

Hello! My name is Rachel McVicker. I am a junior here at the University of Mary Washington and this semester I researched allied contributions to post 9/11 wars. This research project was composed under the advisement of Dr. Davidson of the International Affairs Poli Sci Department to contribute to a larger presentation that he did this spring for the Cost of Wars project put together by Brown University. So, ally contributions to post 9/11 wars is of all of the allies the US has some contributed to the war in money and men and the post 9/11 war world was very different and so it's a topic studied in and of itself because of all of those differences in how different the world was then in comparison to the end of the Cold War the end of World War Two etc. I will primarily be focusing on Afghanistan and Iraq as they were the two biggest events of the post 9/11 World War wise and so in order to assess allied contributions we needed a question and the overarching question is: why did allies enter the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq? why was this their problem? why did they feel the responsibility to send men and women into danger for the War on Terror? and this is a question that can be answered in many different ways in the comparison of many different variables looking at public opinion or looking at government institutions etc. However, I will be looking at today and what I've looked at for this semester is the cost of their involvement. That's a very good indicator of how willing they are to stay involved and how strongly feel about the cause of their fighting for so cost can be assessed in a number of ways. We use 2 main factors in our research the first being the troops cost which is how many troops were sent abroad to fight on the conflict and then how many were killed or injured the second question is extremely important as it will tell it will be a good tell for whether or not the men a country deploys are actually fighting in action or if they are more base residents than going out into the battlefield every day and secondarily and - Secondly is the monetary contribution we will be looking at how much each allied contributor spent on the war efforts in

Iraq and Afghanistan and more so how much of their GDP. And so that allows us to compare those numbers accurately to the United States as every country makes a different amount of money. We cannot expect them to all spend the same amount of money on war and conflict and have the same amount of disposable income to get and so with the cost now defined we can look at the top five contributors in Afghanistan and so we chose the top five because it seems to be a reasonable number to do research on within a few months and just looking at the top five you can see patterns of why these countries you can see patterns of how countries were involved. So, we will be assessing this peak deployment in February of 2011 as our main assessment point. Troop contributions in fatalities as a February of 2011 the United States had 100,000 men had over 1400 fatalities and 1.4% of the peak deployment had either been wounded in action or killed and under this we have the top five contributors for Afghanistan which we narrow down to be the United Kingdom, Germany, France, Italy, and Canada and now for troop contributions it is very clear to see that the United Kingdom was the number one contributor of troops and those troops were being very active in the conflict as 3.7% of peak deployment given in fatalities. The only country with a higher fatality percentage is Canada but they do not give nearly as much troop deployment. This also shows the importance of the United Kingdom in fighting this war as they have just less than over double Germany's contribution but any contribution that was made was extremely helpful and Germany and Italy both only had .9% fatalities of peak deployment making us wonder what were the caveats to that deployment that enabled so many less of those deployed to be injured or killed. Now moving on to this spending in Afghanistan, we looked at a range of year you looked at the range of 2001 the start of the war 2011; we chose 2011 because it was the peak and since then it has very much come down and since this were still going on a lot of the more recent years do not have as much data out in 2011

