



Journal of Arts & Humanities

An Ethical Foreign Policy? Globalism as a Threat to the US National Interest

Dr. Wassim Daghrir¹

ABSTRACT

An ethical foreign policy can have no objectives other than those that are of service to its own people. An unethical foreign policy, however, may pursue objectives that enhance the nation as a power, seeking dominance for its own sake, for the honor, glory and wealth of the state or a minority within the state, or spreading its ideology out of missionary fervor. The mainstream wisdom in the United States is that the US foreign policy agendas are virtuous and ethical, since they are oriented mainly towards the protection and enhancement of the American 'National Interest'. Nevertheless, the orthodox perception among many foreign observers is that the American foreign policy is by no means ethical, since it is oriented exclusively towards the promotion of the Americans' interests at the expense of the rest of the world. My thesis is that the US foreign policy is unethical and anti-democratic mainly because it is causing a lot of harm to the American taxpayers' interests. I esteem that the American people are the real permanent victims of their country's globalist stance. This article is based on an argumentative criticism of the mainstream American perception of U.S. foreign policy as well as a criticism of the foreign observers' perception of American foreign policy. In a nutshell, this article tries to highlight the unethical nature of the American foreign policy with a focus on the complex justifications for such an undemocratic globalist agenda.

Keywords: Globalism vs. National Interest, Unethical Foreign Policy, American Exceptionalism vs. Hegemony.

Available Online: 23rd July, 2015.

This is an open access article under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License, 2015.

"America will never be destroyed from the outside. If we falter, and lose our freedoms, it will be because we destroyed ourselves".

Abraham Lincoln.

"A nation that continues year after year to spend more money on military defense rather than on programs of social uplift is approaching spiritual doom".

Martin Luther King, Jr.

¹ Associate Professor, Department of English and Translation, Effat University Jeddah, Saudi Arabia, Email: wassimdaghrir73@yahoo.com.

1.0 Introduction

Foreign policy making in a democracy is, by definition, far from being a simple task. It is a complex process which stands for a large mixture of opinions and interests. Debate is nothing but a natural element in such a democratic system's political scene. Some observers believe that the US government aims at defending the national interest and at making the world safe for democracy. Washington's detractors, however, opt for the thesis of an American 'imperialist' government that uses all possible means to protect the politico-economic elite's interests and to make the world safe for capitalism. The line of reasoning is that such a superpower's foreign policy cannot exclusively be white or black. The complexity of the foreign policy making process makes it look like a mixture of both. It is sometimes guided by moral values, at other times by narrow specific interests, and for the most part by a mixture of both.

The mainstream wisdom in the United States is that the US foreign policy agendas are virtuous and ethical, since they are oriented mainly towards the protection and enhancement of the American 'National Interest'. Nevertheless, the orthodox perception among many foreign observers is that the American foreign policy is by no means ethical, since it is oriented exclusively towards the promotion of the Americans' interests at the expense of the rest of the world.

My thesis is that the US foreign policy is unethical and anti-democratic mainly because it is causing a lot of harm to the American taxpayers' interests. I esteem that the American people are the real permanent victims of their country's globalist stance. The methodology used is based on an argumentative criticism of the mainstream American perception of U.S. foreign policy, as well as a criticism of the foreign observers' perception of American foreign policy. It tries to highlight the unethical nature of the American foreign policy with a focus on the impressive costs and on the complex justifications for such an undemocratic globalist agenda.

2.0 An ethical foreign policy: Description

An ethical foreign policy is structured to serve people's well-being and to work for the general good. In the international relations arena, any government's 'ethical' priorities would focus on the protection of the homeland from potential foreign threats as well as on the conduct of diplomatic, geopolitical and commercial ties, treaties and alliances which would be beneficial to the majority of taxpayers, and thus reflect the "popular democracy" principle.

An ethical foreign policy can have no objectives other than those that are of service to its own people. An unethical foreign policy, however, may pursue objectives that enhance the nation as a power, seeking dominance for its own sake, for the honor, glory and wealth of the state or a minority within the state, or spreading its ideology out of missionary fervor.

3.0 The mainstream American perception of U.S. foreign policy: "Ethical and exemplary"

The mainstream wisdom in the United States is that the US foreign policy agendas are virtuous and ethical, since they are oriented mainly towards the protection and enhancement of the American 'National Interest' (*the Realist School / the Defensive Dimension*).

