



DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND FOREIGN OPERATIONS FUNDING

When the American people are asked what government spending should be cut in order to balance the federal budget, foreign aid programs generally top the list.^{1 2} In fact, the annual State and Foreign Operations appropriations have increased over 80 percent from 2002 to 2010, adjusting for inflation. President Obama's budget request for Fiscal Year 2012 is a record-high \$59 billion for State and Foreign Operations appropriations.³

Proponents of foreign aid sometimes argue that it represents only one percent of the federal budget (actually closer to 1.5 percent), and that eliminating all of it would not solve our nation's fiscal problems. That is true, but it is true of every other area. And just as other chapters of this report show how other budget lines have wasteful, duplicative and low-priority spending, the Department of State and its Foreign Operations budget is no different.

When reviewing this chapter, it is good to remember that United States citizens are themselves extremely generous with their own money in donating cash to help developing countries. In 2007, U.S. residents sent nearly \$37 billion to developing countries through foundations, religious organizations, and other groups. This figure does not count the \$79 billion in remittances sent from private individuals here back to relatives and loved ones in developing countries.⁴ Also, positive economic development occurs from the nearly \$100 billion in foreign investment U.S. businesses make in these countries.

The budget recommendations below for the Department of State and Foreign Operations would return spending to the levels of the average of the 2001-2010 decade and save nearly \$190 billion over ten years. Funding for a number of smaller region-specific foundations and programs within the Department of State or USAID would be eliminated. Some of these programs would be able to meet their resource needs through private funding. Others could be consolidated and managed through existing organization structures at the Department of State or USAID.

Aid to Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan is not cut under these proposals. The United States is still fully engaged with these countries and to cut their funding at this point in time would not be prudent. However, aid to these countries, especially Afghanistan, must be closely monitored given the history of corruption and poor results from our aid to that nation.

¹ Gallup Poll, "Americans Oppose Cuts in Education, Social Security, Defense," January 26, 2011, <http://www.gallup.com/poll/145790/americans-oppose-cuts-education-social-security-defense.aspx>.

² CNN Poll, "Reality Check: What we really know about the budget," March 31, 2011, <http://www.cnn.com/2011/POLITICS/03/31/gallery.reality.budget/index.html>.

³ CRS R41905, "State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs: FY2012 Budget and Appropriations," July 7, 2011.

⁴ Adelman, Carol, "Global Philanthropy and Remittances: Reinventing Foreign Aid," Hudson Institute, 2009, http://www.hudson.org/files/documents/BJWA_15%20202_Adelman.pdf.

Operating Expenses

Diplomatic and Consular Operations - \$22.75 billion

The National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform presented an option to reduce the overhead cost of diplomatic operations that would save around \$13 billion over the next ten years.⁵ The Commission's option represents around a 10 percent cut to those operations and returns them to a 2010 level of funding. This recommendation doubles that, to roughly 20 percent. The Commission presented reasonable options for the Department of State to consider, such as re-examining the need for Washington D.C. pay for Foreign Service Officers serving overseas.⁶

Beginning in 2009, Congress started paying Foreign Service Officers additional money in the form of locality pay when they were stationed overseas. The purpose of locality pay is to equalize government salaries with salaries earned by private-sector workers in comparable geographic regions here in the United States. Foreign Service Officers who work overseas are provided with foreign cost-of-living adjustments based on the expenses in the nation they are stationed, subsidized housing, and hardship and danger pay for working overseas, if applicable. Other options include revising the expensive 'one size fits all' strategy for building consulates and embassies.⁷

USAID Operating Expenses - \$6 billion

For Fiscal Year 2012, President Obama requested \$1.5 billion for the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) for operating expenses.⁸ This is a massive increase from their operating expenses from just 2009, where they were able to manage their mission with \$1 billion in operating expenses.⁹ Congress should return operating expenses back to their 2009 levels - \$1 billion per year - which is appropriate if other options are adopted to reduce funding, grants, loans and other programs to lower priority countries.

