (3), 372–384.
- Gasper, Des. (1999) “Ethics and the Conduct of International Development Aid: Charity and Obligation”, Forum of Development Studies No. (1) 23-57
- Geek, Wise. (2011). “What is Altruism?” Available at <http://www.wisegeek.com/what-is-altruism.htm>
- Goulet, Danis. (1995). Development Ethics: A Guide to Theory and Practice. New York: The Appex Press.
- Goulet, Denis. (1996) “A New Discipline: Development Ethics”, A Working Paper for the Helen Kellogg Institute for International Studies
- Goulet, Denis.(2006) Development Ethics at Work: Exploration of -1960-2002. London and New York Routledge: Taylor Francis Group:
- Haile, Saba. (2008) “Issues and Challenges in Effective Utilization of the Development Aid in Ethiopia: A Case Study of Major Donor and Government Organizations”. MA. Thesis submitted to Department of Public Administration, Addis Ababa University.
- Hamelink, Cees J. (ed.). (1997) “Making Moral Choice in Development Cooperation”, in Hamelink, Cess J.(e.d.) Ethics and Development: on Making Moral Choices in Development Cooperation. Kampen: UitgeverijKok, pp.11-24.
- Hancock, Graham. (1998) Lords of Poverty: The Power Prestige and Corruption of The International Aid Business. New York: The Atlantic Mnothir Press.
- Hanny, M.K (2010) “Objectives in European foreign aid: A case study of France and Sweden”. European Studies, Department of Political science, Bachelor’s Thesis
- Hardin, Garrett. (1974) “Lifeboat Ethics: The Case Against Helping the Poor.” Available at [http://www.garretthardinsociety.org/articles/art](http://www.garretthardinsociety.org/articles/art_lifeboat) lifeboat

ethics case against helping poor, institutions and development new approaches to growth, governance and poverty". Cheltenham, U.K.: Edward Elgar.

Hardin, Garrett. (2004). "The Tragedy of the Commons", in Callicott, Baird J, and Palmer C. (eds.). Environmental Philosophy: Critical Concepts in the Environment. London and New York: Routledge. Vol (4).12- 22

Hayek, F. A. (1978) "The Atavism of Social Justice," In New Studies in Philosophy. Politics. Economics and the History of Ideas London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, pp. 57-70

Hayter, Teresa (1984) "Aid as Imperialism and Aid as an Obstacle: Twenty Questions about Our Foreign Aid". Hungry San Francisco: Institute for Food and Development Policy. In international politics. International Studies Quarterly, 51(2), 247-275.

Hern, Warren M. (1993) "Has Human Species Become A Cancer on the Planet?: A Theoretical view of population Growth As A sign of pathology" Institute of Behavioral Science. Boulder: University of Colorado Press. 36 (6): 1089 - 1124

Jamieson, Dale. (2005) "Duties to the Distant: Aid, Assistance and Intervention in the Developing world". The Journal of Ethics PP. 151–170

Kant, Immanuel. (1985). Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals. Ellington, J.W. (Trans.) Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company.

Kapur.D. Whittle.D.(2009). "Can the Privatization of Foreign Aid Enhance Accountability". Center of advanced study India. PP. 1143-1180

Katja Hanny Müller (2010) "Objectives in European foreign aid: A case study of France and Sweden". European Studies, Bachelor's Thesis.

Lancaster, Carol. (1999) Aid to Africa: So Much to Do So Little Done: Chicago: the University of Chicago Press.

Little, Daniel. (2003) The Paradox of Wealth and Poverty: Mapping the Ethical Dilemmas of Global Development. Boulder, Colo.: West View Press.

- Lopez, KL. (2009) "Famine, Affluence and Morality-An Analysis on the Topic of Giving Charity," in Ezine Articles. Available at, <http://ezinearticles.com/?famine,-affluence-and-Morality...-An-Analysis-on-the-topic-of-Giving-Charity-Gid=2242447>
- Maizels, A. and, Machiko, N. (1984) "Motivations for Aid to Developing Countries," World Development 12(9) 879-900.
- McNicoll, Geoffrey. (1999) Poverty and Population Growth Australia: National University Canberra.
- Mill, John. (1996) "Utilitarianism", in Feinberg, Joel (ed.). Reason and Responsibility: Reading in Some Basic Problems of Philosophy.^{5th} (ed). Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company, pp. 522-534.
- Miller. Edward. (1948).Questions that Matter an Invitation for Philosophy: New York .USA. University of Colorado
- Morris, Gabriel (2005). "Philosophical Arguments for Increased Aid to Developing Countries" Vanderbilt Undergraduate Research Journal, 1: (1) pp.1-8
- Moyo, Danbisa. (2009). Dead Aid: Why Aid is not Working and How There is a Better Way for Africa. London: Penguin Books
- Nozick, Robert (1974), Anarchy, State and Utopia, New York: Basic Books.
- OECD. (1999) "OECD Evaluation Report" Report No. 19548 of 30 June 1999. Vienna. DAC Evaluation Resource Center.
- Pearson, Report. (1969) Partner in Development: Report of the Commission on International Development. New York and Washington DC. London: Preager Publisher.
- Pora, Bjarnadottir. (2010) "No Longer an Aid Darling Donors' view on the Implementation of the Paris Declaration in Nicaragua". MA. Thesis submitted to the department of Development Studies at the University of Iceland.
- Rachels, James (2003) The Elements of Moral Philosophy: New York: McGraw-Hill Press