The second central consensus in the US is that America's diplomatic, economic, and military interferences abroad are a source of moral pride and glory. After all, the 'City upon a Hill' is 'shining' on the rest of the world, generously sharing the blessings of its 'Exceptionalism', and leading the world towards the path of democracy, success, and prosperity (*the Idealist School*). This crusading dimension, based on such complex concepts as "Manifest Destiny", "Divine Ordination", "White Man's Burden",

and “American Exceptionalism”, is so recurrent in the US official message.² In a September 2010 speech for instance, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton (2010) highlighted this crusading dimension as follows:

This is a new American moment, a moment when our global leadership is essential, even if we must always lead in new ways, a moment when those things that make us who we are as a nation –our openness and innovation, our determination and devotion to core values– have never been more needed. This is a moment that must be seized through hard work and bold decisions, to lay the foundations for lasting American leadership for decades to come.³

4.0 Criticism of the mainstream American perception of U.S. foreign policy

The mainstream American perception of US foreign policy can be challenged for multiple obvious reasons. Indeed, the recurrent flaws of this perception read as follows:

4.01 Threat amplification

In order to manufacture consent around a globalist, elitist agenda, the foreign policy Establishment has systematically opted for an unethical, “McCarthyist”, “Pavlovian” use of **fear tactics**. Indeed, in order to build a consensus around their controversial foreign policy agendas, US foreign policy makers have made use of colossal resources “to scare the hell out of the American people”.⁴ In order to obtain the economic and military resources to carry out an aggressive foreign policy, they have to convince Americans of the magnitude of foreign “threats”, regardless if they were real or exaggerated.

4.02 “National interest”

The threat amplification tactic, based on deceptive strategies, has been reinforced by an unethical use of the concept “National Interest”. The terms “National Interest” and “National Security” have taken on an almost sacred aura, justifying huge military budgets which have starved the infrastructure, the suspension of diplomacy in favor of confrontation, interventions far distant from the US, a secrecy that undermined constitutional procedures and actions Americans condemned others for.

U.S. leaders often refer to US “national interest” as the primary goal of US foreign policy. There is no such thing as U.S. national interest in the abstract, of course, because there is no U.S. entity with a single shared set of interests. Is it in the American people’s interest that the government wages horrific wars on civilians overseas to protect profit-seeking options or to maintain credibility as a brute in world affairs or to delegitimize international law? What “National Interest” means, however, are the interests of the Establishment, of those who run the country, of those who profit from its economic and political policies.

The term “national interest” is a complex and malleable concept that is rarely employed by policy makers in the interest of protecting or serving the whole population. On the whole, U.S. national interest has been taken to be whatever serves the interest of the large-scale corporate and financial institutions and the wealthiest property holders in society. So, since the needs and interests of the large-scale corporations and the wealthiest property holders in America are taken to be the needs and interest of the whole economy, they are taken to be the national interest as well.

4.03 “American Exceptionalism’s” moral paradoxes

Making use of a moralistic discourse to justify immoral acts and thus get rid of the guilt associated with the committed deeds is by no means ethical. For all its rhetoric about freedom and justice, the US government has frequently observed a Darwinian logic favoring the survival of the Fittest. The US

² See Appendix 1: Expressions of American Exceptionalism.

³<http://www.state.gov/secretary/20092013clinton/rm/2011/10/175340.htm>

⁴<http://www.123helpme.com/truman-doctrine-view.asp?id=158012>

treatment of Native-Americans, for instance, fits the commonly accepted definition of genocide. Other examples, which cast doubts on the virtues of American foreign policy, highlight the gaps between words and deeds include the US military intervention in northern Mexico in the 1840's, the US covert interference in Chile in the early 1970's, and the Bush Administration's intervention in Iraq in 2003.

The moralistic, simplistic discourse rooted in Good and Evil legitimates any action undertaken in the name of good, no matter how destructive, on the grounds that it is attacking 'evil.' By clearly distinguishing two distinct sides to the global perspective, a binary opposition leaves no room for different interpretations. This simplistic prism positions the United States as the bastion of goodness and defender of righteousness in the world. Notably, such dramatic binary opposition seems likely to facilitate the assuaging of guilt associated with war.