Educational and Cultural Exchange Programs - \$5.3 billion

This recommendation would significantly reduce funding for the State Department's Educational and Cultural Exchange programs, which fund a range of worthwhile activities such as Fulbright Academic Exchanges. However, the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs also pays for

⁵ "\$200 Billion in Illustrative Savings: Option 14," National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform, http://www.fiscalcommission.gov/sites/fiscalcommission.gov/files/documents/Illustrative_List_11.10.2010.pdf.

⁶ "\$200 Billion in Illustrative Savings: Option 14," National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform, http://www.fiscalcommission.gov/sites/fiscalcommission.gov/files/documents/Illustrative_List_11.10.2010.pdf.

⁷ "\$200 Billion in Illustrative Savings: Option 14," National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform, http://www.fiscalcommission.gov/sites/fiscalcommission.gov/files/documents/Illustrative_List_11.10.2010.pdf.

⁸ United States Agency for International Development, "Congressional Budget Justification: Volume 2, Fiscal Year 2012," <http://www.usaid.gov/performance/cbj/158267.pdf>.

⁹ United States Agency for International Development, "Congressional Budget Justification: Volume 2, Fiscal Year 2011," page 1, <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/137936.pdf>.

other programs which may be less of a priority for our nation given our current fiscal situation. Examples of potential lower priority programs funded in the past include:

- Funding for Summer Institutes for European Student Leaders. This funding allows high school and college students from Denmark, France, Germany, and the United Kingdom to come at U.S. taxpayer expense to the U.S. to learn about civic activism and environmental leadership at American colleges.¹⁰
- Funding for the U.S. Presentation at the 54th International Art Exhibition, Venice, Italy. This was to fund a taxpayer-funded trip for the winning American artist and his or her work to travel to Venice, Italy to exhibit.¹¹
- Separate funding for the U.S. Presentation at the 13th International Architecture Exhibition, also in Venice. Similar to the Art Exhibition, this program provides \$100,000 in taxpayer funds for a winning architect to travel to Venice.¹²
- The American Music Abroad program for ten overseas tours of American music to include country and western, “urban music,” rock and roll, and contemporary urban music.¹³
- Using American film directors, writers and “anti-piracy experts” to teach other nations “expertise in the business and creative aspects of filmmaking, such as marketing and distribution, special effects, and computer animation.”¹⁴
- Bringing international authors and writers from around the world to Iowa to learn about creative writing in the United States.¹⁵
- Funding for other countries to “enhance and improve the infrastructure of youth sports programs” overseas.¹⁶

Voluntary Funding for the United Nations and the UN Tax Equalization Fund - \$22.4 billion

The United States taxpayer is the single largest contributor to the United Nations. The U.S. currently gives over \$6 billion a year to the U.N., with much of that contribution as ‘voluntary.’¹⁷

Voluntary contributions finance special programs and offices created by the U.N. system, such as the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), the United Nations Environment Program

¹⁰Grants.gov, “Summer Institutes for European Student Leaders,”

<http://www.grants.gov/search/search.do?mode=VIEW&oppId=69033>”, accessed July 17, 2011.

¹¹Grants.gov, “Official U.S. Presentation at the 54th International Arts Exhibition, Venice, Italy,”

<http://www.grants.gov/search/search.do/?oppId=50653&mode=VIEW>, accessed July 17, 2011.

¹²Grants.gov, “Official U.S. Presentation at the 13th Annual International Architecture Exhibition, (2012), Venice, Italy,”

<http://www.grants.gov/search/search.do/?oppId=64633&mode=VIEW>, accessed July 17, 2011.

¹³ Federal Register, “Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (ECA) Request for Grant Proposals,” Feb. 1, 2008,

<http://edocket.access.gpo.gov/2008/E8-1749.htm>, accessed July 17, 2011.

¹⁴ Department of State, “American Film Programs,” <http://exchanges.state.gov/cultural/american-film-program.html>, accessed July 8, 2011.

¹⁵ Department of State, “International Writing Program, <http://exchanges.state.gov/cultural/iwp.html>, accessed July 8, 2011.

¹⁶ Department of State, “Sports Programs,” <http://exchanges.state.gov/sports/programs.html#visitors>, accessed July 8, 2011.,

¹⁷ Department of State, “Report to Congress on U.S. Contributions to the United Nations System,” February 2, 2010,

<http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/137490.pdf>, accessed July 17, 2011.

