

Stenographic Transcript
Before the

COMMITTEE ON
ARMED SERVICES

UNITED STATES SENATE

HEARING TO RECEIVE TESTIMONY ON
THE CONFLICT IN UKRAINE

Tuesday, February 28, 2023

Washington, D.C.

ALDERSON COURT REPORTING
1111 14TH STREET NW
SUITE 1050
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005
(202) 289-2260
www.aldersonreporting.com

1 HEARING TO RECEIVE TESTIMONY ON
2 THE CONFLICT IN UKRAINE

3
4 Tuesday, February 28, 2023

5
6 U.S. Senate
7 Committee on Armed Services,
8 Washington, D.C.
9

10 The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:30 a.m.,
11 in Room 216, Hart Senate Office Building, Hon. Jack Reed,
12 chairman of the committee, presiding.

13 Committee Members Present: Senators Reed [presiding],
14 Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Kaine, King, Peters,
15 Manchin, Rosen, Kelly, Wicker, Fischer, Cotton, Rounds,
16 Ernst, Sullivan, Cramer, Scott, Tuberville, Mullin, and
17 Schmitt.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. JACK REED, U.S. SENATOR
2 FROM RHODE ISLAND

3 Chairman Reed: Let me call the hearing to order.
4 Good morning. The committee meets today to discuss the
5 ongoing war in Ukraine. This hearing comes at a somber
6 moment as we mark one year since Russia launched its
7 illegal and unprovoked attack on Ukraine.

8 I would like to welcome and thank the expert witnesses
9 before us today. Dr. Angela Stent is Director Emerita of
10 Georgetown University's Center for Eurasian, Russian and
11 East European Studies. She is an expert on Russian and
12 European geopolitics, with extensive policy experience
13 across the intelligence community, State Department,
14 academia, and NATO.

15 Dr. Dara -- Excuse me, Ms. Dara Massicot is a Senior
16 Policy Researcher at the RAND Corporation. She specializes
17 in Russian military strategy, combat operations, and
18 escalation dynamics, and has served as the lead analyst on
19 these issues at the Department of Defense. Lieutenant
20 General Keith Kellogg is Co-Chair of the Center for
21 American Security at the American Foreign Policy Institute.

22 Both in and out of uniform, General Kellogg has served
23 at the highest level of National Security leadership for
24 years. Over the past year, Vladimir Putin has inflicted
25 suffering upon innocent civilians, threatened European

1 security, and caused serious consequences for the global
2 economy.

3 Now, more than ever, it is clear that if Putin
4 succeeds in Ukraine, he will not stop there. Russia cannot
5 be allowed to call the sovereignty and territorial
6 integrity of any nation into question. Fortunately,
7 several efforts have thwarted his initial assault. First
8 and foremost is the incredible courage and fighting skill
9 of the Ukrainian people, as well as the inspirational
10 leadership of President Volodymyr Zelenskyy.

11 I had the opportunity to travel to Kyiv last month and
12 was deeply moved by the Ukrainians' bravery and commitment
13 to defending their homeland. Second is the remarkable
14 statesmanship of the Biden Administration in forging a
15 unified response, leading worldwide condemnation of Putin,
16 and providing enormous military, economic, and humanitarian
17 support for Ukraine.

18 Finally, Putin's initial assault has folded from the
19 inept performance of his own forces. This war has exposed
20 a poorly led and poorly trained Russian army with corrupt
21 leadership at every level, poor tactics and communications,
22 and woeful logistics. This is a critical point in the
23 fight. Ukraine has achieved some very notable successes,
24 but there is hard fighting ahead and more to be done.

25 We and the rest of the international community must

1 continue to support the Ukrainian people and to expedite
2 the assistance that Ukraine needs to be successful. During
3 today's hearing, I would like to hear from our witnesses
4 how these goals can best be achieved. Although NATO is in
5 the midst of the greatest test it has ever faced, if Putin
6 thought his actions over the past year would drive a wedge
7 within our alliance and the international community, he was
8 badly mistaken.

9 NATO has shown remarkable unity and resolve, and a
10 formidable array of our partners around the globe have
11 joined together with incredible speed to provide Ukraine
12 with military, economic, and humanitarian aid, reinforce
13 combat power along NATO's Eastern flank, and impose the
14 Accords on Russian decision makers.

15 The carnage and destruction wrought by Putin's
16 invasion cannot be undone, but I am encouraged by
17 Congress's bipartisan action to provide support to Ukraine.
18 The assistance packages approved by Congress and championed
19 by President Biden have made a decisive difference in
20 helping Ukraine repel Putin's troops and mercenaries.

21 These assistance packages are also providing much
22 needed aid to displaced Ukrainians whose cities and towns
23 continue to face indiscriminate bombardment by Russian
24 forces. Just as Ukrainians have learned and adapted on the
25 battlefield, the effort to aid and equip their security

1 forces has evolved.

