

Press Dossier

« Should the West deliver weapons to Ukraine »

Gavaudan Alexandre

- 1 - The Economist « *The West needs to send Ukraine more and better weapons* », April 3rd 2022
- 2 - The Guardian, « *Yes, Ukraine needs weapons. But what if supplying them could prove catastrophic?* », Rajan Menon, March 14th 2022
- 3 - The Times, « *Sending Ukraine weapons risks security of Europe, Russia tells Nato* », April 28 2022
- 4 - The Telegraph, « *Plea to West as Ukraine 'fights a tank with a pistol' in Donbas* », James Crisp, June 11 2022
- 5 - Times Colonist, Adrian Raeside cartoon: « *Ukraine's call for more weapons* », March 17 2022

First Article - The Economist

The West needs to send Ukraine more and better weapons
The next phase of the war may be harder—and just as important

The battle of Kyiv may be over, at least for now, but the battle of Donbas is becoming more intense. On April 18th Ukraine's government reported a wave of attacks along a 400km stretch of the front lines, mostly in the Donbas region, parts of which have been under the control of Russian-backed separatists since 2014. Vladimir Putin wants to grab the rest of Donbas, along with other bits of southern and eastern Ukraine. That may not sound as important as the siege of Kyiv, but the consequences of a Russian victory would be almost as bad.

Mr Putin has little to show for his war so far, which has succeeded mainly in killing civilians, mangling his own forces and levelling much of eastern Ukraine. The loss of an untold number of Russian soldiers (more than 20,000, according to the Ukrainians), eight generals and the flagship of Russia's Black Sea fleet, the *Moskva*, has been humiliating. If the latest push makes headway, Russia's dictator can claim vindication, while Ukraine will be left divided and disheartened. Russia might then choose to press its advantage, or simply "freeze" the conflict, leaving a devastated Ukraine to slide into dysfunction. Either way, Mr Putin would have prevented Ukraine from becoming the prosperous, pro-Western rebuke to his own rule that he so clearly fears.

It would be rash to assume that Russian forces will be as incompetent in the east as they previously were in the north, around the capital. For a start, they are now attacking from their home territory, not the temporary positions in Belarus they had taken up under the pretence of conducting "exercises". Their supply lines will be shorter. And they will seek to fight on relatively open terrain where, in contrast to the forests around Kyiv, it will be easier for the invaders to spread out and harder for the defenders to ambush them.

Ukraine needs more help. The Western response so far, particularly that of America, has been remarkable. A steady flow of weapons, especially portable anti-tank and anti-aircraft missiles, made a huge difference in the defence of Kyiv. But to hold the Russians back along a long front, let alone force them to retreat from the territory seized since the war began on February 24th, will take heavier weapons too: tanks, planes, artillery and an abundant supply of ammunition to go with them.

This is not a simple matter. Ukrainian forces use mainly Soviet-era weaponry. In the short term, they need more of it: things like mig fighter jets and t-72 tanks, as well as s-300 missiles and Gvozdika howitzers. nato countries that used to be Soviet satellites, such as the Czech Republic, Poland and Slovakia, have stocks of such kit, and have given Ukraine some of it. They should hand over more. But it will soon run out, and cannot be replenished, so the West needs to start supplying the more modern armaments used by most nato countries, and training Ukrainian soldiers to use them. This week America, Britain and Canada said they would provide Ukraine with heavy artillery—a step in the right direction.

The good news is that nato's supply lines into Ukraine, mainly from Poland, are now well established. So far, Russia has not found an effective way to disrupt them. If the weapons continue to flow and the war grinds on, Russia's economy, only around the size of Spain's even before the war began and economic sanctions were imposed, will not be able to keep supplying weapons on the same scale that nato can. If Mr Putin is to be defeated, and Ukraine allowed to determine its own future, it is not just the Ukrainian soldiers in Donbas, currently being pummelled by Russian jets, missiles and artillery, who will have to keep their nerve. NATO must be steadfast, too.

