

CRS Report for Congress

Received through the CRS Web

Iraq: International Attitudes to Operation Iraqi Freedom and Reconstruction

Updated December 18, 2003

Steven A. Hildreth
Specialist in National Defense
Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division

Jeremy Sharp
Analyst in Middle East Affairs
Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division

Melanie Caesar, Adam Frost, Helene Machart
Research Associates
Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division

Iraq: International Attitudes to Operation Iraqi Freedom and Reconstruction

Summary

On May 1, 2003, President Bush announced the end of the combat phase of the U.S.-led war in Iraq. President Bush referred to the war as a “victory” and claimed that “in the battle of Iraq, the United States and our allies have prevailed.” (“President Bush Announces that Combat Operations in Iraq Have Ended,” *White House Press*, May 1, 2003). In the aftermath of the war, the U.S. military presence in postwar Iraq persists. Approximately 130,000 U.S. troops remain in Iraq and are partaking in the reconstruction and stabilization of the country. Under UNSC Res. 1483, the Administration’s current objective in Iraq is to secure and rebuild the country and fulfill the humanitarian needs of the Iraqi people. However, restoring law and order and delivering basic services continues to be threatened by lawlessness and violence by a variety of Hussein loyalists, ex-soldiers, criminal elements, and possibly international fighters.

Numerous countries are contributing to reconstruction and stabilization forces in Iraq. The United Kingdom governs the southern part of the country, where there are nearly 12,000 British troops. Meanwhile, Poland — with some logistical assistance from NATO — oversees the central-southern region and leads a force consisting of 9,200 troops from Europe, Asia, and Latin America. Still, other countries that have not contributed troops, such as Saudi Arabia and China, have offered monetary pledges and humanitarian aid.

There has been an increase in international cooperation between the United States and the countries that opposed the U.S.-led war in Iraq in the postwar period. On October 16, 2003, the U.N. Security Council unanimously approved UNSC Res. 1511. This resolution authorized a multinational force under unified command (article 13), welcomed countries to pledge substantially to Iraq’s reconstruction needs (article 24), and signaled an overall greater role for the United Nations in postwar Iraq. The spirit of international cooperation was also evident at the Madrid International Conference on Reconstruction in Iraq on October 24, 2003. The conference garnered close to \$13 billion in aid pledges from countries and donors other than the United States. Some analysts suggest, however, that foreign governments are still hesitant to contribute peacekeeping troops and financial assistance out of fear of appearing to sanction the Iraq war.

Concerns over (1) the deteriorating security situation and troops’ safety, (2) the accuracy of prewar intelligence on Iraq, including the unproven assertion of a large-scale program to develop chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons, and (3) the timetable and design for establishing an internationally recognized, “legitimate” Iraqi government, however, have rekindled the prewar debate over the use of military action against Iraq and predictions about the ease of “regime change” in Iraq. In light of the latter concerns, the U.S. government has recently announced that it may seek an additional U.N. resolution to back its proposal for turning over authority to a sovereign Iraqi government. Presumably, such concerns might affect the extent of foreign support toward postwar Iraq reconstruction.

Contents

Overview	1
International Cooperation and Disagreement Before the War	1
International Cooperation and Disagreements in Postwar Era	2
Response	6
Regional and International Organizations	6
Countries	9

List of Tables

Table 1. Map and List of Coalition of the Willing	34
Table 2. Foreign Military-Related Support — Troops & Equipment (Offered or Provided) for a U.S.-Led War on Iraq	35
Table 3. Foreign Military-Related Support — Access & Facilities (Offered or Provided) for a U.S.-Led War on Iraq ..	36
Table 4. Foreign Contributions to Relief and Reconstruction in Postwar Iraq ..	38
Table 5. Countries To Which Iraq May Owe Debt*	43
Table 6. How the Security Council Voted: Selected Votes in 2002 and 2003 addressing Iraq*	45
Table 7. Countries Eligible to Bid on Primary Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Contracts ^a	46
Table 8. Madrid International Donor Conference Reconstruction Pledges ^a	47

Iraq: International Attitudes to Operation Iraqi Freedom and Reconstruction

Overview

Although there was widespread international disagreement in the period leading up to the U.S.-led war in Iraq, forty-nine countries demonstrated support for the coalition's actions in Iraq by publicly agreeing to be included in the Bush Administration's "coalition of the willing." See **Table 1** for a map and detailed list of countries listed in the coalition. Their support varied from military-related to diplomatic support. Military support included, but was not limited to, access to foreign bases and ports, forward deployed U.S. material, the granting of overflight rights, and transit permission through any number of territorial waters or waterways. See **Table 2** and **Table 3** for a description of military support provided by individual countries. Several countries not officially listed as members of the coalition of the willing have also provided financial and humanitarian support to postwar Iraq by providing bilateral aid to U.N. agencies or to a joint UN/World Bank administered trust fund. See **Table 4** for a comprehensive list of financial and personnel commitments in postwar Iraq. Many other countries rebuffed U.S. actions in Iraq and deplored the support the United States received from members of the coalition.

Although new divisions have emerged over the timetable and design for turning authority over from the Coalition Provisional Authority (CPA) to an internationally recognized, "legitimate" Iraqi government, increased international cooperation to fulfill Iraq's humanitarian and reconstruction is also evident. In this vein, this report tracks countries' current political stances on the postwar situation, as well as major foreign monetary and military contributions to postwar Iraq. Where applicable, this report will also discuss the issue of debt forgiveness for Iraq. See **Table 5** for a range of current estimates of debt held by the international community. This overview combines historical information about the war and other issues concerning the current situation in Iraq.

International Cooperation and Disagreement Before the War

In November 2002, the Bush Administration successfully garnered unanimous support within the U.N. Security Council for a resolution (UNSC Res.1441) that called on Iraq to "comply with its disarmament obligations" or "face serious consequences." See **Table 6** for countries that voted on this Security Council Resolution. For several months, the Bush Administration sought to persuade the international community of the necessity of disarming Iraq. During this diplomatic campaign, the Bush Administration accused Iraq of noncompliance with 17 U.N. Security resolutions. Bush alleged that Iraq was in "material breach of its

longstanding United Nations obligations.”¹ He argued that stronger action in Iraq was necessary because Iraq’s failure to declare and eliminate its WMD posed a grave and imminent danger to the national security of the United States and that of its allies.

In February 2003, the United States introduced a second resolution that would have authorized military action in Iraq.² Although members of the U.N. Security Council generally agreed that Iraq failed to fully comply with the United Nations and to cooperate with weapons inspectors, the Council was unable to agree on the use of force. Seemingly, the U.S. draft resolution would not have passed because of sharp divisions within the Security Council. On March 17, 2003, the United States withdrew its draft resolution. See **Table 6** for countries that were eligible to vote on this resolution.

When diplomatic efforts to obtain U.N.-backing for the war in Iraq broke down, the U.S. led a preemptive³ strike on March 19, 2003 to disarm Iraq and overthrow Saddam Hussein and the Baathist regime,⁴ whose end was seen symbolically on April 9, 2003. On May 1, 2003, President Bush announced the end of the combat phase of the U.S.-led war in Iraq. President Bush referred to the war as a “victory,” and claimed that “in the battle of Iraq, the United States and our allies have prevailed.”⁵

International Cooperation and Disagreements in Postwar Era

In the first sign of renewed cooperation after the war, the U.N. Security Council unanimously endorsed resolution 1483 on May 22, 2003, mandating the removal of sanctions against Iraq and granting broad authority to the United States and Britain to administer Iraq until the establishment of a “legitimate” government. The resolution also calls for the use of Iraqi oil revenues to fund reconstruction. Such proceeds will be placed in the Development Fund for Iraq under auditing controls by an appointed International Advisory and Monitoring Board (IAMB). The Heads of the Arab Fund for Economic and Social Development, the International Monetary Fund, the United Nations, and the World Bank established the IAMB on October 24, 2003. A United Nations appeal for international assistance in Iraq also generated

¹ “President Bush: Monday ‘Moment of Truth’ for World on Iraq,” *White House Press Release*, March 16, 2003.

² Some analysts assert that UNSC Res. 1441 could have, by itself, authorized the use of force by the United Nations.

³ For the purposes of this report, a preemptive use of military force is considered to be the taking of military action by the United States against another nation so as to prevent or mitigate a presumed imminent *military* attack or use of force by that nation against the United States. (For further reading, see CRS report, RS 21311, *U.S. Use of Preemptive Military Force*, April 11, 2003.)

⁴ In October 2002, Congress had authorized the President to use the armed forces of the United States to defend U.S. national security against the threat posed by Iraq and to enforce all relevant U.N. resolutions regarding Iraq (P.L. 107-243).

⁵ “President Bush Announces that Combat Operations in Iraq have ended,” *White House Press*, May 1, 2003.

nearly \$1 billion in financial commitments and donations for humanitarian relief and reconstruction in Iraq.

On October 6, 2003, the U.N. Security Council also unanimously approved UNSC Res. 1511. This resolution authorized a multinational force under unified command (article 13), welcomed countries to pledge substantially to Iraq's reconstruction needs (article 24), and signaled an overall greater role for the United Nations in postwar Iraq. The spirit of international cooperation was also evident at the Madrid International Conference on Reconstruction in Iraq on October 24, 2003. The conference garnered close to \$13 billion in aid pledges from countries and donors other than the United States. Some analysts suggest, however, that foreign governments are still hesitant to contribute peacekeeping troops and financial assistance out of fear of appearing to sanction the Iraq war

Concerns for the security of Iraqi citizens, coalition troops, and aid workers, however, persist in the postwar era. The immediate aftermath of the war witnessed lawlessness, violence, and widespread looting, causing destruction to critical infrastructure and disrupting delivery of basic services and food distribution. According to a defense official, "the postwar looting, violence and guerrilla-style resistance in Iraq was 'to some extent unexpected'."⁶ In the months following, troops and aid workers have also come under attack in a series of high profile bombings and attacks on coalition forces. The bombing of the Jordanian Embassy on August 7, 2003; the U.N. headquarters bombing in Baghdad on August 19, 2003; and the truck bombing of the International Red Cross Headquarter on October, 27, 2003 led to the temporary closure of U.N. and International Red Cross offices in Baghdad. A possible missile attack on U.S. helicopters on November 2, 2003 that resulted in deaths of 15 U.S. soldiers⁷, an attack on the Italian military headquarters in Nasiriya on November 12, 2003, that killed nineteen soldiers, as well as other attacks on international coalition forces, however, have not led to a reduction in personnel from countries with troops on the ground. This environment may, however, bear upon nations' decisions to contribute to the stabilization and reconstruction of postwar Iraq.

Since the end of the war, the Administration has actively sought foreign support for stabilization and reconstruction efforts in Iraq. This diplomacy has resulted in military and peacekeeping commitments from several countries. On the ground, individuals may be playing multiple, or non-traditional roles in the fields of stabilization, reconstruction, and humanitarian assistance. As of November 30, 2003, a total of almost 40 countries have pledged personnel to support security, logistics, and reconstruction. These countries include:

Australia, Albania, Armenia Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Estonia, El Salvador, Fiji, Georgia, Honduras, Hungary, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Mongolia,

⁶ Robert Burns, "Pentagon officials says Iraq stabilization proves 'tougher and more complex' than expected," *The Associated Press*, June 10, 2003.

⁷ The event is still under investigation. Initially reports attributed the tragedy to a missile attack, but latter reports have questioned this initial assessment.

Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Singapore, Slovakia, South Korea, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine and the United Kingdom.

Starting August 25, 2003, Poland began to lead 9,200 troops from countries representing Europe, Asia and Latin America. With some logistical assistance from NATO, Poland will oversee the central-southern region and a multinational force comprised of countries mainly from Eastern Europe and Central Asia. The cost of this effort is estimated at \$230-\$240 million; Poland is expected to pay for \$30-\$40 million, while the United States is expected to cover the rest.⁸ The United Kingdom will govern the southern part of the country, where there are already 12,000 U.K. troops.

There are various reasons why some countries are hesitant to send troops into Iraq today. Several countries such as Russia, India and Germany indicated before the passage of UNSC Res. 1511 that they would only send troops under a U.N. mandate authorizing a peacekeeping force in Iraq. Although the passage of UNSC Res. 1511 may meet this criterion, only Singapore pledged to send troops following the passage of this resolution. Some countries have also expressed disapproval with the proposed time line and design for turning over authority to a sovereign Iraqi government. Other countries have said that “they remain dubious about the legitimacy of the unprovoked U.S. war” and do not want to appear to have supported the war by engaging in postwar efforts.⁹ Still others have said that they are not able to finance a military operation. Finally, some countries have said that their troops are already committed in conflicts in other regions such as Afghanistan, the Balkans, Liberia and the Democratic Republic of Congo.¹⁰ Some countries that have been unwilling or unable to send troops have still been willing to send humanitarian aid (relief supplies and monetary aid) to Iraqi civilians.

Iraq and its people suffered for decades under the Hussein regime. Many believe that the road to stability will be long and that substantial work and finances are needed to restore Iraq’s security, stabilize its economy, and rebuild its infrastructure. A World Bank assessment estimated that \$36 million dollars will be needed for reconstruction and humanitarian efforts in 2004-2007; the Coalition Provisional Authority estimated that an additional \$20 million dollars will be needed for sectors not covered in the World Bank assessment such as oil, security, and police.¹¹ The culmination of the United State’s diplomatic efforts to obtain international financial support to offset this cost occurred at the Madrid International Conference on Reconstruction in Iraq in October, 2003. See **Table 8** for a list of pledges made at this conference. The conference raised close to \$33 billion in grants and loans to finance Iraq’s reconstruction from the international community. This figure includes

⁸ Vernon Loeb, “U.S. to Fund Polish-led Peacekeeping Force; Costs Expected to Be More Than \$200 Million, *Washington Post*, July 29, 2003.

⁹ Peter Slevin, “Policing of Iraq to Stay U.S. Job,” *Washington Post*, June 22, 2003.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ “UN/World Bank present Iraq Reconstruction Needs to Core Group,” *World Bank Press Release* October 2, 2003.

the U.S. contribution of \$18.6 billion. The Bush Administration continues to seek foreign support for the reconstruction and stabilization of Iraq through bilateral discussions. In some cases, the U.S. government has also urged countries to forgive Iraq's debt burden to facilitate Iraq's economic recovery. The State Department has estimated that Iraq owes between \$100- \$125 billion, excluding claims from the Iran-Iraq war and Kuwait reparations.¹² As a special presidential envoy for this matter, Former Secretary of State James Baker III obtained assurances from France, Germany, Italy, and Great Britain to reschedule and possibly forgive much of this debt through Paris club mechanisms.