Religious Discourse plays an essential role in promoting national unity on key foreign policy issues. Indeed, usage of religious codes and messages as a means to unite groups against an enemy or in favor of a policy has been a recurring strategy in American politics. Based on simple, unsophisticated, and often-misleading perceptions, the discourse rooted in Good and Evil offers a public relations device – actually a mass deception device- meant to prepare the American people psychologically for such extensive, continuing and unforeseen overseas commitments, such as the “Containment of Communism” and the “War on Terrorism”. In an almost pavlovian way, the binary discourse manufactures retaliatory feelings and heats up war fever among the masses.

4.04 Unethical double standards

The international relations arena is a competitive sphere based on a 'Darwinist' competitive mechanism. US foreign policy makers are fully aware of this and this awareness is clearly manifested in the double standards applied by them in their selective assessment of foreign governments and their not less biased reaction to international law. Several regimes that the US has supported, in the name of democracy, stability, anti-communism, and anti-terrorism, repeatedly act against the very moral principles the US is claiming to defend. Preservation of their own power is the most important interest of these regimes, not the institutionalization of democracy, well-distributed economic growth, or respect for human rights. Certainly, the opposite is always valid as unfriendly governments, regardless of how popular and democratic they are, are often perceived as undemocratic threats to their own people and to regional and global stability.⁵

To back up its strategic and economic allies and, simultaneously, to discourage what it perceives as its foes, Washington makes use of all the diplomatic, economic and military means in its hand to try to influence events and direct them according to its own interests. This includes a selective use of international law which would be advanced to condemn an unfriendly government and totally marginalized to defend an ally.

4.05 Moral paradox: Promoting democracy abroad vs. racism, discrimination, social polarization and the violation of civil liberties at home.

4.06 Democracy and imperialism are incompatible.

5.0 The world's perception of U.S. foreign policy: “Unethical since hegemonic”

Foreign critiques of US 'hegemony' challenge the consensus around the US ethical supremacy. Indeed, the orthodox perception among many Tunisian, Arab, African, and even French and European intellectuals is that the American foreign policy is by no means ethical, since it is oriented exclusively towards the promotion of the Americans' interests at the expense of the rest of the world. This view is

⁵ A perfect example would be the US government's treatment of the freely-elected president Salvador Allende in Chile in the early 1970s.

suspicious of any form of US interference abroad, whether political, economic, cultural or military. It is suspicious of the US official message and perceives America's role in the world as neo-imperialistic. Thus, the use of such concepts as Americanization, coca-colonization, hollywoodization, neo-imperialism, etc. In a July 2009 opinion poll, assessing global public opinion of US foreign policy, 76% of the Chinese, 68% of the French, 68% of the British, 87% of Mexicans, and 86 % of the Turkish found that the "US abuses its great power"⁶ (Kull 2009).

6.0 Criticism of the foreign observers' perception of American foreign policy

In my opinion, the foreign observers' perception of US foreign policy, built around the conspiracy theory, is idealistic, naïve, unrealistic and lacks a historical comparative perspective. These observers are deceived by their own naïve expectations. Why should the US, or any other globalist superpower, care about the rest of the world? Actually, the international relations arena is not, and has never been, guided by morality. It is a jungle which is guided by competition, balance of power, strategic interests, geopolitical interests, all of which within the survival of the fittest frame.

Besides, the US arrogance is by no means unique in history. All previous superior powers, Greek, Roman, Spanish, Portuguese, French, British, Arab, Turkish, German, and Italian etc. were hegemonic powers which imposed their will on the weaker members in this global jungle.

7.0 My thesis: The US foreign policy is unethical and anti-democratic mainly because it is causing a lot of harm to the American taxpayers' interests

My thesis is that the US foreign policy is unethical and anti-democratic mainly because it is causing a lot of harm to the American taxpayers' interests. I esteem that the American people are the real permanent victims of their country's globalist stance for the following reasons:

7.01 Unconstitutional foreign policy

America's globalist agenda and the focus on foreign affairs at the expense of domestic programs is a clear betrayal of the American constitution's objectives. These objectives were clearly stated in the constitution's opening statement which reads as follows:

We the People of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare⁷, and secure the blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

Nevertheless, as a consequence of the heavy military expenses, the general welfare objective has taken a backseat as many social programs have been cut. The military has sucked away public investments, both in dollars and talent, from many of the areas so deeply in need such as health care, public infrastructure, education, social services, etc. The millions of people in the United States who are with no medical care or food or work are the collateral damage of an elite-oriented system that has been going on since the early post-WWII years. Consequently, the American society is obviously polarized. This polarization is highlighted by the US government's official figures:

Poverty⁸

- In 2014, the official poverty rate is 15.0 percent. There are 46.5 million people in poverty.
- The poverty rate in 2014 for children under age 18 is 21.8 percent.
- The richest one percent commands income equal to that of the 40% at the bottom.