2 Throughout the war, the Biden Administration has
3 wisely calibrated our assistance to Ukraine to the
4 conditions on the battlefield. To date, the United States
5 has committed more than \$30 billion in security assistance,
6 including 10,000 javelin and stinger systems, 160
7 Howitzers, 38 HIMARS, 109 Bradley Fighting Vehicles, 31
8 Abrams tanks, 1 million rounds of artillery ammunition,
9 hundreds of air defenses through the new AVs, and hundreds
10 of thousands of other pieces of equipment and ammunition.

11 We remain focused on striking the appropriate balance
12 between providing supplies that can be employed
13 immediately, while looking ahead to provide modern weapons
14 systems that will require additional training. At the same
15 time, we cannot lose sight of the most dangerous aspect of
16 this conflict, Russia's escalation strategy. This battle
17 is one of the few times in the atomic age that we have had
18 a surrogate fight with the potential to draw nuclear powers
19 into a confrontation.

20 Russian nuclear threats cannot be dismissed or
21 ignored, but they also cannot be seen as determinative and
22 uncontested, and they must be constantly evaluated as
23 rhetoric or reality. I would ask for our witnesses'
24 assessment of the escalation threat and how we can manage
25 this dynamic moving forward.

1 It is important to remember that this conflict matters
2 not just to Ukrainian sovereignty and security, but also to
3 that of our allies in Europe, and indeed our own security
4 here at home. This is not a zero-sum endeavor. Rather,
5 assistance to Ukraine is an investment to U.S. National
6 Security, and I look forward to our witnesses' testimonies,
7 and I thank them again for their participation. And with
8 that, let me turn to the Ranking Member, Senator Wicker,
9 please.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATEMENT OF HON. ROGER WICKER, U.S. SENATOR FROM
2 MISSISSIPPI

3 Senator Wicker: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.
4 And thanks to our distinguished panel of witnesses. Last
5 Friday, February 24th, marked the solemn anniversary, one
6 year since Russia's unprovoked, illegal, and brutal
7 invasion of Ukraine.

8 The courage and ingenuity shown by Ukrainian troops,
9 many of whom were civilians before the war, continues to be
10 nothing short of heroic. Now, after a long year of
11 bloodshed and sacrifice, the war has entered a crucial
12 phase.

13 Today's hearing is an opportunity to review the
14 current conditions of the war and its possible trajectory,
15 and to discuss policy recommendations to help Ukraine win.
16 I appreciated President Biden's visits to Ukraine and
17 Poland last week.

18 What I do not appreciate is the President's repeated
19 failure to articulate U.S. goals and interest in Ukraine in
20 a fashion that resonates with most Americans. Congress has
21 appropriated over \$100 billion of taxpayer funding to
22 assist Ukraine and is likely -- and more is likely to be
23 needed later this year, so I would welcome our witnesses'
24 views on why supporting Ukraine matters to the average
25 American.

1 In my view, this is not a particularly difficult case
2 to make. U.S. support to Ukraine helps a capable,
3 motivated, and grateful partner nation restore stability to
4 a region of the world that is critical to our interests.
5 As they prevent chaos spreading further into Europe, the
6 Ukrainian armed forces are also significantly degrading the
7 military capability of one of our chief adversaries,
8 Putin's dictatorship.

9 Finally, our support for Ukraine sends a clear message
10 to the Chinese Communist Party that aggression will be met
11 with resolve. Our allies in the Asia-Pacific understand
12 the connection between projecting strength in Ukraine and
13 deterring Chinese aggression. Japan, for example, just
14 announced a \$5.5 billion aid package for Ukraine.

15 American interests are being secured without U.S.
16 boots on the ground and for a relatively modest cost. And
17 after a year of fighting, the oversight requirements
18 Congress has put in place seem to be working. Just last
19 week, three major independent U.S. watchdogs said they had
20 not received any reports of major fraud regarding U.S. aid.

21 Further, many allies and partners are helping us
22 shoulder the burden. Britain, Poland, Bulgaria, Romania,
23 Slovakia, and the Baltic States deserve special mention for
24 their contributions. Unfortunately, there are some larger
25 European partners who need to do much more, notably Germany

1 and France.

2 This war matters greatly to the United States but is
3 being fought in Europe's backyard. I believe some in the
4 Biden Administration have recognized that the drip, drip,
5 drip approach to providing military assistance has
6 prevented Ukraine from mounting successful
7 counteroffensives to bring this war closer to an end. And
8 make no mistake, Ukrainian battlefield victories are
9 necessary for a just peace.

10 Vladimir Putin is a war criminal who understands only
11 brute force. He will not negotiate until he is forced to
12 do so. I would like to hear from our witnesses about what
13 more could be done to sharpen the military capabilities of
14 the Ukrainian armed forces. We need to learn our lessons
15 from the slow roll approach we use to arm the Ukrainians.