Response

Regional and International Organizations

European Union. Before and during the combat-phase of the U.S.-led war in Iraq, European Union (EU) members were divided over the question of Iraq. Although the EU supported UNSC Res. 1441, members were divided over its implementation. States such as France and Germany opposed war but supported an extension of U.N. arms inspections. States such as Spain and the United Kingdom believed that further inspections were proving futile and that force was necessary.

In addition to having different views on the justification for military action in Iraq, EU countries continue to express different views on the exact timetable for turning over authority from the Coalition Provisional Authority to an internationally recognized Iraqi Government. EU members did agree that the provisions under UNSC Res. 1483, which lifted sanctions on Iraq, are part of a viable plan for Iraq's reconstruction and stabilization.¹³ Furthermore, European Commissioner for Foreign Affairs Chris Patten indicated that an important step has been taken by setting up a broadly representative Governing Council, as recognized by the UNSC Res 1511. On November 17, 2003, the European Union also welcomed plans to accelerate the handover of power in Iraq from the US-led coalition and stressed the "vital role" of the United Nations in rebuilding the country.¹⁴

The European Union has stated that it is "committed to upholding the territorial integrity, the sovereignty, the political stability, as well as the respect for rights of the Iraqi, people, including all persons belonging to minorities."¹⁵ The EU is one of the main sources of external humanitarian assistance in Iraq. Since the beginning of the conflict in March 2003, the European Community Humanitarian Aid Office (ECHO)

¹² Efron, Sonni, "Donor's unlikely to bridge the funding gap for Iraq; White House offers no estimates for next week's conference; Debt Relief is also a concern," *Los Angeles Times*, October 18, 2003.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ "EU welcomes accelerated handover of power in Iraq," <http://www.eubusiness.com>, accessed November 17, 2003.

¹⁵ The official website of the European Union, [<http://eruopa.eu.int>], accessed November 14, 2003.

has provided \$110 million in aid, \$80 million of this for emergency assistance. ECHO assistance has focused on medical emergencies, including the rehabilitation of hospitals and other facilities, emergency relief for displaced people, food aid, demining activities, and restoration of essential services such as water and electricity. At the Madrid International Conference on Reconstruction in Iraq, the EU pledged an additional \$230 million for reconstruction purposes in 2004. The EU pledge is the main vehicle through which some Western European nations, such as Germany and France, are providing financial support to reconstruction in Iraq. Financial decisions about commitments for 2005 and 2006 may depend on the security situation in Iraq, the country's ability to absorb aid, financial commitment to Afghanistan and elsewhere, as well as the speed with which authority is transferred to a sovereign, Iraqi government. EU's reconstruction and humanitarian aid will support the work of organizations such as the International Committee of the Red Cross, CARE, and UNICEF. The largess of pledged funds will be directed through the World Bank/United Nation's administered trust fund..

Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC). In an effort to help the United States economically during the war against Iraq, OPEC agreed to maintain price stability by increasing oil production by 6.5%, or about 1.5 million barrels a day.¹⁶ In the postwar era, Iran's OPEC governor Ardebili said Iraq would be absent from OPEC until it has an internationally recognized government.¹⁷ OPEC, however, welcomed Dr. Ibrahim Bahr Alohom as the head of Iraq's Delegation on September 24, 2003. In addition to seeking the ability to participate as a full member of OPEC, Iraq has also reportedly met with representative from the OPEC fund, the philanthropic endowment of the organization, in order to secure resources for reconstruction and rehabilitation.¹⁸

NATO Members and Aspirants. NATO Secretary General Lord Robertson characterized the period leading up to the U.S.-led war in Iraq as "difficult."¹⁹ During this period, NATO members were sharply divided regarding NATO's role in the war. A U.S. proposal to use NATO forces to protect Turkey from a possible attack from neighboring Iraq proved controversial and also incited debates among NATO members. The proposal called for deploying NATO Patriot anti-missile batteries, AWACS surveillance planes, and chemical-biological protection units to Turkey.²⁰ France, Belgium, and Germany opposed the U.S.-proposed role for NATO, arguing that they did not want to begin any military planning regarding Iraq for fear of sending the signal that diplomatic channels had been abandoned. Although the three countries initially vetoed a move to further consider the proposal, Germany and Belgium subsequently accepted the possibility of a NATO presence in Turkey with

¹⁶ Eric Pfanner, "OPEC Agrees to Increase Its Oil Production Quotas by 6.5%," *New York Times*, January 13, 2003.

¹⁷ "Iraq Not Acceptable at OPEC until New Govt — Iran," *Reuters News*, June 11, 2003.

¹⁸ Safur Rahman, "Gulf News-Iraq to explore new funding possibilities" *Gulf News*, September 22, 2003.

¹⁹ Speech by NATO Secretary General Lord Robertson, May 26, 2003.

²⁰ Michael Thurston, "NATO in deadlock over Iraq before UN meeting," *Agence France-Presse*, February 13, 2003.

the understanding that the mission was solely defensive in nature. Although France, Belgium, and Germany rebuffed the proposal, eight NATO members (the Czech Republic, Denmark, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Portugal, Spain, and the United Kingdom), six future NATO members (Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia) and three NATO hopefuls (Macedonia, Albania, and Croatia), affirmed their support for the U.S. position on Iraq.

After the U.S.-led war in Iraq, NATO leaders affirmed that NATO's unity remained firm despite divisions on the Iraq issue. According to NATO Secretary General: "Some pundits have argued that the Iraq crisis undermined [NATO] unity. I say: look again."²¹ During a two-day summit in Madrid in June 2003, NATO nations vowed to put the divisions aside and to coalesce with the future of the Alliance at heart. On May 21, 2003, the 19 NATO countries unanimously agreed to support Poland in leading a multinational peacekeeping force in Iraq. NATO Secretary General Lord Robertson emphasized "we are not talking about a NATO presence in Iraq...we're talking purely and simply about NATO help to Poland."²² NATO's support is seen as a move to heal the divisions in the alliance before the Iraq war. NATO will provide communications, transport, intelligence and logistical help to the Polish peacekeeping group. NATO also offered to provide logistical support to Turkey if Turkish troops should enter Iraq, but this offer is expected to be unfulfilled because Turkey officially rescinded its offer of troop support on November 7, 2003.²³ Although NATO spokesman Jamie Shea indicated that NATO may be willing to do more in Iraq if asked, Shea qualified his remarks noting that "the challenge for NATO is not Iraq, the challenge for NATO is making an success of Afghanistan."²⁴

United Nations. In November 2002, the U.N. Security Council passed a resolution (UNSC Res. 1441) that called for Iraq to "comply with its disarmament obligations" or "face serious consequences." Although this resolution passed unanimously, it proved difficult for the United States to obtain support for a second, stronger U.N. resolution authorizing force against Iraq. While the United States, Spain, and the United Kingdom pushed for military action against Iraq — arguing that Iraq was in breach of its U.N. obligations on disarmament — France, Russia and Germany strongly opposed military force and instead urged the continuation of the inspections process. On March 17, 2003, the United States and the United Kingdom withdrew the resolution when it apparently became evident that it would not pass. On March 20, 2003, the United States began its first air strikes on Baghdad without this second UN resolution of support, arguing that the first resolution was sufficient. The air strikes were quickly condemned by the France, Russia and China.²⁵

After the war, on May 22, 2003, the Security Council unanimously voted for resolution 1483. This resolution adopted several key measures: it lifted economic

²¹ Speech by NATO Secretary General Lord Robertson, May 26, 2003.

²² "Iraq-NATO Update (Robertson Comments)," *Broadcast News*, May 21, 2003.

²³ "NATO can do more in Iraq, but Afghanistan Priority," *Reuters*, Oct. 28, 2003.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ "Time line: Iraq," *Guardian Unlimited*.

sanctions on Iraq, phased-out the Oil-for-Food program, expressed support for an Iraqi interim administration that will transition into an internationally recognized government, and established the position of a U.N. representative in the reconstruction process.²⁶

The international community also joined together to approve unanimously UNSC Res. 1500 on August 14, 2003 and UNSC Res. 1511 on October 6, 2003. UNSC Res. 1500 authorized the establishment of the United Nations Assistance Mission in Iraq (UNAMI) and welcomed the establishment of the Iraqi Governing Council as an important step towards creating an internationally recognized, representative, and sovereign government in Iraq. UNSC Res. 1511 authorized a multinational force under unified command (article 13), welcomed countries to pledge substantially to Iraq's reconstruction needs (article 24), and signaled a greater role for the United Nations in postwar Iraq. Although the passage of the latter resolution was perceived by some countries as a necessary condition to legitimize contributions to postwar Iraq security and reconstruction, some skeptics suggest that foreign governments are still hesitant to contribute peacekeeping troops for fear of appearing to sanction the Iraq war. Others remain unsatisfied with the timetable and design for turning over authority to an independent, sovereign Iraqi government.

At the onset of the war, the United Nations actively tried to prevent and mitigate humanitarian crises in Iraq. On March 28, 2003 — several days after the start of the war — the United Nations launched an international fund-raising campaign for Iraq. The United Nations called for \$2.2 billion to meet the humanitarian needs of the Iraqi population. Within three months, the international community had contributed or pledged \$870 million toward this effort. Another \$1.1 billion was funneled from the Oil-for-Food program. On June 24, 2003, the United Nations again appealed to the international community to raise the remaining \$259 million. Humanitarian funds have been used to buy food, medical, and emergency supplies. U.N. agencies also repaired hospitals and water and sewage systems; cleared mine fields, and distributed school-in-the-box kits to 400,000 primary school children.²⁷

As the international community makes the transition from providing short-term humanitarian relief to medium and long-term reconstruction aid, the United Nations continues to play an important role in the assessment of Iraq's needs and administering financial donations from other countries. The United Nations Development Group (UNDG) and the World Bank, with assistance from the IMF, prepared a Joint Iraq Needs Assessment on October 2, 2003. This assessment covered fourteen priority areas in the economy, excluding security and oil, and estimated that reconstruction will cost approximately \$36 billion dollars for the period of 2004 - 2007.²⁸ The Coalition Provisional Authority assessed the financial needs for security, the oil sector, and other sectors not covered in the World

²⁶ “U.N. Security Council Resolution 1483 Lifts Sanctions on Iraq,” *State Department Press Releases and Documents*, May 22, 2003.

²⁷ “United Nations agencies appeal for \$259 million in emergency assistance for Iraq,” *M2 Presswire*, June 24, 2003.

²⁸ “UN/World Bank present Iraq Reconstruction Needs to Core Group,” *World Bank Press Release* October 2, 2003.

Bank/UN assessment and estimated that \$19 billion more will be needed for a grand total of \$55 billion for 2004 - 2007.²⁹ At the Madrid International Conference on Reconstruction in Iraq on Oct. 23-24, 2003, the World Bank and UNDG agreed to administer a joint trust fund where countries could provide assistance to rehabilitate the fourteen priority areas covered within World Bank/ UN assessment. The CPA will be consulted to ensure that there is not an overlap in projects funded by the U.S. donations, but the CPA will not have authority over funds allocated to the World Bank/UN trust fund.

Countries

Descriptive accounts of country support are provided for countries that have 1) pledged personnel or monetary assistance to the coalition 2) had a powerful, or strategic voice in channeling international opinion within the United Nations, or 3) are of regional significance to Iraq.

* Members of the coalition of the willing are denoted by an asterisk. See **Table 1** for a complete list of publicly announced coalition members.

***Albania.** Albania demonstrated its support for the war in Iraq through several avenues. On March 20, 2003, the Albanian Prime Minister Fatos Nano pledged his country's "unconditional support in terms of additional troops, ports, bases and air fields." Albania has also provided troops to the Polish-led division in the post-war era.

***Armenia.** Although a member of the coalition of the willing, Armenia's ambassador to the United States has said that Armenia's "peacekeeping resources are 'very limited'."³⁰ However, Armenia is providing some noncombat personnel and medics.³¹

***Australia.** Australia provided military support during the war and has continued to provide financial and personnel support to Iraq in the postwar era. One of Australia's major claims of military success during the war in Iraq is that Australian troops successfully captured al-Asad air base west of Baghdad.³² Although Australia began withdrawing its 2,000-strong combat force in June 2003, Australia maintains about 900 personnel in Iraq and theater to provide logistics support.³³ Officials indicated that Australian forces may be used to train local

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Nathan Hodge, "In Caucasus, U.S. Finds 'Willing' Coalition Members," *Defense Week*, June 2, 2003.

³¹ Statement by with Deputy Chief of Ministry Yedigarian, September 11, 2003.

³² "Australians Release Details of Iraq Role," *AP Online*, May 9, 2003.

³³ Lincoln, Wright, "Iraq Bound Troops are Not Peacekeepers," *Canberra Times*, May 2, 2003. "Howard Warns of Danger," *Geelong Advertiser*, November 1, 2003.

security forces to facilitate the shift to Iraqi self-government in the future.³⁴ At present, approximately 300 Australians provide inspection and monitoring support from an Australian Navy ship in the gulf, while other Australians are involved with air traffic control and logistics in Iraq.³⁵ Australia has spent \$480 million on the U.S.-led war in Iraq; it is likely that defense spending will increase for this effort.³⁶

Australia has also contributed financial and in-kind assistance, such as food aid, to humanitarian relief and reconstruction in Iraq. At the Madrid International Conference on Reconstruction in Iraq, Australia pledged an additional \$14 million dollars to the already \$70 million dollars the government had allocated for reconstruction aid.³⁷ Australia also provided direct bilateral aid to U.N. agencies immediately following the declaration of the end of hostilities.

***Azerbaijan.** According to a special report on the White House's Operation Iraqi Freedom web site, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for Azerbaijan stated on March 21, 2003 that Azerbaijan expresses its "readiness to take part in the humanitarian rehabilitation in post-conflict Iraq." Azerbaijan has committed troops to act as peacekeepers in the Polish-led division starting in 2004.³⁸

Bahrain. The Bahraini government quietly supported the United States in Operation Iraqi Freedom. Since the war, the absence of an internationally recognized Iraqi government has delayed restoring commercial and diplomatic ties. Banks in Bahrain are reluctant to invest in the reconstruction of Iraq until an agreement can be settled over unpaid loans. The Arab Banking Corporation (ABC) made loans to Iraq for the purchase of essential goods and services.