⁶Steven Kull, America's global image in the Obama era. WorldpublicOpinion.org, July 7, 2009, p. 3.

⁷ Emphasis added.

⁸ US Census Bureau, www.census.gov.com

Health Insurance Coverage⁹

-An estimated 15.4% of the population, or 48 million people, are without health insurance coverage in 2014.

-The proportion of children who are with no health insurance cover is 9% of all children, or 7 million.

-The US ranks 51st in the world in life expectancy.

The American people's dissatisfaction with such socio-economic polarization is reflected in the priorities they highlight on the eve of every major election. During the 2012 Presidential Election, a Wall Street Journal survey¹⁰ sought to assess the American voters' priorities and expectations via a simple direct question: "Which one of the following is the single most important issue in deciding for whom you will vote?" The answers came in the following interesting order:

-Economy: 46%

-Social issues and values: 15%

-Social security and Medicare: 12%

-Health care: 10%

-Federal deficit: 7%

-Foreign policy: 6%

-Terrorism: 1%

Yet, the fear-industrial complex continues to dominate national priorities. Over the last 14 years, the enormous apparatus that has been built up to combat terrorism has grown only more out of size and out of proportion to the actual threat. Actually, the best method to assess the American government's priorities and to check out whether these priorities fit the "popular democracy" framework is to highlight the gap between the American people's expectations expressed during the 2012 Presidential Election and the priorities of the US government's Budget. As a matter of fact, in spite of the new Obama Doctrine and its reliance on Soft Power (rebalancing US foreign policy in several respects: domestic over global priorities, diplomatic over military initiatives, and the selective use of America's world power), the Obama Administration's 2014 budget reads as follows:¹¹

-Department of Defense: **526.6 billion dollars.**

-Department of Health and Human Services Including Medicare and Medicaid: 78.6 billion dollars.

-Department of Education: 71.2 billion dollars.

-Department of Housing and Urban Development: 33.1 billion dollars.

Obviously, Americans are the first victims of their country's permanent-war economy. In 2010, the US occupied by far the first rank in global military spending with 43% of the world's military expenditures (followed by China 7.3%).¹² The US military spending in 2011 was \$ 711 billion (China spent \$143 billion and Russia \$71.9 billion).¹³ The total costs of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan were \$1.3 trillion. Yet, one M1 tank could pay for a dozen day-care centers and for the special national milk program for children, which Congress abolished. The cost of one E-3A Airborne warning plane could cover one year's Medicare benefits for a million women and children. The \$250 billion the Pentagon spent to build 2,800 new Joint Strike Fighter planes is more than enough to pay for the schooling of every university student in the US. The proposed combined budgets for the Pentagon over the next five years are \$1.6 trillion. The amount needed to renovate and upgrade every school in America is \$112 billion.

Major wars distract the people from their socio-economic problems. They keep them on a permanent status of fear, which is necessary to maintain an elite-oriented permanent war-economy. Actually, in

⁹*ibid.*

¹⁰ NBC News/Wall Street Journal Survey, September 26-30, 2012, p. 11, <http://msnbcmedia.msn.com/MSNBC/Sections/A-Politics/-Today-Stories-Teases/NBCNews-WSIPoll-9-12.pdf>

¹¹See Appendix 2: The US Government's 2014 Budget in Billions of Dollars.

¹²World military expenditures: top ten spenders in 2010, www.sipri.org/yearbook/2011/04/04A

¹³ The 15 countries with the highest military expenditures in 2011, www.sipri.org/research/armaments/milex/resultoutput/milex_15

order to maintain a predominance of power and to sell the consequential social sacrifices to the American people, the world must be hostile and dangerous. This is why U.S. leaders have always been looking for new enemies. Enemies always exist. They just change their name from 'savages' to 'communists', 'socialists', 'leftists', or 'nationalists', and then 'revolutionaries', 'drug-traffickers', and today 'Arab and Islamic terrorists'. The goal is to divert the discontented, not only through super bowl, wrestling, and TV game shows, but also through the employment of systematic, sophisticated propaganda about foreign enemies who threaten 'National Security' (Weapons of Mass Distraction).

