

When Aid Becomes Cage: The Burden of foreign ~~Debt~~

A) Introduction

B) The Burden of foreign ~~Debt~~

- 1) foreign debt ~~circumscribes the right of framing~~ National economic policy independently, compromising economic sovereignty
- 2) foreign debt ~~delays the urgency of self-reliance~~ leading to unsustainable, short-term economic growth while neglecting long-term necessities
- 3) ~~conditionalities attached with foreign debt~~ ignores the domestic realities of recipient, leading to ~~inequality and unstable domestic setting~~
- 4) foreign debt often requires exporting foreign labor and expertise, compromising domestic employment, which leads to social agitation
- 5) failing to service foreign debt can withhold the territorial integrity of the recipient country

6) foreign debt ~~accompanies with itself~~
~~the cultural superiority and influence,~~
~~involving inferiority complex within~~
~~the demography~~ keep yourself short and meaningful please

7) foreign debt limits the ~~independent~~
~~contours of foreign policy, leading to~~
~~unwanted friends and foes at~~
~~global level~~

8) foreign debt ~~compromises national~~
~~prestige at international forums,~~
~~decreasing soft power and effect of~~
~~diplomacy at global level~~

9) foreign debt, as a tool ~~✓~~ to keep power
imbalance ~~flocking~~, is used by imperial
powers to maintain ~~hegemony and~~
~~superiority~~

10) foreign debt creates a vicious cycle
of dependency that developing
countries often fail to break, leading
to failure of the nation.

C) Conclusion

After WWII, the war-torn Europe was provided with American aid within the Marshall plan. Within a decade, Europe paved its way towards growth and stability. With this, the concept of using foreign debt as a push to unstable economy emerged. In the later century, when the similar framework was applied on developing countries, it failed drastically. What seemed as aid became a cage. Foreign debt, instead of becoming a pushing factor, became a burden, whose servicing took decades and brought far-reaching consequences especially on what is known as sovereignty and freedom. The brunt of foreign debt is borne by political, economic, demographic, social, and global freedom. The critics often see it as a tool by neo-imperial powers to keep developing countries dependent and exploit the power imbalance. Within the domestic setting, foreign debt's conditionality brings destabilize economic and political settings. It compromises sensitive areas of unemployment and cultural influence, which often combines to lead political instability and mass uprisings. At global level, due to embedded sovereignty of the recipient country, it loosens national psyche.

and right to frame an independent foreign policy. It then leads to deterioration of soft power and effectiveness of diplomacy. At large, foreign debt creates a vicious cycle that delays the urgency of becoming self-reliant; it plunges the recipient country in a state that it ^{sudden} ~~often~~ succeeds to break through, leading to failure of the nation. Thus, what started as an aid, foreign debt, becomes a cage, which circumscribes the very rights of a nation-state, leading to political, economic, and social upheavals.

foreign debt limits the right of a state to frame its economic policy independently. The donor while providing capital attaches the way and methods that the debt can be employed with. These conditionalities limit the scope that the government can use; thus, the monetary policy, ~~budget~~ budget formulation, and financial preferences, all have to align with the prescribed conditions. For instance, Pakistan's economic policy is by large shaped by the IMF conditionalities which aids in bringing macro stability, though, the long awaited structural reforms have yet not been implemented since the IMF does not allow so. Thus, one of the several burdens

of the foreign debt is that it holds the economic sovereignty of a state hostage.

Besides, the concurrent lending of foreign debt creates a psychological relief over the urgency of self-reliance. It can create short-term growth in economic numbers, but it remains unstable and is bound to fall. The necessary long-term policies that require self-reliance often get delayed since the foreign debt keeps floating the economy. The self-reliance requires operating indigenous industries producing the import-substituting products and export-oriented material to balance the trade deficit. It requires investment in education, health and social forums to produce effective human capital. It further requires to maneuver through trade and monetary policy to keep the currency value in check, so that the rate of inflation does not surpass the purchasing power of citizens. However, all these necessary efforts get diluted with easy finances provided by outside actors. For instance, although fraught with security issues, Afghanistan government since general Karzai was heavily funded with American and western aid; however, the prevalent provision of foreign debt never necessitated the government to

become self-reliant. Thus, foreign debt compromises the capacity of becoming self-reliant of the recipient country.

Moreover, the donor remains indifferent to the domestic reality of the recipient country, which leads to conditionalities that have far-reaching consequences on its demography.

Along with embedded economic sovereignty of the state, it is the subjects of the state that bear the brunt. Foreign debt designed for macroeconomic stability often ignores the needs of marginalized groups and already deprived. For instance, SAPs, the structural adjustment programs of IMF in 1990s, were heavily criticized by feminists all over the world.