Second Article - The Guardian

Yes, Ukraine needs weapons. But what if supplying them could prove catastrophic?

The United States and some of its Nato allies – Britain, Poland and the Baltic trio – have been the most vigorous in insisting that Ukraine must, for moral and strategic reasons, receive the weapons it needs to fight Russian aggression.

The moral case, strengthened by Ukrainians' valiant resistance and President Volodymyr Zelenskiy's Churchillian wartime leadership, is that Ukraine is the victim, Russia the aggressor.

Ultimately, even Germany, which had been reluctant to arm Ukraine, was persuaded by this portrayal. It sent Ukraine 1,000 anti-tank and 500 anti-aircraft missiles and changed its policy prohibiting other members of the alliance from transferring German-made weapons to Ukraine.

By now, Ukraine is receiving arms and equipment from many other countries, some of whom aren't in Nato.

The gist of the strategic case is that failing to resist aggression invites more of it. Poland and the Baltic states have a particularly strong stake in driving this point home, as a glance at a map of east-central Europe makes evident: if Ukraine comes under Russia's sway, they will be vulnerable.

The United States has been arming Ukraine and training its troops since 2015 and provided it \$1.5bn in military support even before the war. With Ukraine now fighting for survival, there is strong, bipartisan support in Congress for extending even more help. On 11 March the Senate approved a spending bill, passed earlier by the House of Representatives, containing the \$3.5bn in military aid for Ukraine requested by President Joe Biden.

The White House had taken bold steps even earlier. Two days after the Russian invasion the president authorized \$350m in emergency military assistance to Ukraine. By early March the US had arranged for 17,000 anti-tank missiles (including Javelins) to reach Poland and Romania for overland delivery to Ukraine.

Confidence runs high that with more firepower Ukraine will, at minimum, blunt the Russian offensive and be in a strong position whenever the bargaining over the terms for ending the war begins.

Those who believe this can point to compelling evidence: western training and weaponry have unquestionably helped Ukraine destroy a lot of Russian armor and aircraft.

Hence their confidence that more Javelins will improve Ukraine's ability to destroy Russia's tanks, that additional Stinger anti-aircraft missiles will cause even more Russian warplanes to fall from the skies, and that counter-battery radars will locate and demolish deadly Russian artillery.

Yet amid the moral outrage and depth of animosity toward Putin, the risks of pouring arms into Ukraine should be considered carefully and dispassionately.

Providing Ukraine even more arms may well produce the results its proponents anticipate. It could, on the other hand, impel Russian commanders to subject Ukrainians to even greater pain. They have already experienced enormous suffering because Russia, as the Office of the United Nations Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) has noted, routinely hits civilian buildings.

If the war becomes even more brutal, Ukraine may keep resisting, but then the number of Ukrainians seeking refuge in other countries, now 2.6 million (the largest proportion is in Poland), will soar.

With Warsaw and Kraków, its two largest cities, overwhelmed by the influx, Poland has already appealed for help. A continuing exodus from Ukraine could strain the economies and social fabric of its neighbors, especially if the war drags on, preventing refugees from returning home.

Furthermore, Russia may not stand by, allowing the west to fortify Ukraine's army. Putin might order his generals to bomb the supply routes from Poland and Romania, the Nato countries that have the longest borders with Ukraine.

On 11 March, after not having bombed them since 24 February, the day the war started, Russian aircraft took aim at military airfields in Lutsk and Ivano-Frankivsk in western Ukraine. Lutsk lies about 60 miles from Poland's border, in Volyn province, which adjoins it. The city of Ivano-Frankivsk is located north of the Romania's border, and the eponymous province of which it is part adjoins Romania. On 13 March, a barrage of Russian cruise missiles hit the Yavoriv military base, which is in Lviv province and less than 30 miles from the Polish border.

These attacks are a signal from Putin that he won't stand by while the west beefs up Ukraine's army, which has already proved a tougher nut to crack than he anticipated, and were accompanied by the warning from the deputy foreign minister Sergei Ryabkov warning to the United States that Russia would regard arms "convoys" into Ukraine as "legitimate targets".