- Rachels, James. (1996) "Ethical Egoism", in Feinberg, Joel (ed.). Reason and Responsibility: Reading in Some Basic Problems of Philosophy. 5th ed. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company, pp. 545-552.
- Riddle, Roger. (2007) Does Foreign Aid Really Work? Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rist, Gilbert. (1997) The history of development: from western origins to global Fiath. London: Zed Books.
- Schwartz, L., Sinding, C., Hunt, M., Elit, L., Redwood-Campbell, L., Adelson, N., ... DeLaat, S. (2010) "Ethics in Humanitarian Aid Work: Learning from the Narratives of Humanitarian Health Workers". AJOB Primary Research, 1(3), 45-54
- Sen, Amerta. (1999) Development As Freedom: New York, Anchor Books.
- Shultz, George. (1984) "Foreign Aid and U.S. National Interests," In Realism. Strength. Negotiation: Key Foreign Policy Statements of the Reagan Administration Washington, D. C.: U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, pp. 142-45.
- Slim, Hugo. (2011) "Being Humanitarian: Personal Morality and Political Projects in Today's Wars" An Oxford Humanitarian Group Event. Retrieved January 6, 2016, available from http://www.elac.ox.ac.uk/downloads/podcasts/hugo_slim_14-0211_edited.mp3
- Singer, Peter,(1977) "Reconsidering the Famine Relief Argument," in Food Policy, ed. Peter Brown and Henry Shue (New York: Free Press, pp. 36-53 Robert Tucker, The Inequality of Nations (New York: Basic Books, pp. 117-26
- Singer, Peter. (1983) "Triage and Justice": The Ethics of Rationing Lifesaving Medical Resource. Vol. 94 (1) : 142-143
- Signer, Peter. (1990) "Famine Affluence and Morality", in Beitz, charless. R. et al (eds.). International Ethics. Princeton: Princeton University Press.Pp.246-261.
- Signer, Peter (2003) "Rich and Poor", in Chan, Steven M. (ed.). Philosophy for 21st Century: A Comprehensive Reader. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 661-67

- Snare, Francis (1992) The Nature of Moral Thinking: London: Routledge
- Spero, Joan Edegman. (1977) The Politics of International Economic Relations. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Steven Radelet. (2006) “A Primer on Foreign Aid, Centre for Global Development”. Working Paper Number 92. Available from: http://www.cgdev.org/files/8846_file_WP92.pdf (accessed on the 20.01.2016)
- Stokke, Olav. (Ed.) (1989). Western Middle Powers and Global Poverty. Uppsala: Scandinavian Institute of African Studies.
- Tales From Hood. (2010) “What Makes Good Aid * Good Aid*?”, Available at, <http://talesfromthehood.com/2010/11/14/what-makes-good-aid-good-aid>
- Thomson, Anne (1999) Critical Reasoning in Ethics: A Practical Introduction. Routledge
- Todaro M.P. (1977) Economics for Developing World: An Introduction to the Principles, Problems and Policies for Development. London: Longman Group.
- Todaro M.P. and Smith, S. P. (2012) Economic Development (11th ed.). New Delhi: Pearson Education.
- Tomasveski, Katarian (1993) Development Aid and Human Rights Revisited. London and New York: Pinter Publisher.
- Truman, Harry S. (2008 [1949]) Truman's inaugural address, January 20, 1949. Retrieved September 1, 2010 from: http://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/50yr_archive/inaugural20jan1949.htm
- United Nation (1997) Agenda for Development. UN Department of Public Information. New York: NY 10017.
- United Nations. (1969) Journal of Development Planning. New York: United Nations Publication.

Weston, Anthony (2006) A Practical Companion to Ethics: First Ed. Oxford University Press.

World, Disaster Report. (2003) Focus on Ethics in Aid: Edited by Jonathan Walter. International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies. Geneva: Printed by SADAG Imprimerie.

World, Bank. (2002) Global Development Finance: Financing the Poorest Countries. New York and Washington: The World Bank.