16 Thus far, the Ukrainians have continually surprised
17 many in the West with their ingenuity and their will to
18 fight. We are at a pivotal moment in this war, an
19 inflection point we cannot afford to waste as we go about
20 defending the interest of the United States and our allies
21 so that the 21st century is a peaceful, prosperous and
22 American led century.

23 I have repeatedly in this past year advocated Ronald
24 Reagan's concept of peace through strength. In addition,
25 Eisenhower said over 70 years ago, only with strength could

1 we achieve the true task of this time to deter aggression
2 and secure peace. Mr. Chairman, I do agree with you that
3 we must help our Ukrainian friends, that our help should be
4 expedited, and I do question whether the pace has been
5 properly calibrated.

6 But I thank you and I look forward to working with you
7 in this mutual bipartisan endeavor, and I thank our
8 witnesses.

9 Chairman Reed: Thank you very much, Senator Wicker.
10 And now let me recognize, Dr. Stent. Dr. Stent, please.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATEMENT OF ANGELA STENT, DIRECTOR EMERITA,
2 GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY CENTER FOR EURASIAN, RUSSIAN AND EAST
3 EUROPEAN STUDIES

4 Dr. Stent: Thank you very much. Chairman Reed,
5 Ranking Member Wicker, members of the committee, thank you
6 for inviting me to testify before your committee at this
7 very critical time. Let me begin with Russia's war aims.

8 What does Vladimir Putin want? When Putin launched
9 his unprovoked, full-scale invasion of Ukraine a year ago,
10 his goal was to conquer the country in three days, to oust
11 the Zelenskyy government, and to install a puppet regime
12 loyal to Moscow. Putin does not believe that Ukraine is a
13 separate nation, and he denies that it has the right to
14 exist as a state.

15 In my book, Putin's World: Russia Against the West and
16 With the Rest, I have a cynical quote that sums up his view
17 of the world. Putin said, there are only four truly
18 sovereign states in the world, Russia, China, the United
19 States, and India. All the rest had limited sovereignty,
20 they are colonies. Having failed to take Kyiv and
21 encountering fierce and effective resistance from the
22 Ukrainians, Russian forces have been pushed back into what
23 is now a brutal war of attrition.

24 In his address to the Federal Assembly last week,
25 Putin claimed that NATO had started the war and was out to

1 destroy Russia, but he said, we will win on the
2 battlefield. So, what exactly are the Russian war aims
3 today? There was no hint in that speech a week ago, safe
4 to tell the Russian people that this will be a long war and
5 they have no choice but to support it.

6 At a minimum, Russia wants to get total control of the
7 Donbass region, the Donetsk and Luhansk provinces, which
8 have been partially occupied by Russia since 2014. The
9 next goal would be total control of two new regions, which
10 he has declared are annexed to Russia, Kherson and
11 Zaporizhzhia, an artificial red line.

12 Then Putin might be willing to sit down and negotiate
13 an agreement for a ceasefire, but make no mistake, that
14 would only be temporary. Putin has not given up his goal
15 of conquering Ukraine altogether, and this could be a very
16 long war. As critical for this committee, I believe at
17 this important time, is European views and the durability
18 of the transatlantic coalition to support Ukraine.

19 Many of you were at the Munich Security Conference
20 last weekend and you saw and heard the public displays of
21 transatlantic unity, encouragement for Ukraine's
22 determination to prevail. So far, I believe this
23 transatlantic unity has been remarkable. But Europeans are
24 suffering the economic fallout from the sanctions and the
25 end of Russian hydrocarbon imports. Public opinion remains

1 supportive of Ukraine, and the mild winter has mitigated
2 some of the economic pain.

3 But it is likely that as the war drags on this year,
4 there could be more public resistance to sending
5 significant economic support to Ukraine and more calls to
6 pressure Ukraine to begin to sit down at the negotiating
7 table.

8 If, of course, Russia were willing to sit down and
9 negotiate with Ukraine. Russia will likely step up its
10 information war in Europe this year, as elections in
11 various countries loom. The same questioning will likely
12 happen here in the United States as we approach next year's
13 Congressional and Presidential elections.

14 At Munich, it was clear that Western governments do
15 have to do a better job of explaining to their publics what
16 the stakes are in this war and why it affects their
17 interests. This is about international stability and a
18 world in which rules are observed rather than the
19 disruptive world Putin wants, one where there are no rules.

20 The same is even more true for the global South, that
21 is the developing world. And I do have deep concerns about
22 this. As we heard in Munich, these countries face
23 significant problems, food insecurity, the impact of
24 climate change, humanitarian disasters, and this European
25 conflict, in the eyes of many, is absorbing too many

1 resources from the West that would be better directed
2 towards them.