SAPs required that the government cease almost all welfare programs to limit its expenditure. The well-offs remained unaffected while the groups that were part of welfare programs, often the deprived, had to face economic and social difficulties. Thus, foreign debt destabilizes the domestic settings of the state, increasing inequality as the already deprived face the bitter consequences.

Furthermore, the donor country, for maximum profit, often exports its labor and expertise along with aid, compromising employment for indigenous people, which can lead to social agitation. Foreign debt does not work in situ. The donor with its capital inside the country influences its economic policy and endeavours to get the best and maximum profit for itself. Foreign investment and leases with easy contracts, allow foreign labor and expertise to intrude within the domestic market. For instance, the growing indigenous outcry against the ~~construction~~ write with proper and formal CPEC, alleging them ~~of~~ expression please substantiate the argument. Chinese debt and investment inside Pakistan have attracted critique from various factions. Especially, within Balochistan, the people feel alienated amid the foreign investment, where their share of employment is minimal. Thus, foreign debt can be a curse to insuring social agitation once issues like employment are threatened.

In addition, the territorial integrity of the recipient country can be compromised if it fails to service foreign debt. The country in need can come in unhappy

with the donor country with such high stakes that if the recipient country fails to meet deadlines its territorial integrity can be withheld. The example of Sri Lanka is plausible enough to substantiate the premise. When Sri Lankan government failed to fulfill the deadlines of a Chinese debt, it let one of its ports to be leased to Chinese government for 99 years. Thus, when a country becomes unable to break the debt trap, it starts to lose its territory, fading its integrity under the burden of foreign debt.

Furthermore, receiving foreign debt creates an inferiority complex within the society of the recipient. The donor succeeds to showcase its cultural superiority and thus influencing with its cultural values and norms. For instance, the growing westernization within the developing world is a direct consequence of ~~feeling inferior of one's own culture and superior of the western culture~~. The implicit power imbalance between the donor and recipient shaped by the debt transaction goes beyond the economic sphere and intrudes within the country's cultural settings.

outside the domestic affairs, the foreign policy of the country at global level is also influenced by the foreign debt. Directly or indirectly, the donor country creates a hegemonic influence over the recipient country's foreign commitments. As independent foreign relations never realize for a country burdened by the foreign debt. The friends and foes at international level are decided by the ones who control its economic nursery. For instance, lands whose economy depends upon US can never align with the US's rivals; Pakistan, dependent upon western aid led by American interests, can seldom go directly against the western world. Thus, in contemporary world the defining factor of national power is economy. One who controls his own economy is independent in true sense. One who does not, remains under the influence of those who control its economy.

transition from one passage to another one is fine ..but need more mature

transition plz

Moreover, foreign debt makes an independent recipient country vulnerable as its soft power of national prestige gets heavily buffered by the stigma of being under the debt-trap. Diplomacy

of a country is highly dependent upon how it presents itself. When a country's economic policy is notorious for being dependent on conditions set by foreign lenders, its credibility and legitimacy get compromised. For instance, all the global powers like US, China, Russia, and EU, ~~can~~ hold their economic sovereignty. They are not under the burden of foreign debt. Thus, they influence global policies and remain the status quo powers.

Besides, foreign debt is also used as a tool by the imperial powers to maintain their hegemony. Once foreign debt is incurred by the developing country, it becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy of being dependent upon the next round of debt. Along with this vicious cycle, the recipient becomes subordinated to the donor's interests. For instance, African continent, after decades of decolonization, ~~is~~ still under the imperial interests of the global powers. Because its ~~country~~ countries are mostly under the burden of foreign debt. Thus, gradually and slowly the aid becomes a ~~debt~~ trap, a vicious cycle.

which limit the sovereignty of the recipient state, feeding the hegemonic ambitions of global powers working in terms of foreign debt.

In conclusion, foreign debt can be an aid to a state or its political, economic, and social settings. It creates a vicious cycle of debt trap that can compromise the territorial integrity, foreign policy, national psyche, and domestic stability of a country. When indigenous self-reliant mechanisms are absent, foreign debt can be harnessed to fulfill immediate economic needs. However, the uncurrent use of such scapegoats have a far-reaching consequences. It creates an unstable economic system thus plowing a need to have proper choice of words abyss of ultimate state's failure. Although the fate for such a state seems gloomy, there are examples and case studies that provide hope that a state can break this cycle and bring back sovereignty and freedom. It requires that the government make continuous attempts to achieve self-reliance by investing

in productive sector and human capital. Once a country ~~buys~~
~~ask to stand in its own~~
~~resources and producing it can~~
~~break this vicious cycle and~~
~~stabilize its political, economic, and~~
~~social spheres.~~