

FOREIGN POLICY

FOR AMERICA

Messaging Guidance: Supplemental Funding for the Iran War March 11, 2026

Background

The Trump administration is [reportedly](#) considering requesting up to \$50 billion in supplemental appropriations in connection to its ongoing war against Iran. In just the first week of the conflict, U.S. operations have cost around [\\$6 billion](#), mostly for munitions. Last July, Congress passed a reconciliation law that provided a one-time payment of [\\$153 billion](#) in additional funding for the Pentagon, including \$25 billion for munitions procurement. This amount, most of which has not been obligated, is in addition to the [regular defense appropriations](#) of \$839 billion for fiscal year 2026 that included \$28.8 billion for munitions procurement contracts. House Appropriations Committee Chair Tom Cole has stated that any supplemental funding [would not be offset](#), meaning it will add to the national debt.

Key Points

- Lawmakers should not give Trump any more money to continue his illegal war of choice.
- This war is driving up fuel prices for Americans and could lead to a global recession if not stopped.
- Instead of spending billions for Trump's reckless military adventures, Congress should invest in the American people and focus on rising healthcare and energy costs.
- Why would Congress give even more money to Trump's War Department when it just got a \$150 billion bonus it hasn't even fully spent?
- The best way to keep American troops and civilians in the region safe is to end this costly war before more people die.

Common Questions

Q: Does President Trump have legal authority to conduct operations for 60 days under the War Powers Act?

A: No. The [War Powers Act](#) creates notification requirements and expedited review procedures when U.S. forces are involved in hostilities. Congress explicitly stated that the law should not

“be construed as granting any authority to the President with respect to the introduction of United States Armed Forces into hostilities.”

Q: Is supplemental funding necessary to support the U.S. service members?

A: As Sen. Chris Murphy [has stated](#), “If you support the troops, then you should be voting against funding this war so that we get our troops out of harm’s way.”

A: Our military personnel and assets are overextended – the [USS Gerald R. Ford aircraft carrier](#) is on track to remain at sea for 11-months, possibly breaking the record for longest at-sea deployment, set by the USS Midway during the Vietnam War. The extended deployment is taking a toll on the ship’s sailors, with some [considering](#) leaving the Navy, and the carrier faces maintenance issues and upgrade delays.

Q: What about funding to assist evacuating U.S. citizens?

A: Protecting Americans is our government’s number one priority, yet the Trump administration had no plan to ensure the safety of the [hundreds of thousands](#) of our citizens in the Middle East who were put at risk by the outbreak of war, leaving them [stranded](#) and scrambling to leave the region. The administration has since [conducted](#) chartered flights for some U.S. citizens, and Congress of course stands ready to provide any additional support for Americans abroad.

Q: The administration has pulled resources from other areas to support the war in Iran. Is supplemental funding needed to address readiness challenges?

A: Our readiness challenges are the result of Trump launching this ill-advised war despite knowing the risks for escalation and concerns regarding challenges to munitions stockpiles [raised directly](#) by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Diverting military assets and using up limited stockpiles to attack Iran when we had already set back its nuclear program and it did not pose an imminent threat puts at a disadvantage to deal with the more strategic threats posed by China and Russia. Giving more money for mismanaged defense will not make us more secure.

Q: Can approving funding be considered an authorization of the war?

A: Potentially. Past administrations have taken the position that [supplemental appropriations](#) can constitute congressional authorization to use force under the War Powers Resolution. Whatever the legal implications, funding will only extend an already disastrous war.