The United States and its allies may face unexpected countermoves from Russia and what they do in response could widen the war if Putin, in turn, raises the stakes. If the tit-for-tat spills over into Poland or Romania, whether intentionally or not, the stage could be set for a Nato-Russia confrontation, with nuclear weapons lurking in the background. Some experts are confident that arming Ukraine won't widen the war, but if they're wrong the consequences could prove catastrophic.

And what if Ukraine starts losing? Will Nato cut its losses, thereby emboldening Putin? Or will it up the ante, risking a clash with Russia?

None of these scenarios may materialize. Putin may prove prudent and risk averse. Then again, this war has shredded many assumptions that prevailed before it began.

Third Article - The Times

Sending Ukraine weapons risks security of Europe, Russia tells Nato

Britain and its allies are putting the security of Europe at risk by “pumping” Ukraine with weapons, the Kremlin has said in a warning that the West is “testing its patience”.

Dmitry Peskov, the Kremlin spokesman, was responding to a question about remarks by Liz Truss, the foreign secretary, who said the countries must double down on their support, including by supplying heavy weapons, tanks and aircraft.

“The tendency to pump weapons, including heavy weapons, to Ukraine and other countries are actions that threaten the security of the continent and provoke instability,” Peskov told reporters.

Maria Zakharova, the spokeswoman for Russia’s foreign affairs ministry, also warned western countries — particularly the UK — against encouraging Ukraine to strike Russian territory.

She said that President Zelensky was “being used” by the West and threatened attacks on visiting western dignitaries in Ukraine, saying: “Such aggression against Russia cannot remain without an answer.”

President Putin said Russia would retaliate as “quick as lightning” to western intervention

The comments added to a pattern of escalating rhetoric on both sides as the West has increased weapons supplies to Ukraine and been accused of waging a proxy war against Russia.

Jens Stoltenberg, Nato’s secretary-general, said the organisation was ready to support Ukraine for years in the war against Russia, including helping Kyiv to advance from old Soviet-era weapons to modern western military equipment.

“We need to be prepared for the long term . . . there is absolutely the possibility that this war will drag on and last for months and years,” he told a youth summit in Brussels.

Truss believes that the war in Ukraine could last up to five years, or even as long as a decade, and fears President Putin could use weapons of mass destruction to break the deadlock. She said in a speech at Mansion House in London that the Russian leader was a “rogue operator” and warned that he could invade other countries, including Georgia and Moldova.

She called on western countries to help push Russian troops out of Ukraine altogether and said that if Putin succeeded in making territorial gains he could inflict “untold further misery across Europe”.

Truss made the comments during a speech at Mansion House in London, where she was greeted by Vincent Keaveny, the lord mayor

Putin appeared to threaten Nato allies with unspecified weapons, possibly including nuclear missiles, and accused the West of trying to “strangle us economically”.

He said: “If anyone intends, and I underline this again, to intervene in the ongoing events [in [Ukraine](#)] and create unacceptable strategic threats for Russia, they should know that our retaliatory strikes will be as quick as lightning. We have all the tools for this. The kind that no one else can boast of right now. But we won’t brag. We will use them if they are needed. And I want everyone to know this. All the decisions on this matter have already been made.”

In St Petersburg, Putin said that the war, which has already cost the lives of an estimated 15,000 Russian soldiers, would last until “all the objectives will definitely be carried out”.

Ben Wallace, the defence secretary, told Sky News this morning: “He is, in almost desperation, trying to broaden this either with threats or indeed, with potential false flags or attacks.

“It’s certainly the case that Putin, having failed in nearly all his objectives, may seek to consolidate what he’s got, sort of fortify and dig in as he did in 2014. Just be a sort of cancerous growth within the country in Ukraine and make it very hard for people to move them out of those fortified positions.”

He told the BBC: “If Ukraine did choose to target logistics infrastructure for the Russian army, that would be legitimate under international law. It is certainly the case that Britain is assisting and finding artillery for Ukraine, which it is mainly using within Ukraine on Russian forces.”