Belgium. As a NATO member, Belgium was among four countries (along with France, Germany, and Luxembourg) that opposed planning within NATO for an Iraq war declaring that it saw no justification for military action against Iraq at that time. Belgium will provide \$5.89 million in bilateral funds for reconstruction in Iraq, and it will provide \$9 million more to reconstruction through its share of the EU pledge. Belgium has also indicated that it is ready to support concrete projects with a direct impact on Iraqi people through bilateral aid to UNICEF and the UNDP.³⁹ Belgium allocated \$4.7 million in Spring 2003 for humanitarian aid in Iraq and will provide an additional \$6 million for law enforcement and police training.⁴⁰

³⁴ Allard, Tom, "Australian Troops Switch to Get Iraqis Up to Speed", *Sydney Morning Herald*, November 17, 2003.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ "Australian treasurer puts dollar figure on Iraq war role," *Agence France-Presse*, May 11, 2003.

³⁷ "Australia says commit another A\$20 million to Iraq," *Reuters News*, October, 23, 2003.

³⁸ "Poland said Ready to Command Iraq Zone into 2005" *Reuters News*, November 8, 2003.

³⁹ Telephone conversation with Belgium Foreign Affairs Ministry official, November 14, 2003.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

Brazil. Brazilian President Luiz Inácio “Lula” da Silva opposed the U.S. led war in Iraq. In statements made shortly after taking office in January, President da Silva voiced his concern over use of force without U.N. endorsement.⁴¹

Bosnia. The Government of Bosnia indicated that it would be willing to send troops to Iraq and host U.S. bases.⁴² The country currently relies upon 12,000 NATO security forces to maintain its own internal security.

***Bulgaria.** U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell lauded Bulgaria for its steadfast support of the U.S.-led war in Iraq as an elected member of the U.N. Security Council, saying that “Bulgaria is playing a major role in modern transatlantic processes.”⁴³ Bulgaria has made a substantial commitment to the stabilization and reconstruction operation in Iraq. Beginning on September 1, 2003, approximately 483 Bulgarian peacekeepers were deployed to central-southern Iraq to participate in the Polish-led stabilization force as a patrol unit near Karbala. An additional 289 troops have been pledged.⁴⁴ In October 2003, however, Bulgaria moved its diplomatic mission from Baghdad to Amman Jordan due to growing security concerns. See **Table 6** for selected votes Bulgaria cast as an elected member of the U.N. Security Council.

Cameroon. Cameroon has been one of ten non-permanent members serving on the U.N. Security Council from January 1, 2002 until December 31, 2003. Although it voted with the unanimously approved UNSC Res. 1441 and 1443, Cameroon was noncommittal regarding the U.S. effort to secure a second, stronger U.N. Security Council resolution on Iraq to authorize war. See **Table 6** for selected votes Cameroon cast as an elected member of the U.N. Security Council.

Canada. Although Canada did not support the war in Iraq, it has taken steps to participate in the reconstruction effort. Canada has pledged \$244 million for reconstruction aid and provided an additional \$30 million in direct humanitarian relief. According to Canada’s International Development Agency, these funds will be funneled primarily through international relief agencies, such as the Red Cross and UN agencies. Despite these contributions to the transitional administration efforts, Canada supports a wider role for the United Nations in Iraq reconstruction. During a Canada-EU summit held in late May, Prime Minister Chrétien urged the EU to join him in the pursuit of a wider UN role in the reconstruction phase.⁴⁵ In late May, Minister Graham rejected a U.S. request for troops.⁴⁶ Canadian officials reportedly

⁴¹ “France Supports Brazil for a Non-permanent Seat on the UN Security Council,” *Agence France Press*, April 2, 2003.

⁴² “Bosnia offers to Send Troops to Iraq, U.S. Bases,” *Agence France Presse*, November 7, 2003.

⁴³ “Powell thanks Bulgaria for support in Iraq war,” *Xinhua News Agency*, May 15, 2003.

⁴⁴ “List of Countries with Troops in Iraq,” *AP*, November 13, 2003.

⁴⁵ “EU/Canada: Leaders Discuss Iraq, Peacekeeping and Cutting Red Tape,” *European Report*, May 29, 2003.

⁴⁶ “Canada Will Not Send Troops to Iraq,” *Reuters News*, May 29, 2003.

stated that Canada's troop commitment in Afghanistan prevented it from taking peacekeeping responsibilities in Iraq.⁴⁷

Canada's decisions not to support the U.S.-led peacekeeping effort and the earlier military campaign apparently have given rise to increased tensions between Canada and the United States. Even though it has welcomed Canada's reconstruction initiatives, the United States has expressed disappointment with Chrétien's unwillingness to back military action. National Security Advisor Condoleeza Rice said in May 2003 that it would take "some time" before the disappointment could go away.⁴⁸ Canadian authorities have tended to downplay allegations of embittered relations with Washington however.⁴⁹

Chile. Chile started its two year term on the U.N. Security Council on January 1, 2003, and supported the U.S. sponsored resolutions 1483, 1500, 1511 during its tenure on the council. Chile did not back the U.S.-led campaign in Iraq nor express explicit support for the "second resolution" that was submitted and withdrawn by the United Kingdom, United States, and Spain before the war. Chile has been an advocate of strong U.N. involvement in the Iraq reconstruction effort. See **Table 6** for selected votes on Iraq that Chile cast as an elected member of the U.N. Security Council.

China. See People's Republic of China.

Croatia. Croatia has expressed a willingness to send up to 80 engineering and demining personnel to Iraq.⁵⁰ Croatia has provided approximately \$2.8 million worth of humanitarian assistance in the form of medicines, food aid, and relief supplies.⁵¹

Cyprus. During the combat phase of the war, Cyprus offered several military facilities. Cyprus agreed to provide the United Nations with facilities for conducting interviews of Iraqi scientists as provided for in UNSC Res. 1441.

***Czech Republic.** The Czech government has allocated approximately \$19 million over a period of three years for postwar reconstruction in Iraq. The Czech government also approved a proposal to allow 400 Czech troops participate in the Iraq Stabilization Force.⁵² Approximately 280 personnel are operating a field hospital and providing medical care to Iraqis in Basra. The hospital officially opened

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Peter Morton, "'It Will Take Some Time' to Mend this Fence," *National Post*, May 31, 2003.

⁴⁹ Shawn McCartney, "PM and Bush 'Chit-chat' after Months of Tensions," *Globe and Mail*, June 2, 2003.

⁵⁰ "Bosnia offers to send Troops to Iraq, Host U.S. Base," *Agence France Presse*, November, 7, 2003.

⁵¹ Kole, William J. "Ex-Communist Nations send Food Aid to Iraq," *AP*, October, 24, 2003.

⁵² "Government approves Czech participation Iraq Stabilisation Force," *CTK B business News*, May 28, 2003.

on May 18, 2003 although Czech medical personnel have been providing services there since April 25, 2003.⁵³ The Czech contingent also consists of 50 military personnel who will serve as police officers and 15 soldiers who will protect civilian aid workers.

***Denmark.** In a speech to the nation in June 2003, Danish Prime Minister Anders Fogh Rasmussen remarked that Denmark participated in the U.S.-led war in Iraq in part to demonstrate its solidarity with the United States. He recalled that ‘the USA has helped us in Europe to secure freedom and peace several times.’⁵⁴ In spite of some public opposition to the war, Prime Minister Rasmussen continues to justify Denmark’s support of the U.S.-led effort, arguing that it was necessary to depose Saddam Hussein. “The world is a better place to live when there is one less dictator,”⁵⁵ the Prime Minister said on Danish radio on May 30, 2003.

In terms of reconstruction in Iraq, Denmark has made significant monetary and military pledges. On April 9, 2003, the Danish Parliament approved \$56 million for Iraq through 2004. The monetary pledge for reconstruction totals \$26 million.⁵⁶ As part of the military pledge, Denmark approved the deployment of 410 troops including: light infantry, medics, and military police. On November 13, 2003, Denmark’s Defense Minister decided to not to augment the size of the force in Iraq, rejecting a push by two Danish soldiers unions to send 100 more troops.⁵⁷

Djibouti. During the war in Iraq, Djibouti provided military and other facilities to CIA paramilitary forces. Djibouti has been a U.S. ally in the war on terrorism.

***Dominican Republic.** In late May 2003, Dominican Armed Forces Minister José M. Soto Jiménez affirmed that his country was ready for the deployment of 250 troops to assist in the Iraq reconstruction effort.⁵⁸ The contingent’s size was increased to 300 in June 2003. The troops are supporting the Polish-led peacekeeping force. Dominican Foreign Minister Hugo Tolentino Dipp resigned from his post shortly after his government’s expression of support for the U.S.-led war in Iraq, stating that he could “not contradict the position of the government [he] served.”⁵⁹

⁵³ “Czech hospital in Basra opens to patients,” *CTK Business News*, May 18, 2003.

⁵⁴ “Danish premier — Country entered war out of solidarity with the USA,” *BBC*, June 5, 2003.

⁵⁵ Transcript, Danmarks Radio P1, May 30, 2003.

⁵⁶ “Denmark opens Iraq office to secure rebuild orders,” *Reuters*, June 2, 2003.

⁵⁷ “US allies rethinking roles in Iraq,” *The Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, November 13, 2003.

⁵⁸ “Dominican Republic: Government Sending 250 Troops to Help in Iraq’s Reconstruction,” *Associated Press*, May 28, 2003.

⁵⁹ “World Briefing Americas: Dominican Republic: Minister Quits Over Iraq War,” *The New York Times*, May 27, 2003.

Egypt. Although popular opposition⁶⁰ to the Iraq war apparently precluded the Egyptian government from publicly supporting the United States, Egypt granted overflight permission for U.S. aircraft (but not for aircraft attacking Iraq, such as off carriers in the Mediterranean for flights to attack Iraqi aircraft) and waived the 30-day prior notification to pass nuclear-armed ships through the Suez canal.⁶¹ Egypt welcomed the adoption of UNSC 1483; it had long supported the lifting of sanctions against Iraq. Egypt has not publicly provided financial assistance or personnel.

***El Salvador.** El Salvador is contributing approximately 360 troops to assist with the Iraq reconstruction effort. President Francisco Flores pledged this contribution of troops during a visit by U.S. Under Secretary of Defense Dov Zackheim in June 2003.⁶² The troops were deployed in September 2003, to conduct engineering and sanitation operations for a six-month period. The Salvadoran force will serve under the command of the Spanish contingent (in the Polish sector). The President's position faces resistance from opposition parties, particularly the ex-armed-revolutionary group and current political party, the Farabundo Martí para la Liberación Nacional (FMLN). Some legislators, including members of the FMLN, sought to block the deployment in parliament, but a measure of approval passed with 48 out of 84 possible votes.⁶³

***Estonia.** On March 19, 2003, the Estonian President said he supported a military resolution to the crisis in Iraq and that he believed that UNSC Resolution 1441 stipulated a legal basis for using force.⁶⁴ Estonia has authorized 55 troops to be sent as peacekeepers.

Fiji. Fiji offered to send 700 troops to participate in stabilization, the Fiji's government has indicated that they would be unable to finance the cost of this commitment. Thus far, Fiji has been unable to garner international contributions to fund this deployment.⁶⁵

France. France was the most vocal opponent of the U.S.-led war in Iraq. French President Jacques Chirac repeatedly stressed France's commitment to a peaceful solution to Iraqi disarmament. Prior to the onset of the war, France

⁶⁰ Most Egyptians did not favor the war in Iraq. The period before and during the war in Egypt was marked by many violent street protests, in which protestors condemned U.S. actions in Iraq. On March 30, 2003, more than 15,000 Egyptian students rallied in Alexandria, Egypt and called for a boycott of U.S. products.

⁶¹ Telephone conversation with Egyptian Embassy official, Washington, DC, March 21, 2003.

⁶² "Central American Countries May Help U.S. in Iraq," *Associated Press*, June 11, 2003.

⁶³ Armadeo Carrera and Ruth Melanie Cruz, "Envío de tropa a Irak sin respaldo," *La Prensa Gráfica*, July 8, 2003; "Legislators in El Salvador approve sending 360 special forces troops to aid Iraq," *Associated Press Newswires*, July 10, 2003.

⁶⁴ "Estonia backs Iraq War Despite Possible Economic Obstacles," *Interfax News Service*, March 19, 2003.

⁶⁵ "Funding to influence Fiji's Decision on Sending Troops to Iraq," *BBC Monitoring Asia Pacific*, June 3, 2003.

threatened to veto any U.N. Security Council resolutions sanctioning a war in Iraq.⁶⁶ The French government further believed that any military action taken outside of specific UN Security Council support would be “viewed as an aggression.”⁶⁷

France’s position strained relations with the United States, which was traditionally perceived as a French ally with shared interests. In spite of this awkward and shaky period in U.S.-France relations, both Presidents Bush and Chirac agreed at the G8 summit in June 2003 to overcome these differences and move forward together in the reconstruction of Iraq: the common vision is ‘a free Iraq, a healthy Iraq, a prosperous Iraq,’ said President Bush.⁶⁸

France, a veto-wielding member of the United Nations Security Council, voted in favor of a U.S.- proposed resolution to lift U.N. sanctions on Iraq in May 2003. Although the resolution grants authority to the United States and the United Kingdom in post-war Iraq, France continues to call for a central role for the United Nations in the reconstruction and relief efforts in Iraq, and warns of a dominant American power in the world.⁶⁹ France did vote in favor of UNSC Res 1500 and 1511 which established a greater role for the United Nations in Iraq, established a unified command, and welcomed financial support for reconstruction. See **Table 6** for more information on selected votes France cast in the U.N. Security Council.