(UNEP), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), and the U.N. Democracy Fund (UNDEF).

The United States' payments to these organizations are entirely optional; the United States is not legally obliged to contribute to these programs. This differs from the assessed contributions that the United States pays as part of its agreements as a member of that body and agreements to pay a portion of U.N. peacekeeping activities.

The United States contributes \$4 billion in voluntary payments to the United Nations.¹⁸ This recommendation reduces the amount of U.S. government-wide voluntary contributions by \$2 billion a year.

U.S. voluntary contributions are financed through the annual appropriations legislation, primarily through the State and Foreign Operations Appropriations bill. However, almost every department of the federal government contributes to the United Nations with either cash or in-kind contributions.¹⁹ For example the Department of the Interior contributed \$40,000 in Fiscal Year 2008 for Marine Turtle Conservation. The United States also contributed \$1.1 million for the United Nations Convention on Endangered Species.²⁰ This \$1 billion cap leaves plenty of room for the United States to give its past contributions to programs Congress and the administration deem truly important, such as UNICEF, the UNDP, and IAEA.

The Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in coordination with the National Security Council and the Secretary of State would be required to prioritize the voluntary contributions to the United Nations and determine which programs are the most important to American national interests.

This option would also eliminate the United Nations' Tax Equalization Fund. In general United Nations employees have always been exempt from taxes paid to them by the United Nations. The United States differs from most nations by taxing the employee salaries of U.S. citizens at the United Nations.

In order to alleviate this situation, the U.S. and the United Nations created a Tax Equalization Fund. Under this system, U.S. citizens who are U.N. employees pay federal income taxes on their wages, then are reimbursed for those taxes by the U.N. from a fund that the United States pays into with dues.

The description above does not describe the full complexity of the Tax Equalization Fund, which is so difficult to administer that the United Nations has received \$179 million in excess

¹⁸ Department of State, "Report to Congress on U.S. Contributions to the United Nations System," February 2, 2010, <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/137490.pdf>, accessed July 17, 2011.

¹⁹ Department of State, "Report to Congress on U.S. Contributions to the United Nations System," February 2, 2010, <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/137490.pdf>, accessed July 17, 2011.

²⁰ Department of State, "Report to Congress on U.S. Contributions to the United Nations System," February 2, 2010, <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/137490.pdf>, accessed July 17, 2011.

contributions to the Tax Equalization Fund from the United States, and does not know what to do with it.²¹

The Tax Equalization Fund requires staff to compile the amounts each year, which vary based on different factors. The fund violates the principle of tax equity by taxing Americans at different rates for similar work. Diplomats and other Department of State employees who work with the United Nations in New York are required to pay their taxes without any reimbursement from the U.S. government.

There is currently a cumulative surplus of \$179 million payable to the United States. This is a one-time payment. These funds could be applied to debt reduction as well as at least \$5 million per year after the elimination of the program.

International Program Elimination and Consolidation

The Asia Foundation and the East-West Center - \$465 Million

Congress should end federal funding for the Asia Foundation and the East-West Center. The U.S. taxpayer paid \$19 million in Fiscal Year 2010 to The Asia Foundation, a non-profit organization founded in the 1960s to strengthen civil society in Asia.²² Programs the Asia Foundation funds sponsor exchanges for Americans to live and study in Asia, and a Congressional Fellowship Program.^{23 24} This program duplicates existing development programs funded by the State Department, USAID, and charity organizations. Eliminating federal funding would not eliminate The Asia Foundation, as it receives funding from private donors.

A similar candidate for elimination is the East-West Center (EWC) in Hawaii. It is a non-profit education and research organization founded in 1960 that promotes better relations and understanding between the United States, Asia and the Pacific.²⁵ It brings Americans and individuals from the Asia Pacific region to the Center for policy-oriented study, training, and research.²⁶ In 2008, the U.S. government provided over 70 percent of the EWC's funding.²⁷ President Obama listed the East-West Center in his proposals on budget savings.²⁸ The East

²¹ Schaefer, Brett, "The U.N. Should Pay What It Owes the U.S. from Its Tax Equalization Fund," Heritage, November 8, 2010, <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2010/11/the-un-should-pay-what-its-owes-the-us-from-its-tax-equalization-fund>.