3 The global South has not taken sides in this war and
4 has neither condemned nor sanctioned Russia, meaning that
5 Putin is not isolated. He has been cultivating these
6 countries for years. The United States and our allies need
7 to do a better job of explaining to these countries why it
8 is important that Russia not win this war. Depicting this
9 as a fight between democracy and autocracy is ineffective
10 in many of these countries.

11 It is much more effective to highlight that Russia has
12 violated the United Nations charter, it has violated
13 international law. If Russia were to prevail, and the rest
14 of the world to resume business as usual with Moscow, then
15 no country would be secure in its borders and no one could
16 count on preserving -- no country could count on preserving
17 its territorial integrity. Russia is expecting the
18 developing world to remain neutral.

19 NATO should step up its efforts to counter the Russian
20 narrative, and however difficult it is, the U.S. should try
21 harder to break Putin's information Iron Curtain and
22 communicate directly with the Russian people and explain
23 what Putin is doing and what this war is really about, and
24 its true cost to the Russian people and future generations.
25 Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Stent follows:]

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 Chairman Reed: Thank you very much, Dr. Stent. Ms.
2 Massicot.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATEMENT OF DARA MASSICOT, SENIOR POLICY RESEARCHER,
2 RAND CORPORATION

3 Ms. Massicot: Chairman Reed, Ranking Member Wicker,
4 members of the committee and staff --

5 Chairman Reed: Could you bring the microphone closer,
6 if possible, please.

7 Ms. Massicot: Thank you. Sorry about that. Chairman
8 Reed, Ranking Member Wicker, members of the committee and
9 staff, thank you for inviting me to testify before you
10 today. One year has passed since Russia launched its full-
11 scale invasion of Ukraine, and this grim milestone offers a
12 moment of reflection.

13 My area of expertise is Russian military capabilities,
14 strategy, and operations. My remarks today focus on the
15 past year of war, an assessment of where the war stands at
16 present, and outlines considerations for the future.

17 On the eve of Russia's invasion last year, nearly
18 200,000 troops amassed on Ukraine's borders. The Ukrainian
19 military and government transitioned to a higher level of
20 readiness and state of emergency only a few weeks prior.
21 Many assumed that if Russia used their advantages wisely,
22 it would be difficult for Ukrainian forces to withstand for
23 long. But the Russians did not prevail.

24 They were instead routed outside many major cities and
25 retreated on multiple occasions. Why? The answer has many

1 components, and no single factor explains outcomes we see
2 today. Moscow's invasion plan, as we know now, was created
3 by a small, secretive group, and is riddled with faulty
4 assumptions, arbitrary political guidance, and planning
5 errors. War plan's design and objectives departed from
6 Russian military strategy and undercut many of its
7 advantages and amplified its structural disadvantages from
8 the outset.

9 The Russian command withheld its war plan from any
10 elements of its invading force, until the last minute due
11 to excessive secrecy leading to multiple preventable errors
12 on their side. These mistakes then collided with fierce
13 Ukrainian resistance, and Western weapons, intelligence,
14 training, and planning support. Senior U.S. officials
15 place Russian casualties at well over 100,000.

16 The damage to the Russian army, the airborne and
17 special forces is systemic and severe, and since last
18 summer has hindered the Russian military's ability to make
19 large territorial gains. The past year of war has come at
20 a high cost to Ukraine, which is now largely dependent on
21 weapons provided by the West.

22 The Russian military has inflicted severe damage on
23 Ukrainian cities and critical infrastructure, and its
24 forces stand accused of committing war crimes and crimes
25 against humanity against Ukrainians.

1 Millions of Ukrainians are internally and externally
2 displaced. However, Russian leaders are preparing for a
3 protracted conflict. To replace lost personnel, Russia
4 mobilized 300,000 men last September. They were hastily
5 trained and their provisioning is uneven, as are their
6 skill sets. Russia has been withdrawing its older
7 equipment from strategic reserves in Siberia from the war's
8 outset, although that equipment is in various states of
9 serviceability.

10 In January, the Russian military was again ordered to
11 go on the offensive in the Donbas, even though its forces
12 were not prepared. Currently, localized assaults are
13 underway in Donetsk, Luhansk, and Zaporizhzhia, possibly to
14 bring these regions under full occupation, and to keep
15 Ukrainian forces engaged and unable to break away to begin
16 their own counteroffensive.

17 The tactics are crude. The Russians use repetitive
18 armored assaults in some areas and in others are
19 experimenting with assaults of storm troops. In many
20 cases, this means human waves with high rates of casualties
21 as they attempt to close on Ukrainian positions. Russian
22 mobilized soldiers now make public appeals to be spared
23 from what the coming -- what they call, "canon meat."

24 The Russian command shows a high tolerance for losses.
25 However rudimentary, the method has brought incremental

1 success in a few areas where Russian shelling occurs around
2 the clock. Some Ukrainian positions like Bakhmut and areas
3 around Cremona are under serious and mounting pressure, and
4 missile strikes by the Russian air force continue to chip
5 away at Ukrainian air defenses.