In terms of reconstruction assistance, France is providing assistance through its share of the European Union pledge and it does not “see any additional aid at this stage either in terms of financial aid or in cooperation in the military domain.”⁷⁰ On November 13, 2003, French Foreign Minister de Villepin declared that France was prepared to help with the reconstruction of Iraq once sovereignty was awarded to a provisional Iraqi government.⁷¹ He also said that the American goal of setting up a provisional government by mid-2004 was too distant and that a UN representative should be appointed to work alongside Paul Bremer with the aim of electing a representative assembly of Iraq by the end of 2003.⁷² France did state that it would be willing to significantly forgive Iraq’s debt burden through the Paris Club mechanisms in a joint statement issued with Germany and the United States on December 16th, 2003.

***Georgia.** Georgian is currently providing approximately 70 personnel to assist in reconstruction and stabilization. Of these 70 Georgian servicemen, 34 belong to

⁶⁶ “Rice repeats U.S. complaints about France,” *Reuter’s*, May 31, 2003.

⁶⁷ NATO, “Iraq,” *SHAPE News Morning Update*, December 3, 2002.

⁶⁸ “Bush, Chirac ‘in agreement’; Presidents meet, seem to patch up discord over Iraq,” *The Washington Post*, June 3, 2003.

⁶⁹ “Chirac Seems Intent on Challenging U.S.; French Leader Expected to Pursue Policies Based on Multipolar View,” *Washington Post*, May 31, 2003.

⁷⁰ “Officials gather in Madrid for Iraq donors conference,” *Los Angeles Times*, October 23, 2003.

⁷¹ “France urges policy shift on Iraq,” *BBC News*, November 13, 2003.

⁷² *Ibid.*

a special-purpose brigade, 20 are medics, and 15 are military engineers. A staff officer and an interpreter round out the deployment.⁷³

Germany. Germany consistently and strongly opposed a preemptive strike against Iraq and U.S. unilateral action. The German government believed that Saddam Hussein posed no immediate threat to international security. Germany ruled out its participation in an Iraq war, even if it had U.N. Security Council endorsement. On the eve of the war, German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder affirmed that Germany could not and would not “support any resolution legitimizing war.”⁷⁴ Germany has also rejected a military role in postwar Iraq due to commitments in Iraq and continued reservations about the timetable for turning over authority to Iraqi.⁷⁵ Germany has pledged to expand its peacekeeping operation in Afghanistan and theater, where it already has 1,800 troops.⁷⁶

In terms of post-war reconstruction, Germany has made a limited commitment to aid Iraq. In its role as an elected member of the U.N. Security Council, Germany voted in favor of UNSC Res. 1483 that lifted sanctions on Iraq. Chancellor Schroeder stressed the timeliness of removing sanctions and thought it a necessary step to a prosperous and self-sustaining Iraq. In some circles, Germany’s vote symbolized a gesture demonstrating cooperation with the United States in spite of differing views on the war. Germany also voted for the subsequent resolutions UNSC Res. 1500 and 1511 that broadened the scope for U.N. involvement in Iraq. According to the German government, these resolutions began to address important concerns of postwar order in Iraq.⁷⁷ However, German officials also indicated that they would have wished for an speedier transfer of sovereignty to the Iraqi people and clearer guidelines regarding the time line for establishing the new government.⁷⁸

Also in terms of reconstruction, Germany has provided approximately \$58 million for direct emergency and humanitarian aid and \$27.4 million for training Iraqi police.⁷⁹ Germany is also indirectly providing assistance by financing its share of the \$230 million EU commitment; the German share is estimated at \$52 million. Germany also indicated that it would donate an additional \$52 million to the World Bank if Iraq qualifies for IDA loans.⁸⁰ These loans, however, are usually reserved for

⁷³ “Georgian troops await parliamentary go-ahead for Iraq deployment,” *BBC*, June 16, 2003.

⁷⁴ “Germany Restates Anti-war Stance on Iraq,” *Agence France-Presse*, March 16, 2003.

⁷⁵ “Berlin contradicts EU’s Solana on Iraq,” *Deutsche Welle*, November 15, 2003.

⁷⁶ Cook, Lorne, “German Parliament approves expanded military presence in Iraq,” *Agence France Presse*, October, 24, 2003.

⁷⁷ “Security Council action unanimously, calls for power to be returned to Iraqi people as soon as practical,” United Nations Press Release SC/798, October 10, 2003.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

⁷⁹ “Germany says no plans for further contributions towards Iraq’s reconstruction,” *AP*, October 22, 2003.

⁸⁰ “German assistance for Iraq-Donor’s Conference in Madrid,” German Government, October 24, 2002, official website of German federal government,

the poorest developing countries. Domestically, the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) party and Free Democratic Party (FDP), the main opposition parties in Germany, have called upon the government to assume more responsibility for Iraq's stabilization. These parties have also called for greater financial commitments for reconstruction and a cancelling of Iraq debts. Although the German government initially indicated that it would not consider forgiving Iraq's debts,⁸¹ the government has recently eased its stance on this issue indicating a broader willingness to forgive some percentage of Iraq's debt.⁸² Germany stated that it would be willing to significantly forgive Iraq's debt burden through the Paris Club mechanisms in a joint statement issued with France and the United States on December 16th, 2003.

***Honduras.** Honduras was the first Central American country to approve the deployment of personnel to assist in the reconstruction of Iraq. On May 29, 2003, the Honduran Congress approved the deployment of 370 troops proposed earlier by President Ricardo Maduro.⁸³ The contingent is expected to include mine removal experts, engineers, doctors and nurses that will serve for a six month term.⁸⁴ A recent news report says that the Honduran government will provide \$384,000 for the operation.⁸⁵

***Hungary.** As part of the reconstruction and stabilization efforts, the Hungarian government sent 300 troops to join the Polish-led multinational peacekeeping force in August 2003. Hungary will also deploy a transportation unit to assist peacekeeping operations in Iraq. Prior to Operation Iraqi freedom, Iraqi exiles were being trained in Hungary by the United States. This training was intended to provide the exiles with the skills they might need to replace Saddam Hussein and to equip them to aid U.S. soldiers during the war. Although no military training was being provided, as stipulated by Hungary, the Iraqi exiles receive instruction in translation, providing logistical support, and civil and military administration. Hungary agreed to host the training for six months.

India. Prime Minister Vajpayee affirmed in early June 2003 that India was still firm on its non-aligned position regarding the war in Iraq. Foreign Minister Yashwant Sinha said, "India has cordial and good relations with both the U.S. and Iraq. Therefore, the stand taken by India is the middle path."⁸⁶ However, U.S. and British officials mounted pressure on India to deploy troops to postwar Iraq. In late-June 2003, a special team from the Pentagon attempted to persuade India to participate in

[<http://www.bundesregierung.de>], accessed November 12, 2003.

⁸¹ "Berlin says no Iraq debt forgiveness, free possible," *Reuters News*, October 27, 2003.

⁸² Champion, Marc, "Germany Backs Iraq Debt Relief by Paris Club," *Wall Street Journal*, November 24, 2003.

⁸³ "Congreso de Honduras aprueba el envío de tropas de paz a Iraq," *Reuters - Noticias Latinoamericanas*, May 29, 2003.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*

⁸⁵ "Tropas hondureñas viajan a finales de julio a Iraq," *Associated Press*, July 8, 2003.

⁸⁶ Rachele Younglai, "South and East Asian Countries — Where They Stand," *CBC News*, March 11, 2003.

the multinational force in Iraq.⁸⁷ On July 14, 2003, India announced that it would not send troops to Iraq without a U.N. mandate. After the passage of UNSC. 1511, which some countries may have interpreted as the mandate they needed to provide peacekeepers, India continued to refuse to send troops and indicated that hostilities in Kashmir have precluded their participation in stabilization efforts elsewhere. India did pledge \$10 million in aid for Iraqi reconstruction.

Iran. Torn between its enmity toward Saddam Hussein's regime and its fear of a more assertive U.S. foreign policy in the Persian Gulf, Iran remained neutral during Operation Iraqi Freedom. Although Iranian officials did voice their opposition to the use of force against Iraq, behind the scenes, Iran did not stand in the way of the U.S.-led war against Iraq, as they pursued a policy of "active neutrality." In post-war Iraq, more pragmatic Iranian officials have been supporting moderate elements of the Iraqi Shia clerical establishment. Iran also pledged \$300 million in export credits and \$5 million in reconstruction aid to facilitate Iraq's economic recovery. Iran has also been in negotiations with Iraq to set up an oil-swap scheme to speed Iraq's ability to gain export revenues from its oil.

Israel. The Israeli government fully supported ousting the regime of Saddam Hussein because of the major threat he was believed to have posed to Israeli national security. In order to counter such threats, Israeli government officials discussed openly the use of Israeli nuclear weapons should Iraq choose to attack Israel.⁸⁸ However, Israel believed that its use of deterrence must be balanced with the needs of the United States, which sought the good will and cooperation of Arab states in maintaining a coalition against Hussein. Besides these remarks, Israel largely kept silent on the Iraq issue, indicating only that it reserved the right to counter attack.⁸⁹

***Italy.** As a member of NATO, the EU and the G-8 group of industrialized countries, Italy is a vocal European supporter of the U.S.-led operation in Iraq. Italian Foreign Minister, Franco Frattini, has stated that Italy is in "complete agreement" with the United States.⁹⁰ During a visit to Rome in early June 2003, Secretary Powell said "we've had no better friend in recent months than Italy."⁹¹

Italy is one of the most generous contributors of personnel to the Iraq reconstruction and stabilization efforts. In June 2003, 2,400 Italian troops, including 400 Carabinieri police officers, were deployed to Iraq to take part in the UK-led

⁸⁷ David Rohde, "Officials in India Divided on Sending Troops to Iraq," *Peace Force*, June 26, 2003.

⁸⁸ Roger Hardy, "Israel Nuclear Strike on Iraq Possible," *BBC News Online*, August 15, 2002.

⁸⁹ Some observers have speculated that Israel will retaliate only if it suffers casualties as a result of an Iraqi attack. See, Michael R. Gordon, "Israel Tells U.S. it will Retaliate if Iraqis Attack," *New York Times*, September 21, 2002.

⁹⁰ "Powell, Italian Foreign Minister Discuss U.S.-Europe Ties, Iraq, Mideast - Leaders See Progress in Healing U.S.-Europe Fissures," *State Department Press Releases and Documents*, June 2, 2003.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*

multinational force in southern Iraq. The contingent is responsible for the Dhi Qur province; the Carabinieri officers are training local police. Specialized troops are also involved in de-mining operations, rebuilding bridges, biochemical clean-ups, and protecting the humanitarian aid mission. To finance its mission in Iraq for 2004, the Italian government estimates the cost will total \$238 million every six months.⁹²

Italy's forces suffered a serious blow, however, on November 12, 2003 when 18 Italian soldiers were killed in a suicide-attack on the Italian headquarters in Nasiriya. Although Italy's main opposition party initially called for troops to be withdrawn, Italian Prime Minister Berlusconi affirmed his commitment to maintaining forces in Iraq by noting "No intimidation will budge us from our willingness to help that country rise up again."⁹³ Immediately following the attack, Italian polls estimated that 60% of the population supported maintaining troops in Iraq.⁹⁴

Italy has also provided monetary assistance to reconstruction and relief in Iraq. At the Madrid International Conference on Reconstruction in Iraq, the Italian government announced that it will provide \$238 million in financial aid for 2004-2007. In 2003, Italy's contributions and pledges for relief and reconstruction were approximately \$340 million. Italy also agreed to reschedule and possibly forgive Iraqi debt through the Paris Club mechanisms.

***Japan.** In spite of popular opposition to the Iraq war, Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi said that Japan should act as a "responsible ally" to the United States.⁹⁵ Since the end of the war, Japan has emerged as a key player in U.S.-led postwar efforts in Iraq. Japan pledge \$1.5 billion in grants and a further \$3.5 billion in loans for reconstruction in Iraq for 2004 - 2007. Although Japan had expressed some hesitation to fulfill earlier pledges of personnel due to growing security concerns and domestic opposition, the Japanese Cabinet formally approved a dispatch of up to 1,000 noncombat troops on December 9, 2003.

In July 2003, Japanese legislators voted in favor of sending noncombat troops to Iraq, including up to 1,000 engineers and other troops.⁹⁶ Although Japan delayed this proposed deployment several times due to perceived instability in Iraq, the Japanese Cabinet officially approved a dispatch of up to 1,000 troops on December 9, 2003. Within the plan, 600 Japanese Ground Self-Defense Force troops would provide medical services and supply water in southeastern Iraq. Although no specific start date was set, the dispatch could occur anytime after December 15, 2003 and last from six months to one year. On December 18, 2003, the Japanese defense agency chief also announced that Japan would send an advance air force unit by the end of

⁹² Statement of the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, October 24, 2003, [<http://www.esteri.it/attualita/2003eng/statint/i031024a.htm>]

⁹³ Bruni, Frank, "With his Policies Facing A Majore Test, Berlusconi Insists the Troops will Stay in Iraq," *New York Times*, November 13, 2003.

⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁵ "Japan PM in a Pinch over Support for U.S. on Iraq," *Reuters News*, February 12, 2003.

⁹⁶ "Japan Votes to Send Troops to Iraq," *Associated Press*, July 25, 2003.

the year to rally support among a skeptical public.⁹⁷ The advance unit would operate mainly from Kuwait to assist with humanitarian and reconstruction logistics.⁹⁸ Some officials have suggested that Japan is only authorized to send personnel to noncombat situations and that Iraq fails to meet this criterion at present due to the frequency of attacks on aid workers, soldiers, and civilians. The death of two Japanese diplomats on their way to an aid conference in northern Iraq in November increased domestic concern about the safety of sending troops to Iraq.⁹⁹ According to several Japanese polls, public opinion remains largely negative towards sending troops to Iraq.¹⁰⁰ Although these concerns persist, some Japanese have also expressed resistance to relying upon “checkbook diplomacy”, or simply providing financial rather than personnel assistance.¹⁰¹ During the first Gulf war in 1991, Japan received international and domestic criticism for providing \$13 billion to finance the cost of the war, but failing to provide personnel.¹⁰²

Jordan. Although some Arab leaders expressed opposition to intervening in Iraq, Jordan quietly assisted the American-led campaign. Jordan granted overflight rights to coalition planes, and hosted U.S. troops carrying out search and rescue operations in western Iraq.¹⁰³ In the postwar era, however, Jordan’s Embassy in Baghdad was targeted by a truck bomb on August 19, 2003, killing 17 individuals.