7.02 A corporate-managed, elitist foreign policy

The members of the military-industrial-intelligence network need enemies. The military and the CIA need them because enemies are their *raison d'être*. Industrialists, especially the defense contractors, need them because enemies are to be fought with their more and more sophisticated weaponry. Accordingly, instead of caring about the average American's well-being, the tax payers' dollars are spent on the military machine, the dividends of which improve the well-being of the rich Power Elite (welfare for the rich).

The military-industrial complex relies on the governmental political, intelligence, and military institutions to promote markets for U.S. investment, to secure a dominating position over resources that are needed by U.S. corporations, and to use all means to crash those who challenge the smooth functioning of the global free-market system. The U.S. intervenes abroad in order to protect its investors, to guarantee the American access to raw materials and cheap labor, and to destroy the obstacles facing the American corporations. In effect, U.S. leaders have been dedicated above all to making the world safe for the global corporate investment. They have been dedicated to constructing a global system that the U.S. would dominate and within which U.S. business and geopolitical interests would thrive. The point is that the gains of empire flow into the hands of the privileged business class while the costs are extracted from the industry of the rest of the people. This is welfare for the rich: the costs of U.S. foreign aids and military interventions to make the world safe for ITT, General Motors, Coca Cola, and Halliburton are financed by the U.S. government, that is by the American tax payers. In a word, the American officials make their citizens believe that a certain national interest is at stake and ask them to finance the intervention, were it economic or military, and the dividends will not go back to the same tax payers, but to the corporate rich elite.¹⁴

8.0 Explanation of the lack of criticism within mainstream milieus in the U.S.

Alexis de Tocqueville declared a long time ago: "I know of no country in which there is so little independence of mind and real freedom of discussion as in America".

U.S. leaders have managed to keep a permanent war economy even in the absence of major threats. Consequently, many social programs have been cut. Why, then, do U.S. citizens (in such a representative democracy) not show signs of revolt against the system?

In the past, the U.S. people have mounted tremendous popular protests in the streets, in the factories, on the picket lines, and at the ballot boxes. And they will again. The current absence of large scale mass protests by the bottom 60 or 70 percent of the U.S. population over a twenty-five or thirty year decline in their relative share of aggregate national income, or a decline in social benefits, or the lack of affordable medical care, or the tax rip-off for a bloated military machine, or a broken electoral system, is probably due to three major factors. First, the absence of an economic catastrophe that afflicts nearly everyone. Second, the widespread availability of easy consumer credit for purchasing all sorts of

¹⁴ An excellent case study would be that of Halliburton Corporation and all the generous contracts it obtained during the War on Iraq.

necessities and “goodies.” Third, an extremely effective corporate propaganda machine and an entertainment industry that helps to divert and sedate people into quiescence.

Other important factors include the following:

- The perseverance of the traditional American principles which glorify individualism, self-reliance, hands-off policies...
- The legacies of McCarthyism, principally the destruction of the left, the demonization of social reforms, the rejection of serious debates around US foreign policy, the marginalization of criticism, and the use of secrecy...
- an elitist system: a one party, one ideology, one system scene.
- a weak democracy.

9.0 Conclusion

The US foreign policy is unethical and anti-democratic. The impact of US public opinion will continue to be hampered by a political culture that remains stubbornly ignorant of world history, geography, and even current events. Such aloofness breeds misperceptions of foreign events and makes citizens susceptible to manipulation by the members of the Establishment. The lack of public scrutiny also gives the members of the Power Elite considerable margin to provide favors to special interests, particularly corporate interests.

The famous historian and political scientist Howard Zinn (2002) offers the following concluding thoughts:

While criticizing the war on terrorism and exposing its many hypocrisies, we need to realize if we do only that, we, too, become victims of the war. We, too -like so many Americans listening to the President's frightening picture of enemies here, there, everywhere- will have been diverted from an idea that could unite Americans as surely as fear of terrorists. That idea is a startling one, but immediately recognizable as true: Our most deadly enemies are not in caves and compounds abroad but in the corporate boardrooms and governmental offices where decisions are made that consign millions to death and misery -not deliberately, but as the collateral damage of the lust for profit and power.