Wallace also reinforced Truss’s view that Russian forces must be pushed out of “the whole of Ukraine” — including Crimea, which was occupied in 2014.

After failing to capture Kyiv, Putin has concentrated his troops for a large offensive in Donbas. Western intelligence suggests he wants to achieve a breakthrough [in time for May 9](#), a national holiday in Russia commemorating the Soviet Union’s victory in the Second World War. However, defence experts have cautioned that Putin will struggle to make any big territorial gains in the next fortnight to meet that deadline.

Truss said she believed that further military and economic support should be sent to countries threatened by Russian aggression and opened the door for their accession to Nato.

Explosions were heard this week in Tiraspol, the capital of Transnistria, Moldova’s pro-Moscow breakaway region, amid fears that Putin could try to capture all the Russian-speaking regions along the Black Sea.

This morning the Ministry of Defence said that the approximately 20 Russian warships in the Black Sea remained ready to strike Ukraine. However, it said that the closure of the Bosphorus to warships by Turkey had prevented Russia from replacing Moskva, its lost flagship.

Truss also referred to tensions in the Balkans, where pro-Serbian separatists in Bosnia have stepped up calls to secede. She said that the fate of these countries hinged on the war in Ukraine.

“We will keep going further and faster to push Russia out of the whole of Ukraine. This has to be a catalyst for wider change.” she said. “We must ensure that, alongside Ukraine, the western Balkans and countries like Moldova and Georgia have the resilience and the capabilities to maintain their sovereignty and freedom. Nato’s open-door policy is sacrosanct.”

Truss said western countries must keep sending food, medicine and other essentials to Ukraine to keep its economy afloat. As much as 20 per cent of the area planted with crops in Ukraine has been left empty or destroyed. The economy is heavily reliant on agricultural exports and is known as the “breadbasket of Europe”.

The foreign secretary also demanded increases to defence budgets across the western world to address a “generation of underinvestment”. She said the Nato target to spend 2 per cent of GDP on defence should be a “floor, not a ceiling”.

She questioned Britain’s trading relationship with China and said that economic access “has to be earned”.

Britain is discussing the potential outcomes of the invasion as part of a quad of nations with the US, France and Germany. It is understood that Truss is determined that any settlement is agreed on unfavourable terms to Russia in order to deter another invasion. As part of the talks, Truss is pushing for Russia to pay reparations.

“When the guns finally fall silent in Ukraine, it means making sure Kyiv has the resources it needs to maintain security, deter further attacks and rebuild,” she said.

“That’s why we are working on our joint commission with Poland to ensure Ukraine is equipped with Nato-standard weapons. And it’s why we are determined to work with the US, EU and other allies on a new Marshall Plan for the country.

“Ukraine deserves nothing less than a landmark international effort to rebuild their towns and cities, regenerate their industries, and secure their freedom for the long term.”

The Marshall Plan was a package of American financing to rebuild Europe in the aftermath of the Second World War, totalling more than \$115 billion in today’s money.

Truss said that hostile states such as Russia and China had brought countries into their orbit through economic dependency as well as military power. “For too long many have been naive about the geopolitical power of economics. Aggressors treat it as a tool of foreign policy — using patronage, investment and debt as a means to exert control and coerce,” she said.

“They are ruthless in their approach. Our response won’t mirror their malign tactics, but it must more than match them in its resolve.”

Fourth Article - The Telegraph

Plea to West as Ukraine 'fights a tank with a pistol' in Donbas

The West must adopt a “war-footing” and arm Ukraine properly to defeat Russia, Latvia said on Saturday as Ukrainian officials warned that Vladimir Putin’s army could still win his war.

In separate interviews with The Telegraph, Edgars Rinkēvičs, Latvia’s foreign minister, warned that the West needed to support Ukraine “for as long as it takes” and Mykhailo Podolyak, a Ukrainian presidential adviser, said that the army needed more heavy weapons.