In terms of assistance to Iraq, Jordan contributed a mobile field hospital to assist in relief efforts in Iraq.¹⁰⁴ Jordan also agreed to train 30,000 Iraqi military police. The United States has demonstrated its appreciation for Jordan’s low-profile but critical support of the war in Iraq. Jordan is now the United States third-largest recipient of aid.

Kazakstan. Kazakstan did not lend any public (diplomatic or material) support to the war in Iraq. However, in May 2003, Kazakstan’s Foreign Ministry announced that it was ready to participate in the rehabilitation of Iraq. Kazakstan has sent a 25-member unit of engineers and civil specialists who will repair Iraq’s infrastructure, particularly water mining projects.

***Kuwait.** Kuwait was the most receptive Arab government to the U.S.-led coalition to depose the Iraqi regime. Kuwait has hosted hundreds of thousands of U.S. troops and was part of the “coalition of the willing.” Kuwait’s Defense Minister, Sheikh Jabir al-Mubarak al-Sabah, put Kuwaiti bases and training camps at the

⁹⁷ “Japan to send advance air unit by year end to start Iraq deployment,” *Agence France Presse*, December 18, 2003.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁰¹ Onishi, Norimitsu, “Japan Heads to Iraq, Haunted by A Taboo bred in Another War,” November 19, 2003.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*

¹⁰³ “Countries Offering Support for War Against Iraq,” *Reuters News*, April 2, 2003.

¹⁰⁴ Thom Shanker, “About \$1.7 Billion Raised for Relief in Iraq,” *The New York Times*, April 22, 2003.

disposal of the U.S. military. Since the 1991 Gulf War, Camp Doha has served as a critical U.S. facility for Gulf deployments. The U.S. Air Force continues to use Ali Salem and Ahmed Al- Jaber airbases to station combat aircraft. To facilitate reconstruction and stabilization, Kuwait pledged an addition \$500 million in aid in addition to the reported \$1 billion worth of humanitarian assistance it has contributed to Iraq in the past several years. Kuwait has remained noncommittal as to whether it would forgive Iraq's debt although much of the 1991 reparations have been resolved in the intervening decade.

***Latvia.** Latvia's commitment to the stabilization and reconstruction of Iraq includes a military pledge of 150 servicemen.¹⁰⁵ These individuals are serving under the multinational division led by the Polish.

***Lithuania.** Lithuania indicated that it will contribute up to 130 troops to the international reconstruction and stabilization force in Iraq. On June 4, 2003, Lithuania deployed 44 peacekeepers who will be stationed in the U.K.-controlled city of Basra. Their major tasks include conducting security patrols and guarding check points.¹⁰⁶ In early-August, Lithuania deployed 45 more troops to the Polish-led sector.¹⁰⁷

Luxembourg. Luxembourg was among four countries (along with Belgium, France, and Germany) that opposed the U.S. suggestion to begin planning within NATO for possible military action in Iraq, maintaining that it saw no justification for military action.¹⁰⁸ In the postwar era, Luxembourg pledged \$1.18 million for reconstruction in Iraq at the Madrid Donors Conference; \$1.18 million in grants would be provided in 2005 if UN and NGO staff are able to operate in Iraq.¹⁰⁹

***Macedonia.** Macedonia is participating in the reconstruction of postwar Iraq. On June 6, 2003, Macedonia deployed 28 troops to a town north of Baghdad, where they will remain until December 2003. The troops are responsible for securing facilities and roads.

Mexico. As a non-permanent member of the Security Council, Mexico supported resolution 1441, but remained "noncommittal" on the "second resolution" submitted and withdrawn by the United Kingdom, United States, and Spain. Several analysts assert that Mexico sought to reconcile its interests to maintain good relations with the United States and appease local public opposition to the war in Iraq.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁵ Aija Rutka, "Latvian National Armed Forces mission to be stationed in Northern Iraq," *Latvian News Agency*, May 20, 2003.

¹⁰⁶ "Troops Iraq Departure," *Lithuanian News Agency*, June 4, 2003.

¹⁰⁷ "Lithuanian servicemen arrive in Iraq to ensure law and order," *Itar-Tass*, June 12, 2003.

¹⁰⁸ "Western Leaders' Iraq Rift Grows," *CNN*, January 23, 2003.

¹⁰⁹ Telephone conversation with Luxembourg Embassy Official, Washington, DC, November 17th, 2003.

¹¹⁰ Domestic political tensions were undoubtedly a factor in President Fox's decisions as July legislative elections neared. Nick Miles, "Mexico's Iraq Vote Dilemma," *BBC News*

Mexico's position leaned generally toward a stronger U.N. role in the prewar phase. In a March 2003 interview, Ambassador Aguilar Zinser said that Mexico deplored and regretted that military action had been taken without the approval of the Security Council.¹¹¹ After hostilities were declared over, Mexico backed UNSC Res. 1483, which lifted economic sanctions and recognized U.S.-UK authority over Iraq's administration. After the resolution's approval in May 2003, the Mexican Ambassador to the United Nations, Adolfo Aguilar Zinser, stressed the document's importance in creating a role for the UN in the reconstruction phase. See **Table 6** for more information on key U.N. Security Council votes in 2002 and 2003.

***Mongolia.** Mongolia supported U.S. actions in Iraq and was one of the first countries to pledge to send peacekeepers to the stabilization efforts. Mongolia sent 180 peacekeepers in September. Their responsibilities include guarding pipelines and working on construction projects under the Polish Command.¹¹² The United States and Mongolia secured a bilateral free trade agreement later in September.

***Netherlands.** The Netherlands has played a significant role in the stabilization force in Iraq. It has dispatched 1,100 noncombat troops to southern Iraq where it will relieve a U.S. contingent of similar size. The team includes 650 marines, a logistic team, a commando contingent, military police, medics and a unit of 230 military engineers. Additionally, the Netherlands has also provide three manned Chinook transport helicopters. The Dutch government has promised \$21 million for Iraqi relief and reconstruction efforts.¹¹³ Amid security concerns in August, 2003, the Netherlands moved its diplomats from Baghdad to Amman, Jordan.

***Nicaragua.** Nicaragua has expressed its commitment to assist with the reconstruction effort. President Enrique Bolaños said after a June 2003 meeting with U.S. Under Secretary of Defense Dov Zakheim and Spanish Defense Secretary Fernando Diez Moreno that Nicaragua would contribute troops to conduct anti-personnel-mine removal tasks.¹¹⁴ A divided legislature approved the deployment of 230 troops in August. The Nicaraguan force are serving under the command of the Spanish contingent in the Polish Division.

Norway. As a member of NATO, Norway supported Iraqi disarmament through UNSC Res. 1441 and regretted the use of force. According to Norwegian

World Edition, March 2, 2003; Ivan Briscoe, "UN vote-hunting provokes fear and frustration among minor players," *El País*, March 5, 2003; "Mexico - Market Strategy - Decision Time for Fox," *Emerging Markets Daily News*, March 5, 2003.

¹¹¹ Verónica Sanz, "México dice que "potencias ocupantes" deben asumir reconstrucción," *Agencia EFE - Servicio General*, March 24, 2003.

¹¹² Brooke, James "Allies: Mongolians Return to Baghdad, this time as Peacekeepers," *New York Times*, September 22, 2003.

¹¹³ Thom Shanker, "About \$1.7 Billion Raised for Relief in Iraq," *The New York Times*, April 22, 2003.

¹¹⁴ "Bolaños recibe a altos cargos de defensa de España y EEUU," *Agencia EFE - Servicio General*, June 11, 2003.

Foreign Minister Jan Peterson, Norway would have preferred to “solve this conflict through peaceful means.”¹¹⁵ In the postwar era, Norway has pledged both economic and military aid for the reconstruction and stabilization of Iraq. The Norwegian government has promised \$60 million and 150 soldiers toward the effort to rebuild and relieve Iraq.¹¹⁶ The troops will be under British command in southern Iraq, although some may be under Polish command.¹¹⁷ They will be responsible primarily for clearing mines, repairing roads and revitalizing the health sector. Norway has said that its soldiers will not partake in the ongoing policing effort in Iraq. Fifteen Norwegian troops left for Iraq on June 26, 2003, and 104 joined them on July 9, 2003.

Oman. Reportedly, Oman was one of several key Gulf States who made arrangements with the United States to allow use of military facilities in the region.¹¹⁸ As early as December 2002, the United States moved several B-1 bombers from Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean to Oman in order to be closer to Iraq.¹¹⁹ Oman not only offered its military facilities, but hosted 100 elite British Special Air Service forces. Several major airlift hubs and supply depot provided substantial support for the U.S. military buildup in the region.¹²⁰ Significant air refueling capabilities at Seeb were used to support the no-fly zone in Iraq. Oman also pledged \$3 million for reconstruction in Iraq.

Pakistan. Pakistan did not favor unilateral U.S. military action in Iraq. On April 2, 2003, Pakistan’s senate passed a resolution deploring the military attack and demanded that the UN Security Council take immediate action to stop hostilities.¹²¹ President Pervez Musharraf ruled out U.S. military use of Pakistani bases for war in Iraq, except for possible logistical support. As an elected member of the U.N. Security Council since January 1, 2003, Pakistan did not offer support to the “second resolution” submitted and withdrawn by the United States, United Kingdom, and Spain, but has supported subsequent resolutions 1483, 1500, and 1511, which lifted sanctions and signaled a greater role for the United Nations in reconstruction and stabilization.

¹¹⁵ Thom Shanker, “About \$1.7 Billion Raised for Relief in Iraq,” *The New York Times*, April 22, 2003.

¹¹⁶ “Norway Sends Aid, Peacekeeping Forces to Iraq,” *IPR Strategic Information Database*, June 5, 2003.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁸ For more information, see also CRS Report RL31701, *Iraq: Potential U.S. Military Operations*.

¹¹⁹ Arkin, William, “U.S. Military Building a War: As Some Argue, Supply Lines Fill Up,” *The Los Angeles Times*, November 10, 2002.

¹²⁰ Center for Defense Information, “Terrorism Project: U.S. Forces in the Middle East,” [<http://www.cdi.org/terrorism/forcesinthemideast5.cfm>], December 31, 2002.

¹²¹ “Pakistan’s Senate Passes Resolution Against War on Iraq,” *Agence France-Presse*, April 2, 2003.

Following the war, the United States asked Pakistan to contribute troops to the multinational peacekeeping forces in Iraq.¹²² On May 27th, 2003, President Musharraf said Pakistan was “in principle ready” to send troops to Iraq under the umbrella of the United Nations, the Organization of Islamic Conference or any shared arrangement among the Islamic States.¹²³ On October 26th, 2003, Pakistan’s state news agency reported that Pakistan would not send troops, and the Information Minister Sheikh Rashid Ahmed was quoted in an AP report stating that “Pakistan would not send troops to Iraq at any cost.”¹²⁴ Pakistan did, however, pledge \$2.5 million for reconstruction aid in Iraq.

As a non-permanent member of the U.N. Security Council, and its symbolic status as one of the world’s largest majority Muslim nations, Pakistan is viewed as an important strategic partner to the United States. Pakistan was considered a pivotal ally in the U.S. campaign in Afghanistan and the war on terror. Pakistan was awarded an economic assistance package of \$3 billion during talks between Presidents Musharraf and Bush at Camp David in June 2003.¹²⁵

People’s Republic of China (China). China insisted that the Iraq crisis be resolved politically through the United Nations, and it supported giving weapons inspectors more time to disarm Iraq. PRC leader Jiang Zemin affirmed: “The door of peace should not be closed. As long as the slightest hope remains, we should seek a political solution and endeavor to avoid war.”¹²⁶

Although China has kept a low-profile with regard to U.S. military action in Iraq, Chinese officials continue to say that the United Nations, not the United States or the United Kingdom, should be the central player in the reconstruction process.¹²⁷ China voted in favor UNSC Res. 1483 in view of urgent postwar reconstruction needs in Iraq, even though some of China’s specific concerns had not been addressed satisfactorily in the resolution.¹²⁸ China also pledged \$25 million to the reconstruction of Iraq at the Madrid Donors conference held Oct. 23-24, 2003.

***Philippines.** President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo has repeatedly expressed her “support of the U.S. actions against Iraq,” and was one of the first and most vociferous supporters of the U.S.-led war against terrorism. The Philippines’

¹²² “Pakistan Asked to Join Iraq Peacekeeping Force,” *Financial Times*, May 16, 2003.

¹²³ “Pakistan Ready to Send Troops to Iraq — President Musharraf,” *BBC Monitoring South Asia*, May 27, 2003.

¹²⁴ “Iraq will not sent Troops to Iraq - report,” *Reuters News*, October 26, 2003.

¹²⁵ Carlotta Gall, “Pakistanis Protest Offer of Iraq Force,” *Islamabad*, June 27, 2003.

¹²⁶ John Pomfret, “China Backs Europeans on Iraqi Inspections,” *Washington Post*, March 7, 2003. “Chinese Leader Tells French President China Opposes New Resolution on Iraq,” *Associated Press Newswires*, March 6, 2003.

¹²⁷ “China Pushes for Post-War Role,” *CNN News*, April 10, 2003.

¹²⁸ “China Expects UN to Play Due Role in Reconstruction in Iraq,” *Xinhua News Agency*, May 22, 2003.

peacekeeping mission to Iraq includes 196 troops, 75 of whom are military police peacekeepers and 100 are medical and social workers.

***Poland.** The United States views Poland as one of its “staunchest allies” in its efforts to disarm and rebuild Iraq.¹²⁹ During a May 2003 visit to Krakow, President Bush thanked Poland for its steadfast support of the U.S.-led war, saying that “America will not forget that Poland rose to the moment.”¹³⁰ During the combat phase of the war, Poland contributed 200 troops to the coalition, both special forces and non-combat personnel.

Poland is playing a substantial role in the reconstruction and stabilization of Iraq. Polish soldiers have been leading a 9,500-strong multinational force in the south-central region of Iraq in a zone between the U.S. and U.K.-led areas since September. Reconstruction tasks include: securing the war-torn area and “helping establish new civilian authorities.” NATO forces, too, are providing support to the Polish unit by providing expertise in intelligence, communications, and logistics. After Poland sustained its first casualties in November, Prime Minister Lesek Millers affirmed that Poland would continue to support the mission and added that their reasons for stabilizing Iraq were moral, and not only political.¹³¹

***Portugal.** After the end of major military operations, Portuguese Prime Minister Jose Manuel Durao Barroso offered to deploy 120 National Guard troops to help with the maintenance of security in Iraq, but to the disappointment of U.S. officials, Portugal has since modified this commitment to include paramilitary police — not regular soldiers.¹³² 128 elite police officers were sent to Iraq to join Italian paramilitary forces, but were temporarily rerouted to Basra after the bombing of the Italian headquarters in Nasiriya. Portugal also pledged a total of \$20.7 million in bilateral aid.