²² Public Law 111-117, <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-111publ117/pdf/PLAW-111publ117.pdf>, accessed July 17, 2011.

²³ The Asia Foundation website, "Exchanges," <http://asiafoundation.org/program/overview/exchanges>, accessed July 17, 2011.

²⁴ The Asia Foundation website, "Congressional Fellows Program," <http://asiafoundation.org/program/overview/congressional-fellows-program>, accessed July 17, 2011.

²⁵ East-West Center website, "About EWC," <http://www.eastwestcenter.org/about-ewc/>, accessed July 17, 2011.

²⁶ East-West Center, "2010 Annual Report," <http://www.eastwestcenter.org/fileadmin/resources/publications/PDF/annualreport2010-lowresolution.pdf>, accessed July 17, 2011.

²⁷ Office of Management and Budget, "Presidential Terminations, Reductions, and Savings, Budget of the U.S. Government, Fiscal Year 2010" <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/usbudget/fy10/pdf/trs.pdf>, accessed July 17, 2011.

²⁸ Office of Management and Budget, "Presidential Terminations, Reductions, and Savings, Budget of the U.S. Government, Fiscal Year 2010" <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/usbudget/fy10/pdf/trs.pdf>, accessed July 17, 2011.

West Center duplicates existing cultural exchange programs at the State Department and also receives funding from outside sources such as private donations and charities.

International Clean Technology Fund - \$3.3 billion

President Bush in 2008 proposed the creation of an International Clean Technology Fund to provide resources to China to help them develop their domestic clean energy research and development.²⁹ Congress devoted \$300 million taxpayer dollars for foreign clean-energy development in Fiscal Year 2010.³⁰ This duplicates the mission of the Strategic Climate Fund (SCF), which is a U.S. taxpayer-funded program at the World Bank that develops renewable and clean energy for developing countries. Moreover, China is already enjoying profits from clean technology from its prominent position in two major markets of “clean technology” goods. China is a world leader in the manufacture of solar panels,³¹ and produces 90 percent of the current supply of “rare earth,” a key element to the production of hybrid automotive batteries.³²

National Endowment for Democracy - \$1.3 billion

The National Endowment for Democracy (NED) is funded at over \$100 million annually.³³ The nonprofit organization was created in the early 1980s to provide cash grants promoting democracy around the world through election monitoring and promoting civic involvement. Despite being a non-government organization, more than 99percent of the National Endowment for Democracy’s funds come from the U.S. taxpayer.³⁴

This office duplicates the work of the State Department’s Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor. The Bureau’s goals are “supporting and promoting democracy programs throughout the world,” which it says it does by “supporting election monitoring and parliamentary development.”³⁵

End Foreign Aid for Countries that Own Billions in US Debt - \$18.3 billion

²⁹White House Archives, “President Bush Delivers State of the Union Address,” <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2008/01/20080128-13.html>, Jan. 28, 2008, accessed July 17, 2011.

³⁰ CRS Report R41228, “State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs: FY2011 Budget and Appropriations,” March 8, 2011.

³¹ Keith Bradsher, “China Racing Ahead of U.S. in the Drive to Go Solar,” *New York Times*, Aug. 24, 2009, <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/08/25/business/energy-environment/25solar.html>, accessed July 15, 2011.

³² Jason Scott and Jennifer Freedman, “EU Says China Is Tightening Rare-Earth access Even as Quotas Increase,” *Bloomberg News*, July 15, 2011, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-07-14/china-almost-doubles-rare-earth-export-quota-in-second-half-after-wto-move.html>, accessed July 15, 2011.

³³ CRS Report R416890, “The FY2012 State and Foreign Operations Budget Request,” March 9, 2011.

³⁴ National Endowment for Democracy “2009 Independent Auditors’ Report,” http://www.ned.org/sites/default/files/AuditReport_09.pdf.