seemed to be a good year for us to nail down town. So once again the United Kingdom is the number one contributor by almost 9 billion dollars in contributions it is clear to see that the United Kingdom, Canada, Germany, France and none of them gave a comparable percentage of GDP as the United States. .09% is very slim in comparison to the 2% of the United States gave but they all still gave money and Italy still contributed with that .02% troops with .02% and it's important to note that Canada came in #2 on the contributors list for military spending while they were on the bottom up troop deployment and that points out one thing that we will be looking at in the future with this research which is the percent of the military deployed and not necessarily the percent of population or other aspects that we looked at now I'm moving on to Iraq um you will be looking at the peak deployment as of December 2005 and it's important to note here that Iraq was a much more controversial war. The countries that did go to war went to war for the mission of removing weapons of mass destruction from the hands of the Iraqi government and the people that said that there were weapons of mass destruction there were US and British intelligence. However, other major world powers had intelligence that said completely differently that there was no WMDs in Iraq and so the choice to go to war was much harder for a lot of nations. And, it shows in the list of the top five contributors so once again starting off with troop contributions the United States gave 160,000 troops um had 4211 fatalities which accumulated two 2.6% of their peak deployment. As you can see in all of this data the number of troops was much less than the number of troops contributed in Afghanistan and part of that is due to the controversial nature of this war. Furthermore, these allies differ very much, United Kingdom and Italy are the only two that were major contributors in both conflicts. In Iraq ,we also have South Korea, Poland, and Australia all who are steadfast American allies and have been since this conflict. Furthermore, there were policies put in place that enabled South Korea

and Poland to be paid by the United States to contribute. However; it does not look like those contributions were extremely influential in keeping them in. Lastly, before we move on to monetary spent military spending for Iraq it is important to note that while South Korea has the second most ally contributed troops with 3200; they only experienced one fatality and, based on the Brookings institutes Iraq index, it is clear to see that once that one fatality was experienced South Korea pulled almost half of their troops out within a year and then continue to slowly decrease the amount of troops involved. This is potentially suggesting that South Korea was not willing to be in a violent conflict and they could not justify that to their citizens, which is a very interesting perspective to have. Australia also only had two fatalities making this question what were the Italian troops doing specifically in in the Iraq conflict moving on to monetary spending the United States spent 586 billion dollars and we should keep which amounts to 3.9% of our GDP And in South Korea both came up with a measly .006/.007% of their GDP demonstrating that these percentages are a lot lower than in Afghanistan. They were a lot less willing to come to war which is very interesting also is kind of telling given the controversial nature of the Iraq war. In total, looking at both wars, we can see that the UK and Italy are the only two countries that were major contributors involved in both, as I previously stated. And, now the UK gets a lot of recognition for this. The UK in the US have always had this special relationship as it's known throughout the IA world. Italy is not as well recognized as a major US ally even though they came to represent in both of these conflicts and so it is important to recognize these contributions. Furthermore, too value these allies which is something that the US has lacked in the past. And so, going forward the US should value the Italian alliance equally as much as it has valued the UK alliance in these conflicts. Second of all the fatality numbers of the allies is comparable to US fatalities in most cases, aside from the few that I've pointed out, and that just

goes to show that these allies were equally involved in the conflict itself they were not just there keeping the beds warm on base they were out in the field on the battlefield fighting with the American soldiers; however, those two cases where fatalities are not nearly equal make us wonder what were the cost of service which is the 2nd question here on this slide. It leads me into looking forward I did not get to complete this research to the full extent that I wanted to and the cost of wars project is still continuing but it has also been slowed down by the COVID crisis. So looking forward these are the two main questions I still hope to find answers to with this research did the nations that contribute feel threatened by the 9/11 attacks? The 9/11 terror attacks were attacks on a western liberal institutional ideology. They were an attack on the modern world order that we have now and so while these were directly against the United States, did Britain and Italy and France countries that also follow that same liberal order did they feel threatened? did they feel like their country was next? Because that perception greatly influences whether or not they enter these wars for the United States; or they enter these wars for themselves, which is crucial to answering that original question that I posed of why these countries got involved. and then Secondly this is a question that I have mentioned of what the caveats were to service, you know. I know from previous knowledge that Germany has a specific caveat in their deployment contracts that they would not fight at night, in hopes that it would decrease fatalities. And, what other caveats were there by country in order to protect their men? because a lot of that will feed into being able to properly analyze the legitimacy of the contributions made. Thank you for taking your time, or taking time out of your day, and listening to my presentation. I wish I could have been presenting this at the early convergence center or in Monroe Hall but these are the times and so we shall make the most of them. I hope you all have a great day!