Qatar. During Operation Iraqi Freedom, Qatar played a key role in housing and supplying U.S. combat forces and providing command and control facilities for CENTCOM personnel. Like many small Gulf states, Qatar was cautious in expressing its support for U.S. policy in Iraq, although it did not attempt to hide its burgeoning relationship with the United States. In terms of assistance to Iraq reconstruction, Qatar pledge \$100 million in reconstruction aid to the World Bank/U.N. trust fund. Qatar Airways also carried nine tons of food and medicine in the first commercial flight to Iraq since the start of the U.S.-led invasion.¹³³ Qatar Airways will maintain weekly flights schedules to support international relief organizations.

¹²⁹ “U.S.-Europe Spat Threatens to Isolate Britain,” *The Times (London)*, January 25, 2003.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*

¹³¹ “Polish PM rallies troops in Iraq,” *BBC News*, November 13, 2003.

¹³² Tom Squitieri and Dave Moniz, “Allies Balk at Sending Troops,” *USA Today*, July 10, 2003.

¹³³ “Update 1-Italian troops, Qatari plane landed in Basra,” *Reuters*, June 10, 2003

***Romania.** Romania has sent 734 peacekeepers to Iraq, including: medical, engineering, and military police personnel.¹³⁴ Most of the peacekeepers will be under British and Italian command, but the engineers will be under Polish command. Romania has also provided in-kind assistance of food, water, and medicines.

Russia. Russia opposed and criticized the U.S.-led war in Iraq. At the heart of Russian attitudes toward military action in Iraq lies Putin's focus on protecting Russian economic interests in Iraq, restraining U.S. unilateralism, and maintaining good relations with the United States. The latter was deemed essential to Putin's economic agenda. Putin's foreign policy can be viewed in light of his efforts to balance these competing objectives.

Although Russia opposed the war in Iraq, saying that U.S. actions in Iraq bypassed the U.N. Security Council, Russian Foreign Minister reaffirmed after major military operations ended that "[Russia] is now oriented towards [future] steps and actions in Iraq."¹³⁵ In concert with France and Germany, who also rejected U.S. actions in Iraq, Russia voted in favor of UNSC Res. 1483 in May 2003, to aid Iraq.¹³⁶ Russia has declined, however, to send peacekeepers to Iraq, saying that a U.N. mandate would be necessary first.¹³⁷ See **Table 6** for more information on selected security council votes pertaining to Iraq. Russia has also indicated a reluctance to forgive the estimated \$8 billion in loans owed by the Iraqi government or provide financial assistance for reconstruction.

Saudi Arabia. Although Saudi Arabia ultimately did not oppose Operation Iraqi Freedom, it was not as fervent a supporter of U.S. operations as was its smaller neighbors in the Persian Gulf. Saudi Arabia had little sympathy for Saddam Hussein's regime, but had consistently opposed the war against Iraq until the last few weeks prior to the start of hostilities. In the end, Saudi Arabia provided private assurances that the United States would have access to Saudi airspace, air bases, and a Combined Aerospace Operations Center at Prince Sultan Air Base. Officially, Saudi Arabia did not allow the U.S. military to launch a ground attack against Iraq from Saudi territory.¹³⁸ The Saudis are extremely sensitive to allowing an outside power use their facilities in an attack against another Arab state. Al-Qaeda's criticism of the regime for permitting the U.S. presence on Saudi soil has only heightened Saudi Arabia's unwillingness to return to the levels of military cooperation reached during the 1991 Gulf War. Recognizing the potentially destabilizing effects of energy price rises on the international economy, Saudi Arabia kept world energy prices stable during and after the war by manipulating its daily oil

¹³⁴ "Romania to send some 650 troops to Iraq in early July," *Agence France Presse*, June 5, 2003.

¹³⁵ "Russia, France, Germany to vote for U.S.-British Draft Security Resolution on Iraq," *Interfax News Service*, May 22, 2003.

¹³⁶ "Russia To Provide 7.0 Mln Euro Aid to Iraq," *Dutch News Digest*, May 15, 2003.

¹³⁷ "Russia Not Planning to Send Peacekeepers to Iraq," FBIS Document CEP20030701000008, July 1, 2003.

¹³⁸ Some analysts believe that Saudi Arabia quietly approved the presence of U.S. ground troops in the Kingdom.

production. The desert kingdom also replaced the 90,000 barrels a day of reduced-price oil Jordan was receiving from Iraq.

The Kingdom has also pledged \$500 million in loans and \$500 in export credits to assist with reconstruction in Iraq. In the immediate aftermath of the war, Saudi Arabia delivered over 400 tons of relief supplies to Iraq, including food, water, and medicine. In addition, Saudi Arabia donated six-fully equipped ambulances to Iraqi hospitals and 10 water purification plants to Iraq. Nearly 180 Saudi medical staff operate a field hospital and treat as many as 800 Iraqi patients a day.¹³⁹

***Singapore.** At the signing of the U.S.-Singapore free trade agreement on May 6, 2003, President Bush said Singapore “has been a vital and steadfast friend in the fight against global terror. Singapore worked hard to secure the passage of [UNSC Res.] 1441”¹⁴⁰ The Singaporean government also pledged to send 192 military personnel to assist in stabilization and reconstruction in mid-late November.¹⁴¹ A landing ship tanker will carry a crew of 161 to perform logistics and inspect ships in the gulf. An additional 31 military personnel will arrive by plane. This two-month deployment follows an earlier two month deployment of a police team to train Iraqi military.¹⁴²

***Slovakia.** Slovakia has actively supported the coalition during and after the war. During the combat phase of the war, Slovakia deployed 75 anti-chemical warfare troops to assist Czech forces in monitoring radiation levels and chemical contamination, and in making available decontamination services.¹⁴³ Slovakia allowed the United States use of its railways and roads to transport military personnel and machinery. The United States was also permitted to use Slovakia’s airspace for military flights.¹⁴⁴ During the reconstruction phase of the U.S.-led effort in Iraq, Slovakia has supplied an engineering unit consisting of 85 soldiers whose primary task will be to repair infrastructure damaged in the war and clear mines and ammunition from public areas.¹⁴⁵

***South Korea.** South Korea supported the war in Iraq. President Roh Moo-Hyun said “I believe that to support the U.S. efforts benefits our national interest,” South Korea has pledged a total of \$260 million in humanitarian and reconstruction

¹³⁹ Saudi Embassy Press Release, www.saudiembassy.net, accessed July 30, 2003.

¹⁴⁰ Remarks by US President George Bush at the Signing of US-Singapore Free Trade Agreement at the White House, Tuesday, 6 May 2003, Washington, D.C.,” *Singapore Ministry of Foreign Affairs Press Release*, May 8, 2003.

¹⁴¹ “Singapore dispatches 192 military personnel to Iraq,” *BBC Monitoring Asia Pacific*, October 28, 2003.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*

¹⁴³ “Defense Minister on Deployment of Slovak Chemical Unit for Iraq,” *SITA Slovenska Tlacova Agentura*, February 4, 2003.

¹⁴⁴ “Slovakia accepts U.S. request for assistance in case of war against Iraq,” *Associated Press Newswires*, February 13, 2003.

¹⁴⁵ “Slovak govt votes to send army engineers to Iraq,” *Reuters*, June 5, 2003.

aid for Iraq. The government initially provided approximately 650 noncombat troops to Iraq to assist with reconstruction and relief.¹⁴⁶

The South Korean Cabinet also approved a measure to send 3,000 troops, including 1,400 combat and 1,600 noncombat forces on December, 17, 2003. Noncombat forces will be composed of engineers and medics, and the combat forces will allow the new division to take responsibility for its own security. Due to mixed domestic opinion on the war, National Security Advisor Ra Jong-yil emphasized that the combat forces would support the reconstruction and peace efforts.¹⁴⁷ The measure approved by the cabinet must be formally approved by the parliament, but analysts predict that the measure will be approved easily.¹⁴⁸ The pledge of 3,000 troops was significantly less than the initial U.S. request of 5,000 troops, but would make South Korea fifth largest contributor of forces after the United States, United Kingdom, Italy, and Poland. The cabinet approval occurred amid increased security concerns following the killings two South Korean contractors in Iraq on November 30, 2003. A week after these killings, 60 South Korean contractors working on Iraq's electrical power grid left Iraq.

***Spain.** As an elected, non-permanent member of the UN Security Council, Spain has been one of the strongest supporters of the U.S. led intervention in Iraq. In May 2003, Spain joined the United States and the United Kingdom in cosponsoring UNSC Res. 1483, which legitimizes the authority of the "occupying powers" in Iraq.¹⁴⁹ See **Table 6** for more information on selected security council votes pertaining to Iraq. Some suggest that Spain's position in support of the war - widely opposed domestically - was influenced by President José María Aznar's hopes for a more influential Spain on the world stage and for increased U.S. support for his government's fight against separatist terrorist groups such as ETA.¹⁵⁰ On May 8, President Bush announced that the U.S. would include ETA's political wing (Batasuna) in its list of terrorist organizations, and that it would take measures to cut the group's financing.¹⁵¹ However, President Aznar has justified his Iraq position asserting that the Iraqi regime and its weapons of mass destruction presented a "certain threat" to global security.¹⁵²

¹⁴⁶ "South Korea Backs Iraq War Move," *BBC News*, April 2, 2003.

¹⁴⁷ Chandra, Amit "Government announces plans to send 3,000 South Korean troops to Iraq," *WMRC Daily Analysis*, December, 17, 2003.

¹⁴⁸ "Seoul finalize troop plans - 3,000 forces likely to be stationed in the northern region," *Korea Herald*, December 18, 2003.

¹⁴⁹ "Passages from Security Council Resolution Ending UN Sanctions on Iraq," *The New York Times*, May 23, 2003.

¹⁵⁰ Carla Vitzthum and Keith Johnson, "Aznar Raises Spain Profile, at a Price," *Wall Street Journal*, May 21, 2003.

¹⁵¹ "Bush coloca a Aznar entre sus más estrechos amigos y aliados," *Agencia EFE - Servicio General*, May 8, 2003.

¹⁵² Pilar Marcos "Aznar mantiene que Irak pudo "hacer desaparecer" sus armas de destrucción masiva," *El País*, June 5, 2003.

Spain has been one of the principal contributors to the reconstruction and stabilization efforts in Iraq. The Spanish government has pledged \$300 million in economic aid to Iraq until 2007. Included in this pledge is: \$210 million in grants, \$75 million in concessional loans, and \$15 million for Spanish companies that carry out work in Iraq. On the peacekeeping front, Spain has dispatched 1,300 troops that are mostly assigned to police duties in south-central Iraq under the Polish-led division. Although Prime Minister Jose Maria Aznar has reiterated Spain's commitment to Iraq, Spanish authorities have withdrawn many diplomatic staff and liaisons to the Coalition Provisional Authority under growing security concerns.¹⁵³

Syria. As an elected member of U.N. Security Council since January 1, 2002, Syria called on Iraq to disarm while acting to prevent a war in Iraq in early 2003. The Syrian government strongly denounced U.S. intervention in Iraq. On March 30, 2003, in a speech to the Syrian Parliament, Foreign Minister Farouk al-Sharaa said "Syria has a national interest in the expulsion of the invaders from Iraq." Two days earlier, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld accused Syria of allowing military supplies to be transported through its territory to Iraq, an act he called "hostile."¹⁵⁴ The U.S. has reportedly warned Syrian government of interference into Iraq.

Taiwan. President Chen Shui-bian declared support for the U.S. position on the war on March 21st, 2003.¹⁵⁵ Taiwan is not listed on the U.S. "coalition of the willing" list, presumably because it does not have diplomatic relations with the United States. As part of its plan to develop ties with Middle East countries, Taiwan hopes to establish a connection with Iraq and open a trade representative office. Taiwan has pledged up to \$4.3 million in relief aid for postwar reconstruction of Iraq, including 5,000 tons of rice.¹⁵⁶ Taiwan's parliament also approved an additional \$8.6 million for reconstruction aid.

Thailand. A close and long-standing U.S. ally, Thailand took a neutral position and kept a low profile during the Iraq war mainly because of sensitivities toward its Muslim minority. Thailand is the only U.S. ally in Asia that did not back Washington publicly on the Iraq war.¹⁵⁷ Some analysts believe that the Prime Minister played down his cooperation with the U.S.-led war on terrorism and the war in Iraq to safeguard the Thai tourism sector, reportedly hurt by fears of possible terrorist attacks and the outbreak of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) in Asia.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵³ "Bomb kills American in Bagdad, Spain recalls staff," Reuters, November 4, 2003.

¹⁵⁴ Neil MacFarquhar, "Syria Wants U.S. to Lose War, Its Foreign Minister Declares," *The New York Times*, March 31, 2003.

¹⁵⁵ "Taiwan President Reiterates Support for US Military Action in Iraq," *BBC Monitoring Asia-Pacific*, March 21, 2003.

¹⁵⁶ Monique Chu, "Ministries to Talk about Iraqi Aid: Having Already Promised to Donate up to NT \$150 million in Aid, the Government Will Further Discuss how the Government can Help After the War," *Taipei Times*, April 2, 2003.

¹⁵⁷ "U.S. Might Punish Thailand," *The Nation* [www.nationmultimedia.com], April 29, 2003.

¹⁵⁸ "Thai Prime Minister Denies U.S. Military Aid Report," *Dow Jones Newswires*, June 8, 2003.

In the postwar era, however, Thailand sent approximately 443 troops to support stabilization and reconstruction in Iraq and donated approximately \$238,000 to the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) in Thailand to support humanitarian assistance efforts in Iraq. The Por Tek Teung Foundation also donated \$71,300 to the ICRC.