6 I would like to end my remarks with a brief discussion
7 about what may come next. And the outcome of the war, of
8 course, is highly contingent on multiple factors related to
9 sustainment, force regeneration, and availability of
10 Western support to Ukraine. Russia, for its part, has
11 untapped manpower that numbers in the low millions and will
12 likely need to mobilize replenishment this year.

13 The Kremlin is pressuring its defense industrial base
14 to produce more ammunitions, but it has not yet fully
15 activated its wartime authorities. Without mobilizing more
16 men and pulling more equipment from the reserves, another
17 new incursion into Northeastern Ukraine, such as the
18 Kharkiv region, would be difficult and in my opinion,
19 another ground attack on Kyiv seems well beyond the ability
20 of Russian forces now.

21 There are several potentially disruptive events that
22 Russia could undertake that might alter the dynamics of the
23 war that I outline in more detail in my written remarks.
24 So, in conclusion, Russian combat potential is diminished
25 due to the losses that it has sustained. It is trying to

1 overcome these deficits by consolidating its positions,
2 generating more manpower and equipment, and using brute
3 force tactics.

4 Defending against this renewed offensive is taking a
5 toll on Ukrainian forces, and Russia is actively digging in
6 with fortifications, trenches, and minefields to make it
7 costly for Ukraine to liberate more of its territory moving
8 forward.

9 The capabilities of both sides are being worn down,
10 and Ukraine will need continued and predictable support as
11 Russia digs deep into its reserves. This concludes my
12 remarks. Thank you.

13 [The prepared statement of Ms. Massicot follows:]

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 Chairman Reed: Thank you very much. General Kellogg,
2 please.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATEMENT OF LTG KEITH KELLOGG, CO-CHAIR, CENTER FOR
2 AMERICAN SECURITY AMERICA FIRST POLICY INSTITUTE

3 General Kellogg: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Ranking Member,
4 esteemed members of the committee, thank you for having me
5 here today. I am grateful to be able to offer my
6 perspective, and I look forward to answering your
7 questions.

8 Among the many opportunities I have had in my life,
9 none has been a greater privilege or a higher honor than
10 wearing the uniform of the United States Army in nearly
11 four decades of decorated service on behalf of this
12 country. Much of that was combat service, including two
13 tours in Vietnam, Operation Just Cause in Panama, the first
14 Gulf War, and Iraq.

15 I have had the privilege of being the Commander of
16 Special Operations Command Europe and the 82nd Airborne
17 Division at Fort Bragg, North Carolina. My military career
18 is one of multiple aspects in my life that make my
19 perspective on the war in Ukraine unique.

20 The second is my service in the last Administration on
21 the National Security Council, the acting National Security
22 Advisor to the President, and the National Security Advisor
23 to the Vice President.

24 And finally, a comprehensive two week visit I made
25 last month to Ukraine. My trip to Ukraine was facilitated

1 by the expertise of the Weathermen Foundation, founded by
2 Best Weatherman and Andrew Duncan, seated behind me today,
3 and led by my daughter, West Point graduate, Dr. Meaghan
4 Mobbs.

5 I visited arenas of battles near the line of contact.
6 You know, Kharkiv, Iziium, Donetsk, and interfaced across
7 the spectrum of military forces, from senior decision
8 makers to trigger pullers. In Bucha, in Iziium, I saw the
9 firsthand consequences of unbridled Russian aggression and
10 their willingness to kill innocents and use indiscriminate
11 violence against children.

12 My views today, which are offered today in my strictly
13 personal capacity, are consistent with everything I have
14 written and I have said throughout this conflict. To be
15 clear, Russia's full-scale invasion was prefaced by a
16 humiliating American withdrawal and defeat in Afghanistan
17 that allowed Putin to believe he could launch a new war in
18 Europe without a major response, much like he found in 2014
19 when he seized Crimea from Ukraine.

20 Deterrence has failed. And this failure has been
21 compounded by a willingness to use strong words,
22 unaccompanied by decisive and timely action. It is the
23 incremental and halting of the American and allied response
24 to the Russian invasion that persuades Putin he can drag
25 out this war and count on time to be his friend and bring

1 him to victory.

2 It has been support sent in half measures and with
3 hesitation, which succeeds in enabling the fighting of the
4 war but not the ending of it. This is important because
5 ending the war needs to be the principal American effort.
6 If we do not demonstrate leadership now, we risk being
7 mired in another endless war.

8 As with all wars, there will be negotiation between
9 the warring parties, and so we must look forward to what
10 will hasten those negotiations, consistent with American
11 honor and interest. It is clear the path to bringing about
12 these negotiations is to rapidly increase Ukraine's
13 lethality to enable Ukrainian forces to destroy currently
14 committed Russian forces on the battlefield and disrupt
15 their supply chain logistics.