³⁵ Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor “Democracy,” Department of State, <http://www.state.gov/g/drl/democ/index.htm>, accessed July 17, 2011.

The U.S. gave a total of \$1.7 billion³⁶ in foreign assistance in 2010 to countries holding at least \$10 billion in U.S. Treasury securities.³⁷ According to the Treasury Department, the largest holder of U.S. debt as of March is China, which holds \$1.1 trillion Treasury bonds, and received \$27.2 million in foreign aid in 2010.³⁸

Brazil held \$193.5 billion in Treasury securities and received \$25 million in U.S. foreign aid, while Russia had \$127.8 billion and received \$71.5 million, India held \$39.8 billion and received \$126.6 million from the U.S.^{39 40}

These countries' ability to invest billions in our debt is a strong indicator they do not require foreign aid from the United States. Congress should eliminate all foreign aid programs for countries that own more than \$10 billion in U.S. treasury securities.

Consolidate Global Climate Change Funding - \$15.4 billion

The State Department requested \$1.4 billion in funding for the international programs to combat global climate change among the Departments of State, USAID, and the Department of the Treasury.^{41 42} This recommendation would eliminate all programs regarding global climate change through the Departments of State, Treasury and USAID and instead allow other nations to share in the knowledge about climate change from other federal agencies such as the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

Consolidate Development Assistance with the Millennium Challenge Corporation - \$17 billion

Development Assistance funds long-term projects for the improvement of developing countries⁴³, similar to the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC). The Department of State requested \$2.9 billion for development assistance for Fiscal Year 2012. These funds include programs such as "Feed the Future," Global Climate Change funding, and basic education initiatives.

³⁶ This excludes foreign aid for Colombia and Mexico, which are primarily counter-narcotics programs that impact the United States.

³⁷ Major Foreign Holders of Treasury Securities, <http://www.treasury.gov/resource-center/data-chart-center/tic/Documents/mfh.txt>, June 15, 2011, accessed July 17, 2011.

³⁸ CRS Memorandum, "FY2010 U.S. Foreign Assistance to Major Holders of U.S. Treasury Securities," May 13, 2011, http://coburn.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?a=Files.Serve&File_id=8afef35c-cdd1-487c-9a30-5b83a16104e6, accessed July 17, 2011.

³⁹ Major Foreign Holders of Treasury Securities, <http://www.treasury.gov/resource-center/data-chart-center/tic/Documents/mfh.txt>, June 15, 2011, accessed July 17, 2011.

⁴⁰ CRS Memorandum, "FY2010 U.S. Foreign Assistance to Major Holders of U.S. Treasury Securities," May 13, 2011, http://coburn.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?a=Files.Serve&File_id=8afef35c-cdd1-487c-9a30-5b83a16104e6, accessed July 17, 2011.

⁴¹ Department of State, "Congressional Budget Justification Volume 2: Foreign Operations," Page 5, http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PCAAC013.pdf, accessed July 17, 2011.

⁴² CRS Report R41680, "The FY2012 State and Foreign Operations Budget Request," March 9, 2011.

⁴³ Department of State, "Congressional Budget Justification Volume 2: Foreign Operations FY2012," Page 89, <http://www.usaid.gov/performance/cbj/158267.pdf>.

The State Department requested (separately) over \$1 billion in funding for five-year long-term projects for countries committed to responsibly using this aid to improve their citizens' lives through the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC).⁴⁴

This recommendation would reduce Development Assistance by \$1.55 billion and allow projects that would have been funded through Development Assistance to compete for funding through the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC). Funding for the MCC would not be reduced. Full funding within the Development Assistance budget would also remain for USAID's Feed the Future Initiative (\$922.3 million) and the USAID FORWARD Initiative.⁴⁵

Consolidate Regional Development Organizations with the World Bank - \$7.9 Billion

In addition to funding the World Bank, the United States also funds similar regional multilateral development banks that focus on certain areas of the world. The purposes are similar: loans and aid for infrastructure and other projects intended to grow the economies of the recipients.

This option would end U.S. funding for the listed regionally focused organizations and direct them to either consolidate with the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, or operate without U.S. funds. Extremely poor countries still would be able to apply for loans from the World Bank and International Monetary Fund.