Mr Rinkēvičs said that Eastern European countries had now largely run out of Soviet-era tanks and weapons to send to Kyiv and that Western Europe needed to step up production to meet the threat from Russia.

“The EU and Nato need what I call strategic endurance,” he said. “Unfortunately, like it or not, because of Russia, we are back in a situation where the military defence is a priority for Europe and for Nato.”

Mr Rinkēvičs, who praised UK support for Ukraine, said that some countries had “psychological difficulties” in taking a tough line on Moscow but that a “war-footing” towards weapons production was the necessary approach to bring peace.

“Russia will be talking only when there are two elements. Number one, when they understand that the military advance has been stopped and secondly when they will be pushed back by Ukrainian forces,” he said.

Despite repelling the Russian army from the gates of Kyiv in March, Ukrainian officials have said that Russia could still triumph in Donbas where it has concentrated its firepower. Analysts have said that Russia can outgun Ukraine by 20 to 1 in artillery duels.

In Kyiv, Mr Podolyak, the Ukrainian presidential adviser, said the Ukrainian army was “fighting a tank with a pistol” because of European prevarication over military support.

“Approximately 90 per cent of casualties on the battlefield are caused by artillery fire,” he said in an interview. “Our men will die until the point that our European partners provide the weapons we need and when they stop actually asking us to meet Putin halfway and not to humiliate the Russians.”

Mr Podolyak praised Boris Johnson for being one of the few political leaders in Europe “ready to take responsibility” for backing Ukraine with more weapons.

But he said that the scale of the battle and the length of the front required vastly more military capabilities.

“In terms of rocket launchers, we don’t need three or four of them, but around 300,” he said.

Britain promised this week to send its first long-range missiles to Ukraine, after a pledge from the United States for four of its M142 high mobility artillery rocket systems. The UK's M270 missile systems can fire 12 rockets in 40 seconds with pinpoint accuracy up to a range of 50 miles. The exact number has not been specified but it is thought to be three.

The warning of the growing risk of a Russian victory was echoed by Lesia Vasylenko, a Ukrainian MP, who referenced Russia's land grabs in Crimea and Donbas eight years ago.

She said on Twitter:

The world needs a quick victory over aggression. This can be secured only through supplying more artillery weapons to #Ukraine. #russia still has more of everything. At this rate aggression has a chance to win again. Just like in 2014-15.

And at a high-level global security conference in Singapore, Lloyd Austin, the US Secretary of Defence, also said that Ukraine and the West had to remain united if they wanted to defeat Russia.

"So we understand what we can lose. We see the dangers of disorder," he said. "Let's use this moment to come together in common purpose."

Emmanuel Macron, the French president, was recently criticised for warning against humiliating Russia. He has kept channels of communication with Mr Putin open and claimed Paris could be a mediating power to bring about peace.

It is an approach that has irritated the former Soviet Baltic states, where many families have direct experience of suffering under Moscow's rule.

Writing in The Telegraph, Kaja Kallas, Estonia's prime minister, described calls for a ceasefire as "premature".

"What Ukraine needs today are arms to fight back the aggressor and liberate their country," she said.

Fifth Article



« Ukraine's call for more weapons », Adrien Reaside, March 17 2022

Argumentative Synthesis

The 24th of February 2022, Vladimir Putin ordered Russian troops to invade Ukraine. Putin was acting for what he believed were his country's best interests, and it may be that the West has no pragmatic reason to intervene in this conflict. Still, the United States and its allies must not ignore Russia's aggression or skirt their responsibility to protect Ukraine from further harm and to defend a free country independence. In this context, using an op-ed from the Economist « *The West needs to send Ukraine more and better weapons* » published April 3rd 2022 claiming that the West must send weapons to Ukraine, an article from The Guardian, « *Yes, Ukraine needs weapons. But what if supplying them could prove catastrophic?* », Rajan Menon, March 14th 2022 describing the current situation and stating the problems that the delivery of weapons could cause, an article from The Times, « *Sending Ukraine weapons risks security of Europe, Russia tells Nato* », April 28 2022 focusing on the dangers of sending weapons to Ukraine, an editorial from The Telegraph, « *Plea to West as Ukraine 'fights a tank with a pistol' in Donbas* », James Crisp, June 11 2022 highlighting the need for Ukraine to receive weapons and finally a cartoon from Times Colonist « *Ukraine's call for more weapons* », March 17 2022 made by Adrian Raeside criticizing the hypocrisy of the West, the file asks the central question Should the West delivers weapon to Ukraine.