16 Putin must see that the fate of his army in the field
17 in Ukraine is at risk of near total destruction. The
18 reasons for American interest are many. The war threatens
19 the American led international order.

20 We cannot be secure in our leadership role if we allow
21 a war of regression to regress and persist in a major
22 sovereign state with the potential of a Russian victory.
23 Simply saying whatever it takes as long as it takes is not
24 policy, it is a slogan.

25 One of the great maxims of warfare is tactics without

1 strategy is just the noise before defeat. No number of
2 supplemental aid packages, no round of sanctions, nor a
3 Presidential visit to Kyiv will achieve success without a
4 plan.

5 The Ukraine war must end this year, but not any end
6 will do. An end to the war in Ukraine must be defined with
7 American interests at heart and there must be a pathway to
8 achieve it. This can be achieved by first providing
9 Ukraine with all the military armament it needs to defeat
10 the Russian army in Ukraine.

11 The survival of Putin's army in the field must be put
12 at risk and you need to do it now. Second, the
13 identification of an end state for how this war will end,
14 with a road map to get there must be communicated
15 effectively to the American people. And third, our allies
16 must do more, spend more, and do it more quickly.

17 This war is in their backyard and they cannot expect
18 the citizens of the United States to continue to carry the
19 overwhelming financial burden as they do today. All this
20 is simple, but not easy. Let me be plain, Americans are
21 right to ask the hard questions about why we are spending
22 so much in Ukraine. Many of your own constituents,
23 Americans with whom I have spoken, have legitimate concerns
24 about our involvement in this war.

25 We see a Federal Government that is eager to pour

1 billions into the defense of Ukrainian borders while
2 showing no real interest in the defense of American
3 borders. From a strictly policy perspective, the correct
4 answer is that American Government is equipped to do both.
5 As we enter the second year in Ukraine, we cannot continue
6 the status quo.

7 We need to work towards an end to this war and do so
8 immediately and decisively. If this war turns into a
9 multiple year of attrition, which is its present
10 trajectory, then Americans may be asked to sacrifice more
11 than they are willing to give, and Ukraine will lose.

12 As it stands, a Ukrainian defeat is an American defeat
13 by proxy. This cannot be tolerated. I look forward to
14 your questions.

15 [The prepared statement of General Kellogg follows:]

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 Chairman Reed: Thank you very much, General. Dr.
2 Stent, one of the issues that continually engages the
3 planners and the statesmen and women who deal with this
4 problem is escalation. Could you comment upon the factors
5 that you see, particularly since so much of this is really
6 a function of what Putin is thinking, and that is an odd
7 analysis one must make.

8 Dr. Stent: Thank you, Chairman. That is obviously a
9 key question. I think Putin from the beginning has wanted
10 us to believe that he could escalate. He wants to
11 intimidate not only the Ukrainians, but really the Western
12 coalition, the NATO countries that are supporting Ukraine.

13 And therefore, we have had these hints from him right
14 from the beginning, you know, we are a very strong nuclear
15 power, we can do things that you haven't even dreamed of.
16 And that waxes and wanes.

17 Sometimes it is more forceful. Sometimes he stops
18 saying that. We have had at some point the Chinese even
19 saying that it is -- you know, criticizing the use of this
20 kind of rhetoric, not criticizing him.

21 The Indians, too. So, there has been some pushback
22 there. But he wants us to believe that he could do this.
23 And I think, you know, you cannot rule out, if we are
24 talking about the potential use of a tactical nuclear
25 weapon, right, you cannot rule out that he would never do

1 it because he does have the weapons.

2 But I think we have allowed ourselves sometimes to
3 limit what we are doing for Ukraine because we are too
4 concerned about the potential for, you know, World War III
5 breaking out.

6 Again, I don't want to dismiss it and say it couldn't
7 happen. But I think we have to be very careful in looking
8 at this. There are many unknowns, but not allowing us to
9 limit what we are doing because of this changing rhetoric
10 that we hear from Vladimir Putin.

11 Chairman Reed: Thank you, doctor. Ms. Massicot, the
12 Russians went in with a plan that collapsed. Their forces
13 had multiple difficulties. What do you think they have
14 learned, which they can usefully apply in the next several
15 months?

16 Ms. Massicot: I think they realized within about a
17 month and a half that they had too many objectives for the
18 forces they had left. So, you saw them withdraw from Kyiv.
19 You saw them then withdraw from the Northeastern Ukraine.

20 And really, this has been a process that has been
21 ongoing up until the recent withdrawal from Kherson. And
22 they are capable of adapting their tactics. There is some
23 institutional learning going on in that regard. They are
24 more effective now with their electronic warfare. They are
25 more effective with some of their air defenses. It is

1 hurting Ukraine's ability to fly drones that were very
2 effective in the beginning.