- Inter-American Foundation
- Inter-American Development Bank
- Inter-American Investment Corporation
- Enterprise for the Americas Multilateral Investment Fund
- African Development Foundation
- African Development Bank
- Asian Development Fund
- Asian Development Bank
- International Fund for Agricultural Development

⁴⁴ CRS Report R41680, "The FY2012 State and Foreign Operations Budget Request," March 9, 2011.

⁴⁵ Global Climate Change is listed as both "Development Assistance" and "Global Climate Change" funding in the budget justification. The savings from eliminating Global Climate Change funding are not double-counted.

International Program Reductions

Reduce Economic Support Funding - \$42 Billion

The President requested over \$7 billion for Fiscal Year 2012 for the Economic Support Fund, one of the largest accounts for foreign aid.⁴⁶

This option would reduce our foreign aid by focusing it on the key nations of Afghanistan and Iraq as well as maintain funding for the Human Rights and Democracy Fund. All other programs would be funded through private donations and non-governmental organizations.

Reduce Funding by 20 Percent to the World Bank - \$3 billion

The World Bank's purpose is to make loans and grants to developing countries for projects that will improve their economies, alleviate poverty, and eventually create enough growth so that further assistance is not needed. However, one of the top recipients of lending from the World Bank is China. In 2010, China received over \$4 billion in new loans from the World Bank.⁴⁷ The cumulative lending to China from the World Bank has been \$47 billion for 323 development projects.⁴⁸ This is in spite of the fact that China is lending over \$110 billion of its own money to developing nations during this same time period.⁴⁹

The Department of State requested over \$1.3 billion for funds for the World Bank for Fiscal Year 2012, more than the \$1.2 billion it provided in Fiscal Year 2010 and Fiscal Year 2011.⁵⁰ This option would reduce that amount by 20 percent and freeze it at that level for the next ten years. This would still provide over a \$1 billion per year to the World Bank and force the World Bank to re-examine its priorities on its need for lending.

Reduce Foreign Military Financing - \$27 billion

The United States Foreign Military Financing program provides funding to other nations to purchase military equipment made in the United States and its allies. These funds are intended to both help other nations defend themselves as well as promote joint and allied operations with the United States by providing similar and compatible military equipment for wartime use.⁵¹

⁴⁶ CRS Report R416890, "The FY2012 State and Foreign Operations Budget Request," March 9, 2011.

⁴⁷ CRS Report R41170, "Multilateral Development Banks: Overview and Issues for Congress," March 7, 2011.

⁴⁸ World Bank, "China Projects and Programs," June 30, 2010, <http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/china/projects>.

⁴⁹ Dyer, Geoff and Anderlini, Jamil, "China's lending hits new heights," January 17, 2011, Financial Times, <http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/488c60f4-2281-11e0-b6a2-00144feab49a.html#axzz1S03C5Nfy>.

⁵⁰ CRS Report R416890, "The FY2012 State and Foreign Operations Budget Request," March 9, 2011.

⁵¹ Defense Security Cooperation Agency, "Foreign Military Financing Program," Department of Defense, http://www.dsca.osd.mil/home/foreign_military_financing%20_program.htm, accessed July 17, 2011.

The Department of State requested \$6.5 billion in funding for Fiscal Year 2012 for Foreign Military Financing in base and supplemental funding.⁵² This option would reduce this amount \$3 billion per year for the next ten years and fund Foreign Military Financing for Israel, in accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding on U.S. Military Assistance signed during President Bush's administration. \$2.75 billion of this funding will be used to purchase 20 F-35 fighter planes made in the United States.⁵³

DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND ADDITIONAL FOREIGN AID TEN YEAR SAVINGS

Discretionary: \$192.12 billion

Total: \$192.12 billion

⁵² United States Agency for International Development, "Congressional Budget Justification: Volume 2, Fiscal Year 2012," <http://www.usaid.gov/performance/cbj/158267.pdf>.

⁵³ CRS Report RL33222, "U.S. Foreign Aid to Israel," Congressional Research Service, September 16, 2010.