***Turkey.** Although relations between Turkey and United States suffered as a result of the Turkish parliament decision to deny the United States rights to use Turkey as a northern front in the war against Iraq in March, Turkey demonstrated support to the U.S. led-coalition by pledging 10,000 peacekeepers to stabilization in Iraq. Turkey later rescinded its offer after the Iraqi Governing Council announced that it would reject Turkey's offer on November 5th, 2000. Although some skeptics have suggested that the Bush administration approved a \$8.5 billion loan package to Turkey to purchase support in Parliament, U.S. officials deny that loans amounted to a quid pro quo for the pledge of peacekeepers.¹⁵⁹ A U.S. official did suggest that the loans were linked to Turkey's pledge to refrain from unilateral military action in northern Iraq.¹⁶⁰

In June 2003, Turkey announced a new policy to promote enhanced trade relations and economic cooperation between Turkey and Iraq and more amiably relations with the Kurds in the North.¹⁶¹ Turkey is also considering an invitation from Kurdish groups to open Turkish consulates in the region.¹⁶² On June 24, 2003, Turkey also announced that it would open its bases for humanitarian aid en route to Iraq; in addition to the transport of food and other supplies, Turkey will allow transit of military personnel.

***Ukraine.** Over the course of the U.S.-led war in Iraq, the Ukraine was acknowledged as a steadfast ally of the United States. It deployed an anti-chemical weapons battalion of 450 soldiers to Kuwait. Beginning in late-August 2003, 1,647 Ukrainian peacekeepers joined the Polish-led multinational stabilization force in Iraq.¹⁶³ The peacekeepers are responsible for patrolling a section of Iraq's border with Iran, protecting Iraqi officials and guarding important government facilities.

United Arab Emirates. After trying to arrange a peaceful abdication of power for Saddam Hussein prior to the war, the United Arab Emirates was resigned to quietly supporting Operation Iraqi Freedom. The U.A.E. allowed U.S. ships to dock in its port, and it allowed the basing of U.S. aerial refueling aircraft at the large Jebel Airport, but it was reluctant to broaden defense ties to the United States beyond these

¹⁵⁹ Entous, Adam "US- Dollar diplomacy may have paid off in Turkey Vote," *Reuters News*, October 7, 2003.

¹⁶⁰ Bentley, Mark, "Turk loan linked to Iraq donations - U.S. Official" *Reuter News*, October 2, 2003.

¹⁶¹ "Turkey adjust policy regarding northern Iraq," *Xinhua News Agency*, June 5, 2003.

¹⁶² "Foreign Minister: Turkey considering opening diplomatic mission in northern Iraq," *AP*, May 18, 2003.

¹⁶³ "To 1,800. The Ukrainian Ministry of Defense has started," *Interfax News Service*, July 3, 2003.

steps. U.A.E. President Sheik Zayed bin Sultan al-Nahayan is seen as a traditional Arab nationalist who, despite forging strong defense relations with the United States over the past ten years, does not want U.S. influence in the Gulf or broader Middle East to increase. Since the end of the war, the U.A.E. has pledged \$215 million in reconstruction aid and has set up a hospital and a water purification system in Iraq.¹⁶⁴

***United Kingdom.** The United Kingdom has been the strongest supporter of the U.S.-led effort in Iraq. Prime Minister Tony Blair gave his full backing to the United States despite strong dissent from within his own Labour Party and the general public. Prime Minister Blair considered Iraq's responses to be non-cooperative and in breach of the U.N. resolutions. He believed this breach constituted just cause for military action.¹⁶⁵ Blair repeatedly attempted to persuade European leaders that Iraq posed an immediate threat to international security. During the combat phase of the war, the U.K. committed 42,000 troops to the Gulf and dispatched at least 26,000 ground troops, a quarter of its army. The United Kingdom has also made financial commitments approaching \$923 million for reconstruction in Iraq for 2003-2006. The largess of these funds will be channeled into the World Bank/UN administered trust fund. This funding does not reflect the cost borne by the United Kingdom to finance its stabilization forces.

Prime Minister Blair's unwavering support of the U.S.-led war in Iraq has come at some cost to his domestic standing, especially since the United States has yet to uncover weapons of mass destruction. Two British Cabinet members resigned from their positions and testified against the Prime Minister in parliamentary inquiries. They accused Blair of misleading the British people by allegedly fabricating intelligence and exaggerating claims of illicit weapons in Iraq.¹⁶⁶ The Prime Minister steadfastly justifies the war in Iraq: 'I stand absolutely, 100 percent behind the evidence, based on intelligence. . . The idea that we doctored intelligence reports . . . is completely and totally false.'¹⁶⁷

The United Kingdom plays a central role in the post-war period of the U.S.-led operation in Iraq. Along with the United States and Spain, the United Kingdom drafted a U.N. Security Council Resolution that would pave the way for the reconstruction process in Iraq. On May 9, 2003, the three countries introduced UNSC Res. 1483 which, among many other things, ended international sanctions on Iraq and divided Iraq into three sectors, for which the United States, United Kingdom and Poland each assume responsibility. The United Kingdom has temporary command of southern Iraq, where its priorities are to improve security and provide humanitarian aid to the Iraqi people. Countries working with the United Kingdom include: Italy, the Netherlands, Romania the Czech Republic, and New Zealand.

¹⁶⁴ Thom Shanker, "About \$1.7 Billion Raised for Relief in Iraq," *The New York Times*, April 22, 2003.

¹⁶⁵ "Blair Stand Puts Strain on Coalition," *Guardian (London)*, January 22, 2003.

¹⁶⁶ "British government exaggerated Iraq threat, former ministers tell inquiry," *Associated Press*, June 17, 2003.

¹⁶⁷ "Blair says he stands '100 percent' behind Iraq weapons allegations," *Agence France Presse*, June 2, 2003.

Despite 53 British casualties since onset of the war as of November 20, 2003, Prime Minister Tony Blair has rebuffed suggestions that the U.K. should pull out of Iraq.¹⁶⁸ After the bombing of the Italian base in southern Iraq on November 12, 2003, British officials affirmed that they were prepared to send more troops if necessary.¹⁶⁹

In its post-war efforts, the United Kingdom has tried to establish some political normalcy in Iraq. On May 5, 2003, the United Kingdom reopened its embassy in Iraq. However, the diplomatic mission will not have official status until Iraq forms an internationally-recognized central government. On the same note, the United Kingdom appointed Sir Jeremy Greenstock, former British ambassador to the United Nations, as the new special envoy to Iraq.¹⁷⁰ In late-May 2003, Prime Minister Blair visited Iraq, becoming the first Western leader to do so.

***Uzbekistan.** The government of Uzbekistan pledged support for a U.S.-led war against Iraq. Uzbekistan was included in the “coalition of the willing” announced by Secretary of State Powell on March 18, 2003.

¹⁶⁸ “UK could send more troops to Iraq,” *BBC News*, November 13, 2003.

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁷⁰ “Britain names UN ambassador as Iraq envoy,” *Agence France Presse*, June 16, 2003.

Table 1. Map and List of Coalition of the Willing**List of Publicly Announced Coalition Members¹⁷¹**

Afghanistan	Dominican Rep.	Japan	Palau	South Korea
Albania	El Salvador	Kuwait	Panama	Spain
Angola	Eritrea	Latvia	Philippines	Tonga
Australia	Estonia	Lithuania	Poland	Turkey
Azerbaijan	Ethiopia	Macedonia	Portugal	Uganda
Bulgaria	Georgia	Marshall Islands	Romania	Ukraine
Colombia	Honduras	Micronesia	Rwanda	United Kingdom
Costa Rica	Hungary	Mongolia	Singapore	United States
Czech Republic	Iceland	Netherlands	Slovakia	Uzbekistan
Denmark	Italy	Nicaragua	Solomon Islands	

¹⁷¹ White House Press release [<http://whitehouse.gov/infocus/iraq/news/20030327-10.html>]

Table 2. Foreign Military-Related Support — Troops & Equipment (Offered or Provided) for a U.S.-Led War on Iraq

COUNTRY ¹	COMBAT TROOPS	NON-COMBAT UNITS	MILITARY EQUIPMENT
Albania*		70	
Australia*	2,000 personnel; 150 special forces		2 navy frigates; navy transport vessels; transport aircraft; up to 14 FA-18 fighters
Bahrain			Up to 3 naval vessels
Bulgaria*		150 (for chem/bio decontamination assistance) ³	
Canada		31 attached to allied units as part of a military exchange	
Czech Republic*		430 from the 4 th NBC Defense Company ⁴	
Denmark*	150 personnel	70 (medical team)	Submarine and corvette
Estonia*		55 post-war peacekeepers (split with Lithuania)	
Lithuania*		55 post-war peacekeepers (split with Estonia)	
Poland*	Unknown number of special forces	200	Supply ship
Romania*		278 made available (includes an NBC unit, military police, and medical and engineering detachments)	
Slovakia*		75 (for chem/bio decontamination assistance)	
South Korea*		600 military engineers; 100 medical personnel	
Spain*		900 naval personnel (for medical, mine-clearing, and chemical decontamination purposes)	Fighter jets; aircraft carrier; hospital ship; frigate; oil tanker
Ukraine*		550 (49 to assist NBC battalion)	
United Kingdom*	45,000 personnel, including 11,000 Royal Marines, 26,000 land forces, and 8,000 Royal Air Force		100 fixed-wing aircraft ² (additional bomber squadrons on notice - 60 aircraft); 27 Puma and Chinook helicopters; 120 Challenger tanks; 150 Warrior armored personnel carriers; 16 warships

¹ An asterisk "*" indicates those countries listed among the "coalition of the willing."

² British aircraft in the Gulf include Hercules transport aircraft; Tornado GR4 bombers and Tornado F3 air defense aircraft; Harrier jets; Jaguar bombers; other air defense aircraft; reconnaissance aircraft; VC10 air refueling tankers; Tristar tankers; c-17 Globemaster transport aircraft; and C-130 Hercules aircraft (for transfer of troops and equipment).

³ President Parnavaov asserted that "Bulgaria should not take part in direct action," meaning that Bulgarian troops would not be engaged in direct combat and would not be deployed into Iraq.

⁴ Czech troops were stationed in the region to reinforce U.S. anti-chemical warfare capabilities. The Czech government did not authorize Czech troops to engage in any attack on Iraq that was not authorized by the United Nations Security Council.

Table 3. Foreign Military-Related Support — Access & Facilities (Offered or Provided) for a U.S.-Led War on Iraq

COUNTRY ¹	BASING RIGHTS	MARITIME ACCESS ²	OVERFLIGHT RIGHTS	OTHER FACILITIES ³ AND POST-WAR AID
Albania*	×	×	×	×
Bahrain	Shaikh Isa Air Base	U.S. 5 th Fleet in Manama		
Belgium			×	
Bulgaria*	Sarafovo Air Base (along Black Sea)		×	
Cyprus	2 British military bases located in Cyprus			Interview space (to interview Iraqi scientists)
Egypt		Use of the Suez Canal, including for nuclear armed ships ⁴	×	
Ethiopia*	×	?	×	
France			×	
Georgia*	×		×	Use of military infrastructure
Germany	×		×	
Greece	Soudha Base	×	×	
Hungary*	Taszar Air Base (U.S. has rented for past 7-years)		×	Training space for 3000 Iraqi exiles
Israel				Possible intelligence sharing (unconfirmed)
Italy*	Use of bases for technical purposes such as refueling		×	
Japan*				Will provide refugee relief and economic assistance to countries bordering Iraq; will provide logistical assistance in postwar peacekeeping
Jordan			?	?

CRS-36

COUNTRY ¹	BASING RIGHTS	MARITIME ACCESS ²	OVERFLIGHT RIGHTS	OTHER FACILITIES ³ AND POST-WAR AID
Kuwait*	Ali Salem, Ahmed Al- Jaber, and Camp Doha bases	×	×	
Oman	Masirah, Seeb, and Thumrait Air Bases		×	
Pakistan				Possible use of interview space - for interviewing Iraqi scientists (unconfirmed)
Portugal*	Air Bases in Azores Islands			
Romania*	Black Sea Mihail Kogalniceanu military airfield in Constanta (plus others)	Port of Constanta	×	Use of infrastructure
Saudi Arabia	Prince Sultan Air Base			
Singapore*		×		
Slovakia*			×	Use of railways and roads
Spain*	Moron Air Base; Rota Naval Base	×	×	
Thailand		?		
Turkey*			×	
United Arab Emirates	×	×		
United Kingdom*	×	×	×	

¹ An asterisk '*' indicates those countries listed among the "coalition of the willing."

² Includes passage through nationally controlled canals, territorial waters, and use of ports for transshipment of ocean borne cargo.

³ Allowing use of the country's infrastructure and other assets, including training and interviewing facilities.

⁴ Egypt normally allows access through the Suez Canal, except for those at war with Egypt. For U.S. vessels, Egypt has waived the 30-day prior notification to pass nuclear-armed ships through the canal.