3 In terms of the larger issues that they are facing,
4 they have shown an unwillingness or inability to target or
5 interdict Western support coming into Ukraine. I think
6 that is an escalation choice on their part. They don't
7 want to open that up. They can't overcome that with that
8 mentality, and I don't think they want to at this time.

9 So tactically, yes, they can adapt. There is no
10 secret new Russian army that is going to come from East of
11 the Urals and finish this. They are very damaged at this
12 point.

13 Chairman Reed: Thank you. General Kellogg, one of
14 the strengths I think, of the Ukrainian forces is the
15 training that we began in 2014 under President Obama for
16 their young noncommissioned officers and their younger
17 officers who today, as the clock ticks forward, are now
18 senior NTOs and battalion officers. Is that your
19 impression also?

20 General Kellogg: Yes, Senator, it is. Their quality
21 of leadership is much better than the Russian quality of
22 leadership. The Russians have not learned the Western
23 style leadership. We transferred our expertise with the
24 young noncommissioned officers, which the Russians does not
25 rely on our younger officers and our senior officers as

1 well.

2 And I think the other thing they have done is the fact
3 is the Russians violated every principal war I ever grew up
4 with at the start of this invasion, and Ukrainians were
5 able to capitalize on it. You cannot discount the value of
6 Ukrainian soldiers either. There is one thing that
7 Napoleon once said, the moral of the physical is three as
8 to one, never discount the heart of a fighting army and the
9 training they have received.

10 Chairman Reed: I have witnessed that in my brief stay
11 in Ukraine, where their forces are committed to the fight,
12 unlike I think most of the Russian conscripts who are
13 essentially, as was described, they are trying to avoid
14 what -- the meat grinder or whatever. So, I think that is
15 an advantage.

16 And I think also, too, which is consistent in all your
17 testimony, is the need to explain to the world what is at
18 stake and to continue to provide support for the Ukrainian
19 people. One other aspect of this is the overall effort,
20 and sometimes we merely look at the military aspect, but
21 there is a specific amount of humanitarian assistance and
22 budgetary assistance to the government of Ukraine, and some
23 of our allies are doing much more of that than they are
24 with military assistance, but you need a combination of
25 humanitarian, governmental, and military assistance to

1 carry the day. Senator Wicker, please.

2 Senator Wicker: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank
3 you to our witnesses. General Kellogg, you are
4 dissatisfied with the pace of delivery of weaponry and
5 ammunition. Dr. Stent mentioned in her testimony that we
6 are limiting what we do for various reasons.

7 One of the arguments that is sort of baffling is that
8 we are holding back on some things because we need them to
9 defend our interests in NATO. That is surprising to me
10 since we are in NATO and we have positioned our resources
11 there to defend against Russia.

12 So, does it make sense to hold back our capabilities
13 in other places in Europe rather than deliver them where
14 the fight is right now?

15 General Kellogg: No Senator, it does not. Senator,
16 the Ukrainians are fighting the fight that we thought we
17 were going to fight 20 and 25 years ago, against the very
18 people we thought we were going to fight, with the very
19 equipment that we thought we were going to have to use in
20 Europe.

21 So, give the Ukrainians the equipment they need. An
22 example, Army preposition set number two is sitting in
23 Germany. Multiple combat teams, multiple brigades are
24 sitting right there. Transfer that equipment out. It is
25 there. They can train for it in Grafenwoehr and Hohenfels.

1 Unleash it against the Russians.

2 That is what the equipment is designed to be used for.
3 You might as well use the equipment as it was designed for.
4 And the Russians, once they have an inability to proceed on
5 the battlefield, they have no ability to go towards NATO
6 because they will not have the military capacity, as long
7 as we use the equipment that we should be giving them right
8 now.

9 Senator Wicker: And how soon could that be
10 accomplished?

11 General Kellogg: Sir, it could be rapid. The
12 equipment is stationed right there. You can get the pre-
13 positioned sets moving as quickly as you want to. There
14 will be -- saying, well, it is going to affect our
15 readiness.

16 No, it doesn't, because the readiness which it was
17 designed to be used for was to defeat the Russian army.
18 That is what the Ukrainians are doing right now. Give them
19 the tools they need to win this fight now.

20 Senator Wicker: Well, if you would comment on the
21 practicality of F-16s. Do you buy the Administration's
22 stated reason for the reluctance there of the ATACMS?

23 General Kellogg: My concern on that, Senator, is the
24 fact that if and when they need them, when the term was,
25 they don't need them right now, but when they do need them,

1 it will be late to give it to them.

2 What they really need are the MiG-29s that came out of
3 Poland. Given the equipment they are used to be using on
4 there -- now, it is not as the avionics, clearly, and not
5 as good on U.S. aircraft as we see on like the example on
6 MiG-29, but they can still put equipment on there that can
7 defeat the Russian.

