

Reasons for the United States' continuing/expanded aid to Ukraine
As shared by **Update on Ukraine** panelists
(please watch the video to hear them discuss these points)

Economic

- I) The US sent \$75 billion dollars (in military and civilian aid) to Ukraine last year, which is 0.3% of the US GDP and 3.6% of the defense budget (total defense spending is \$900 billion dollars a year). It's only 8% of what the US spent on defense during this last 18 month period (source: <https://www.cfr.org/article/how-much-aid-has-us-sent-ukraine-here-are-six-charts>).
 - A) This is less than what the US spent in 1 year in Iraq and Afghanistan (\$2-\$3 trillion overall in Afghanistan and \$4 trillion in Iraq)

- II) This is far less than the US spent in the past, in the 1970s and 1980s, to counter the threat of the USSR
 - A) The US had spent a total of 7.3% of our GDP on defense in the 1980s, and in the 1990s that went down to 5.3% (coinciding with the end of the Cold War).
 - 1) Source: The history of Defense spending as a fraction of US GDP is available at <https://fred.stlouisfed.org/series/A824RE1A156NBEA>
 - B) About 2% of everything we made went to defense during the Cold War.
 - C) Clearly, for decades the US spent a lot more fighting Russian aggression, and is fully capable of continuing that today.
 - D) The EU, UK and Canada are spending far more than the US in Ukraine in direct financial subsidies.

Military

- I) Unlike the wars in Afghanistan or Iraq where we were militarily involved, in Ukraine we're funding a local partner in accomplishing their goal.
 - A) The US spent 30 billion dollars in Serbia successfully, with no American casualties: we're funding a local partner with no American lives at stake

- II) Fear over nuclear war might be overstated – it's unlikely that either the United States or Russia will start a nuclear war if the United States provides more aid to Ukraine.

- III) 60% of what we spend on this is spent in the United States
 - A) This helps bolster our domestic armament production and technology.

- IV) If the US allows the success of the current Russian aggression against Ukraine, there may be an international threat rising again.

- V) There was a sense of non-partisanship in the past with how the United States spent defense funds during the Cold War – we are now fighting along party lines for something that benefits all Americans.

Ukraine's infrastructure

- I) Decentralization/local government is significant in Ukraine: their elected mayors and councilors contribute to an already robust government and they are essential to the rebuilding effort in the country.
- II) Ukraine also has its own powerful notion of democracy, so the US would not need to be involved with governmental aspects as it was in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Diplomacy/International Relations

- I) The consequences of retreat/failure would be devastating and irremediable for the democratic world order and the standing of U.S.
- II) Ukraine, because of its human and natural resources and its great strides in creating an effective civil society, would very materially strengthen the EU and NATO.
- III) If Russia wins this war, it violates the United Nations international system in place since 1945 and gives space for other countries to do the same.
 - a. Currently, once a country is a part of the United Nations, it cannot wage wars to seize and conquer other nations. Russia had previously recognized the borders of Ukraine, so this is not a territorial dispute, it's the invasion by one member of the United Nations of another.
 - b. It's worth noting that the last time the USSR took over in Ukraine, the brutal Holodomar genocide occurred.