Table 4. Foreign Contributions to Relief and Reconstruction in Postwar Iraq

COUNTRY	PERSONNEL	MONETARY DONATIONS	MATERIAL RESOURCES
Andorra		\$65,000 in bilateral aid to the United Nations	
Albania	70 peacekeepers		
Armenia	13 non-combat medics and emergency personnel		
Australia	900 non-combat personnel assisting with logistics and air traffic control	\$85.8 million in aid to the World Bank/U.N. administered reconstruction trust fund; \$56.27 million bilateral relief aid to the U.N.	Restoration of water and sewer systems; Food aid; Relief supplies
Austria		\$962,000 in bilateral aid to the United Nations	
Azerbaijan	150 peacekeepers		
Belgium		\$5-\$6 million to the World Bank/U.N. administered reconstruction trust fund; \$3.34 million for relief aid to the U.N.	
Bulgaria	500 peacekeepers		Relief supplies
Canada		\$244.1 million to the World Bank/U.N. administered reconstruction trust fund; \$30 million for relief aid to the U.N.	Food aid
Chile		\$15,000 for bilateral aid to the U.N.	
China		\$25 million to the World Bank/U.N. administered reconstruction trust fund	

CRS-38

COUNTRY	PERSONNEL	MONETARY DONATIONS	MATERIAL RESOURCES
Croatia	80 engineers and demining specialists		Food aid; Relief Supplies
Czech Republic	400 troops, including 280 medics, 50 military police and 15 soldiers to protect aid workers	\$19 million for reconstruction aid; \$203,000 for bilateral relief aid to the U.N.	
Denmark	390 peacekeepers	\$49.3 million for reconstruction aid; \$158.2 million in export credits	Food aid
Dominican Republic	300 peacekeepers		
El Salvador	360 sanitation and engineering personnel		
Estonia	47 peacekeepers	\$74,000 for bilateral relief aid to the U.N.	
Fiji	500-700 peacekeepers (Under consideration)		
Finland		\$5.9 million to the World Bank/U.N. administered reconstruction trust fund; \$1.27 million in bilateral aid to the U.N.	
France		\$9 million in bilateral aid to the U.N. for humanitarian relief; financing a share of the EU commitment for reconstruction	Humanitarian aid, including medicine, water, blankets
Georgia	70 troops, including 34 special-purpose brigade, 20 medics, and 15 engineers		
Germany		\$58 million in bilateral aid to the U.N. for emergency humanitarian relief; financing a share of the EU commitment for reconstruction	Food aid

CRS-39

COUNTRY	PERSONNEL	MONETARY DONATIONS	MATERIAL RESOURCES
Honduras	370 mine removal experts, engineers, doctors, nurses		
Hungary	300 peacekeepers		
Iceland		\$1.04 million in bilateral aid to the UN for emergency relief	Food aid
Italy	2500-3000 peacekeepers	\$238 million to the World Bank/ U.N. administered reconstruction trust fund	Food aid, Relief Supplies
Ireland		\$2 million in bilateral aid to the U.N. for emergency relief	
Japan	1,000 noncombat troops; will be sent in 2004 for six months to 1 year	\$1.5 billion in grants and \$3.5 billion in concessional loans for reconstruction. Pledges will be administered by the World Bank/U.N. trust fund.	
Jordan			Mobile field hospital
Kazakhstan	25 engineers		
Kuwait		\$500 million in aid for reconstruction; \$26.46 in bilateral aid to the U.N.	Relief aid, including food, cleaning materials, house ware, blankets, shoes, oxygen cylinders, and medicine
Latvia	150, including 6 field engineers, 30 freight specialists, and peacekeepers to patrol and convoy streets	\$96,207 in bilateral aid to the U.N.	
Liechtenstein		\$760,000 in bilateral aid to the U.N.	
Lithuania	130 peacekeepers	\$560,000 in reconstruction aid to the World Bank/U.N. administered trust fund; \$68,000 in bilateral aid to the U.N. for emergency relief	

CRS-40

COUNTRY	PERSONNEL	MONETARY DONATIONS	MATERIAL RESOURCES
Macedonia	38, including 28 peacekeepers and 10 medics		
Mauritius		\$37,000 in bilateral aid to the U.N. for emergency relief	
Mongolia	180 peacekeepers and health care personnel		
Netherlands	1,100, including 650 marines, 230 engineers, and medics	\$21 million for reconstruction aid	3 manned Chinook transport helicopters
Nicaragua	230 troops to remove mines		
Norway	150 soldiers	\$30 million for reconstruction aid; \$30 million in bilateral aid to the U.N. for emergency relief	
Pakistan		\$3.3 million	Relief supplies, including water, food, medicine and surgical equipment
People's Republic of China		\$25 million in reconstruction aid	
Philippines	196 personnel including 75 military police/peacekeepers, 100 medical and social workers		
Poland	2,300 peacekeepers		
Portugal	120 paramilitary police	\$16.5 million in reconstruction aid to the World Bank/U.N. administered trust fund; \$861,000 bilateral aid to the U.N. for emergency relief	Food aid
Qatar		\$15 million in bilateral aid to the U.N. for humanitarian assistance	Relief supplies, including food and medicine
Romania	734 peacekeepers	\$194,000 in bilateral aid to the U.N. for humanitarian assistance	Relief supplies, including water, food, and medicine
Russia		\$8 million in reconstruction aid	Medical care to Iraqi children; relief supplies, including food

CRS-41

COUNTRY	PERSONNEL	MONETARY DONATIONS	MATERIAL RESOURCES
Saudi Arabia	180 medical staff	\$500 million in concessional loans for reconstruction; \$500 million in export credits; \$10.8 in bilateral aid to the U.N. for emergency relief	Relief supplies, including food, water, medicine, fully-equipped ambulances. Operate field hospital
Singapore	192 military personnel to assist with logistics and training	\$1.7 million	Relief supplies, including tents, cots, blankets
Slovakia	85 soldiers to clear mines and repair infrastructure	\$290,000 in reconstruction aid to the World Bank/U.N. administered trust fund	
South Korea	3,000 troops approved by the cabinet; 1,400 combat troops and 1,600 medics and engineers	\$260 million in reconstruction aid to World Bank/U.N. administered trust fund	
Spain	1300 peacekeepers	\$210 million in grants and \$75 million in loans to World Bank/U.N. administered trust fund; \$32.41 million in bilateral aid to the U.N. for emergency relief	Relief supplies, including food and water
Sweden		\$30 million in reconstruction aid to the World Bank/ U.N. administered trust fund; \$3.27 million in bilateral aid to the U.N. for emergency relief	
Taiwan		\$8.6 million for reconstruction aid	Relief supplies, including food
Thailand	443 troops	\$283, 000	
Turkey		\$5 million	Relief supplies, including food
Ukraine	1,647 peacekeepers		
United Arab Emirates		\$215 million for reconstruction aid to the World Bank/ U.N. administered trust fund	Constructed hospital and water purification system
United Kingdom	12,000 troops, including peacekeepers	\$923 million for relief and reconstruction aid	Food aid; Relief Supplies

Table 5. Countries To Which Iraq May Owe Debt*

Creditor	Range of Bilateral Debt Estimates	
Australia	\$.5 billion	(Source: Paris Club, July 11, 2003)
Austria	\$.8 billion	(Source: Paris Club, July 11, 2003))
Belgium	\$.2 billion	(Source: Paris Club, July 11, 2003)
Brazil	\$.2 billion	(Source: Paris Club, July 11, 2003)
Bulgaria	\$1 - \$1.7 billion	(Source: CSIS, January 23, 2003; Exotix, April 2003)
Canada	\$.6 billion	(Source: Paris Club, July 11, 2003)
China	>\$2 billion	(Source: CSIS, January, 23, 2003)
Czech Republic	\$.06-\$1 billion	(Source: Boston Globe, April 4, 2003)
Denmark	\$.03 billion	(Source: Paris Club, July 11, 2003)
Egypt	unknown	(Source: CSIS, January 23, 2003)
Finland	\$.2 billion	(Source: Paris Club, July 11, 2003)
France	\$1.7-\$8 billion	(Source: Paris Club, July 11, 2003; Exotix, April 2003)
Germany	\$2.1- \$5.2 billion	(Source: Paris Club, July 11, 2003; <i>Reuters News</i> November 22, 2003)
Hungary	\$.017 billion	(Source: Paris Club, July 11, 2003)
India	\$1 billion	(Source: <i>The Hindu</i> , April 14, 2003)
Italy	\$1.3-\$1.7 billion	(Source: Paris Club, July 11, 2003)
Japan	\$4.1-\$7.02 billion	(Source: Paris Club, July 11, 2003; Japan Bank for International Development, June 11, 2003)
Jordan	\$.295 - \$1.3 billion	(Source: CSIS, January 23, 2003; Minister of Finance, Michael Manto, July 15 th , 2003)
South Korea	\$.05-\$1.1 billion	(Source: Paris Club, July 11, 2003; <i>Dow Jones</i> 3/29/03)

*Most estimates reflect only the principal owed and ignore interest and arrears on the sovereign debt. Table excludes debts/reparations under contest from the Iran-Iraq War and contested reparations from the Gulf war in 1992. Information obtained from http://www.jubileeiraq.org/debt_today.htm

Creditor	Range of Bilateral Debt Estimates
Kuwait	\$17 billion in dispute and excludes reparations from 1992 Gulf War. Iraqis claim that the bulk of this amount was provided as grants to fund the Iraq-Iran war. (Source: "Kuwait MPs reject call to drop Iraq Debt Demands," <i>Reuter News</i> , September 28, 2003)
Morocco	\$.0312 billion (Source: CSIS, January 23, 2003)
Netherlands	\$.1 billion (Source: Paris Club, July 11, 2003)
Poland	\$.5-\$.7 billion (Source: CSIS, January 23, 2003; <i>Boston Globe</i> 4/20/03)
Romania	\$1.7 billion (Source: <i>Bucharest Business Week</i> , April 21, 2003)
Russia	\$3.4- \$12 billion (Source: Paris Club, July 11, 2003; CSIS, January 23, 2003)
Saudi Arabia	\$25 billion in dispute. Iraqis claim that the bulk of this amount was provided as grants to fund the Iraq-Iran war. Saudi Officials claim that it was a loan. (Source: "IMF Says not Paris Club Iraq debt \$62 billion, <i>Reuters News</i> , October 23, 2003).
Serbia	\$1.8-\$ 2 billion (Sources: Minister of Economy, World Bank Press Conference April 18, 2003)
Spain	\$.3 billion (Source: Paris Club, July 11, 2003)
Sweden	\$.1 billion (Source: Paris Club, July 11, 2003)
Switzerland	\$.1- \$.7 billion (Source: Paris Club, July 11, 2003; Exotix, April 2003)
Turkey	\$.8 billion (Source: CSIS, January 23, 2003)
United Kingdom	\$.9 billion (Source: Paris Club, July 11, 2003)
United States	\$2.1-\$5 billion (Source: Paris Club, July 11, 2003; <i>Dow Jones</i> 3/29/03)

Table 6. How the Security Council Voted: Selected Votes in 2002 and 2003 addressing Iraq*

	UNSC Res. 1441	“Second Resolution” withdrawn due to a supposed lack of support	UNSC Res. 1483	UNSC Res.1500	UNSC Res. 1511
Angola			Yes	Yes	Yes
Bulgaria	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes
Cameroon	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes
Chile			Yes	Yes	Yes
China	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes
Colombia	Yes				
France	Yes	Threatened Veto	Yes	Yes	Yes
Germany		Voiced Opposition	Yes	Yes	Yes
Guinea	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes
Ireland	Yes				
Mauritius	Yes				
Mexico	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes
Norway	Yes				
Pakistan				Yes	Yes
Russian Federation	Yes	Voiced Opposition	Yes	Yes	Yes
Singapore	Yes				
Spain		Co-sponsored Resolution	Yes	Yes	Yes
Syrian Arab Republic	Yes		Yes	Yes	Abstain
United Kingdom	Yes	Co-Sponsored Resolution	Yes	Yes	Yes
United States	Yes	Co-Sponsored Resolution	Yes	Yes	Yes

* Security Council voting records obtained from UN website <http://www.un.org>

Table 7. Countries Eligible to Bid on Primary Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Contracts^a

Afghanistan	Moldova
Albania	Mongolia
Angola	Morocco
Australia	Netherlands
Azerbaijan	New Zealand
Bahrain	Nicaragua
Bulgaria	Norway
Colombia	Oman
Costa Rica	Palau
Denmark	Panama
Dominican Republic	Philippines
Egypt	Poland
El Salvador	Portugal
Eritrea	Qatar
Estonia	Romania
Ethiopia	Rwanda
Georgia	Saudi Arabia
Honduras	Singapore
Hungary	Slovakia
Iceland	Solomon Islands
Iraq	South Korea
Italy	Spain
Japan	Thailand
Jordan	Tonga
Kazakhstan	Turkey
Kuwait	United Arab Emirates
Latvia	Uganda
Lithuania	Ukraine
Macedonia	United Kingdom
Marshall Islands	United States
Micronesia	Uzbekistan

a. As of November 25, NSA, per Defense Policy Information cited from memo written by Deputy Secretary of Defense Wolfowitz, Department of Defense, dated December 5, 2003. Excerpt of the memo was posted on the State Department's Information on International Programs website [<http://usinfo.state.gov>]

Table 8. Madrid International Donor Conference Reconstruction Pledges^a

All Pledges in USD millions	2004	2005-2007	Unspecified by Year	Total Pledges
Australia	\$45.59	0	0	\$45.59
Austria	\$1.94	\$3.53	0	\$5.48
Belgium	\$5.89	0	0	\$5.89
Bulgaria	\$0.64	0	0	\$0.64
Canada	0	0	\$187.47	\$187.47
China	0	0	\$25	\$25
Cyprus	0	0	\$0.12	\$0.12
Czech Republic	\$7.33	\$7.33	0	\$14.66
Denmark	\$26.95	0	0	\$26.95
European Community	\$235.62	0	0	\$236.62
Estonia	\$0.08	0	0	\$0.08
Finland	\$5.89	0	0	\$5.89
Greece	0	0	\$3.53	\$3.53
Hungary	\$1.24	0	0	\$1.24
IMF	\$850	\$1700	0	\$2,550 - \$4,250
India	\$10	0	0	\$10
Iran	\$5	0	0	\$5
Ireland	\$3.53	0	0	\$3.53
Iceland	\$1.5	1	0	\$2.5
Italy	0	0	\$235.62	\$235.62
Japan	0	0	\$4914	\$4,914
South Korea	0	0	\$200	\$200
Kuwait	0	0	\$500	\$500
Luxembourg	\$1.18	\$118	0	\$2.36
Malta	0	0	\$0.27	\$0.27
Netherlands	\$9.42	0	0	\$9.42
New Zealand	\$3.35	0	0	\$3.35
Norway	\$4.29	\$8.58	0	\$12.87
Oman	0	0	0	\$3
Pakistan	0	0	\$2.5	\$2.5
Qatar	0	0	\$100	\$100
Saudi Arabia	\$120	\$380	0	\$500
Slovenia	\$0.27	\$0.15	0	0.42
Spain	\$80	\$140	0	\$220
Sweden	0	0	\$33	0
Turkey	0	0	\$50	0
United Arab Emirates	0	0	\$215	\$215
United Kingdom	\$235.48	\$216.85	0	\$452.33
United States	0	0	\$18,649	\$18,649
World Bank	\$500	\$2,500	0	\$3,000 - \$5,000
Totals	\$2155.90	\$4,958.6 - \$8,658.2	\$25,118.5	\$32,232.33 - \$35,932.33

^a Most donors could not specify whether the pledge would be in loans or grants. Pledge information obtained from World Bank website as of December 18, 2003, [<http://www.worldbank.org>]