Ukraine needs protection. While Ukraine still has a long road ahead of it, the West should take action to help stop Vladimir Putin's aggression. One way of taking action is by sending weapons to Ukraine. As the economist article shows, Putin has caused the death of thousands of civilians. The guardian article shows the immagrational problem that this conflict has created, with thousands of ukrainians having to flee the territory and seek refuge in neighboring countries. The Telegraph article and the cartoon support the idea that the Ukrainians are dying and that Putin could win the war. It is therefore up to the West, Ukraine's ally, to help him. And what better way to help a country at war than to supply it with weapons? Especially since Ukraine lacks weapons, as the Latvian foreign minister says. The Ukrainian Prime Minister says that Ukraine lacks heavy weapons, which is illustrated in the cartoon where we see Ukraine fighting with guns while Russia has many heavy weapons. The second article points out that the military aid brought to Ukraine for 15 years had a significant impact and greatly helped to push back the Russian advances on the Ukrainian territory. Finally, by arming Ukraine and pushing back Russian forces, it could allow, as James Crisp states, to force Putin to open negotiations.

The arms race could be a dangerous prospect and furthers cold war mentality. The first danger, as the Guardian article shows, is that it could increase the suffering of the Ukrainian people, because Putin could then decide to increase the strike force, which would lead to more deaths and injuries, but also to more refugees. this increase in refugees could cause serious injury to the economy of Ukraine, but also to its neighbors. This logic of escalation, which can have terrible consequences on the Ukrainian population, can also have consequences on the rest of the world. Indeed, from a Russian

point of view, as Rajan Menon and the Times expose, this could be perceived as a threat or an involvement of the West in this conflict. With the nuclear threat in the background, an escalation of the conflict into a NATO-US confrontation could be catastrophic. Russia, through its foreign affairs spokesman, has already warned the West that Russia's response would be lightning fast in the event of intervention. Putin, as the Times article highlights, is threatening the West with nuclear weapons. Finally, in the event of Western military support and a defeat of Ukraine, NATO would appear weak and would embolden Putin, as the Guardian shows. Therefore, the deployment of weapons might seem like the next logical step, but it would encourage a Russian arms build-up and potentially lead to a global conflict.

Thus, other solutions have to be found. First, the sanction against Russia. Sanctions, as opposed to sending weapons, are a more practical and cost-effective alternative. They are also less likely to worsen the situation on the ground in Ukraine. Sanctions can be targeted at specific individuals or groups within Russia rather than hitting everyone indiscriminately and thus cause minimal collateral damage in terms of civilian lives lost or livelihoods destroyed. Moreover, sanctions don't require an enormous military effort; instead they rely on diplomacy and financial pressure. The Economist article shows that the Russian economy is weak and unstable, and that it will not be able to withstand the expenses of the war and the sanctions. The Times talks about its sanctions and shows that they have been useful and have already proved their worth. On the other hand, sending food, medical care and other materials necessary for reconstruction and aid to citizens is also a way to help Ukraine. The possibility of a large-scale economic plan to help Ukraine is also possible, like a Marshall Plan in the aftermath of World War II in Europe, which could greatly help Ukraine in the future. Thus, economic aid is also necessary.

To conclude, sending weapons to Ukraine is a good idea for two reasons: it will protect the Ukraine from Russia and Ukraine needs protecting. However, there are also two good arguments against this idea: sending weapons furthers a cold war mentality and sanctions are a better alternative.