The so-called war on terrorism is not only a war on innocent people in other countries, but it is also a war on the people of the United States: a war on our liberties, a war on our standard of living. The wealth of the country is being stolen from the people and handed over to the superrich. The lives of our young are being stolen. And the thieves are in the White House.¹⁵

References

1. <http://www.state.gov/secretary/20092013clinton/rm/2011/10/175340.htm>
2. <http://www.123helpme.com/truman-doctrine-view.asp?id=158012>
3. Steven, K. (2009). America's global image in the Obama era. *WorldpublicOpinion.org*, 7, 3-11.
4. US Census Bureau, www.census.gov.com.
5. World military expenditures: top ten spenders in 2010. (April 2001). Retrieved from www.sipri.org/yearbook/2011/04/04A.
6. The 15 countries with the highest military expenditures in 2011. (September 2012). Retrieved from [www.sipri.org/research/armaments/milex/resultoutput/milex_15-NBC News/Wall Street Journal Survey, September 26-30, 2012, p. 11,](http://www.sipri.org/research/armaments/milex/resultoutput/milex_15-NBC%20News/Wall%20Street%20Journal%20Survey,%20September%2026-30,%202012,%20p.%2011)
7. Zinn, H. (2002). Operation enduring war. *The Progressive*, 3, 24-28.

Appendix 1: Expressions of American exceptionalism

¹⁵Zinn, H. (2002). Operation enduring war. *The Progressive*, 3, 24-28.

"We must consider that we shall be as a City upon a Hill, the eyes of all people are upon us."
John Winthrop, "A Model of Christian Charity" (1630)

"It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and at no great distant period a great nation to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence."
George Washington, Farewell Address, 17 September 1796

"Destiny has laid upon our country the responsibility of the free world's leadership."
Dwight D. Eisenhower, First Inaugural Address, 20 January 1953

"Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and success of liberty.... [T]he energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it—and the glow from that fire can truly light the world."
John F. Kennedy, Inaugural Address, 20 January 1961

"Our [foreign] policy is designed to serve mankind."
Jimmy Carter, commencement address at University of Notre Dame, 22 May 1977

"Americans resort to force only when we must. We have never been aggressors. We have always struggled to defend freedom and democracy. We have no territorial ambitions. We occupy no territories."
Ronald Reagan, State of the Union Address, 25 January 1984

"The past few days when I've been at that window upstairs, I've thought a bit of the 'shining city upon a hill.' The phrase comes from John Winthrop, who wrote it to describe the America he imagined. What he imagined was important because he was an early Pilgrim, an early freedom man. He journeyed here on what today we'd call a little wooden boat; and like the other Pilgrims, he was looking for a home that would be free. And how stands the city on this winter night? More prosperous, more secure, and happier than it was 8 years ago. But more than that: After 200 years, two centuries, she still stands strong and true on the granite ridge, and her glow has held steady no matter what storm. And she's still a beacon, still a magnet for all who must have freedom, for all the pilgrims from all the lost places who are hurtling through the darkness, toward home".
President Ronald Reagan, Farewell Address.

"The fact is America remains the indispensable nation. America, and only America, can make a difference between war and peace, between freedom and repression, between hope and fear [in the world]."
William Jefferson Clinton, address at George Washington University, 5 August 1996

Appendix 2: The US Government's 2014 Budget In billions of dollars

Agency	Discretionary, requested
Department of Defense including Overseas Contingency Operations	526.6
Department of Health and Human Services including Medicare and Medicaid	78.3
Department of Education	71.2
Department of Veterans Affairs	63.5
Department of Housing and Urban Development	33.1
Department of State and Other International Programs	48.1

Agency	Discretionary, requested
Department of Homeland Security	39.0
Department of Energy	28.4
Department of Justice	16.3
Department of Agriculture	21.5
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	17.7
National Intelligence Program	48.2
Department of Transportation	16.3
Department of the Treasury	12.9
Department of the Interior	11.7
Department of Labor	12.1
Social Security Administration	9.1
Department of Commerce	8.6
Army Corps of Engineers Civil Works	4.7
Environmental Protection Agency	8.2
National Science Foundation	7.6
Small Business Administration	0.8
Corporation for National and Community Service	1.1
Net interest	0
Disaster costs	6
Other spending	19.4
Total	1,235