8 You equip their HARM 88 missile on it. You can put a
9 lot of ordinance on that, given the stuff that they are
10 currently used to using in the air.

11 Senator Wicker: Okay. Well, is there any point in
12 our training the Ukraine, beginning to train Ukrainian
13 pilots on F-16s at this point? You recommend that or not?

14 General Kellogg: Senator, I would be training them on
15 everything we have got, because if we had an ability to
16 bring them back, we should have done it months ago. It
17 still takes time to train regardless of which, a tank
18 crewman or a pilot in an aircraft. We probably should be
19 training them, if we had an ability. We thought that we
20 were going to come do it, get ahead of the game instead of
21 behind the game.

22 Senator Wicker: And then there are two schools of
23 thought with regard to the Pacific. One is that this
24 distracts us from our major threat, and that is the
25 Communist Party of China. The other is that China is

1 watching and looking for indications of American resolve.
2 So why should we be -- how should we be viewing this with
3 regard to the pacing threat of China?

4 General Kellogg: Two parts real quickly. The actions
5 we are taking in Ukraine, supporting them, is being watched
6 by China. And if they see us with strength, then they
7 would regard us with caution as well.

8 And I am not sure we are doing that. Sir, and the
9 first question again was on the two fight. Sir, I believe
10 that the fight in the Pacific, if we have to go there, will
11 be primarily an air and naval fight. It won't be a ground
12 fight.

13 We are not going to march to Beijing. So, the systems
14 are different. There is a ground war in Europe. It is an
15 air and sea war, primarily, in the Pacific. Sort of like
16 an apples and oranges.

17 Senator Wicker: And I hear two concerns on --among
18 the talking heads. Now, one is corruption, and our
19 resources are potentially being stolen over there. Am I
20 correct that we are pretty much on top of that? And also,
21 is it fair to count the burden sharing, as Mexico, I
22 believe, indicated, in terms of the humanitarian aid that
23 is being primarily shouldered by European allies.

24 General Kellogg: Well, we are still giving, according
25 to the Kiel Institute, sir, that -- which tracks that still

1 50 percent of the aid out of the countries they track, 41,
2 is still 50 percent American. So, we are giving a lot.
3 They need to step up to the plate and do more to be able to
4 give that aid to them as well. And again, sure, the first
5 question was on the comments, or the first one part of that
6 --

7 Senator Wicker: You know, I shouldn't ask two
8 questions at one time, so thank you very much.

9 Chairman Reed: Thank you, Senator Wicker. Senator
10 Shaheen, please.

11 Senator Shaheen: Thank you. And thank you to each of
12 you for being here this morning. Dr. Stent, you pointed
13 out that Russia is going to step up its information war
14 this year. I think they have been very effective in their
15 information war, actually much more so than we have.

16 And I wonder if you and others on the panel have
17 thoughts about what we should be doing to ramp up our
18 information war to combat what Russia is doing, not just in
19 Europe, but Africa and other places around the world.

20 Dr. Stent: Thank you, Senator. I mean, we definitely
21 should be. And I think we have not done as good a job as
22 we should. We know what the Russians are doing. It is
23 very difficult to counter some of their disinformation, but
24 we have a lot of smart people working on this who should
25 understand how to do it. We have to do this for different

1 audiences.

2 So, I think we have to also, you know, explain to the
3 Europeans, those people who oppose supporting Ukraine, what
4 this is about. We definitely have to do more in the global
5 South, whether that is radio, TV, using other media, really
6 explaining to them what this conflict is about. And as I
7 said, I think we also have to try and penetrate that Iron
8 information curtain in Russia itself.

9 We are not getting through to the Russian people. It
10 is very difficult to. They don't have alternative sources
11 of information. And even when they do, they don't know
12 what to believe. But I just think we should put more
13 resources into that.

14 Senator Shaheen: Thank you. I agree. Before I go
15 on, I want to ask you about Belarus, because Lukashenko
16 last a couple of weeks ago announced that Belarus would not
17 join Putin's war, although it continues to serve as a
18 staging area. So, can you talk about how much you think we
19 can rely on that? Are we going to see Belarus engage
20 further with Putin in this war? And what is the status of
21 the citizens of the country in terms of their concern about
22 the war?

23 Dr. Stent: Sure, that is a very important question.
24 So, Russia has been pressuring Belarus since the beginning
25 to send troops there. But one thing that the dictator

1 Lukashenko understands is that 80 percent of the Belarusian
2 population do not support this war.

3 And if he did try and mobilize and send them there, he
4 would face significant disruptions and protests at home.
5 Yes, it is a very repressive state, but still, people do
6 take to the streets there. So, he does understand that.
7 And that is why he said we will only during the war if
8 Belarus is attacked by Ukraine.

9 Now, of course, you could manufacture something, which
10 they would be capable of doing and say, well, the
11 Ukrainians threatened us. But so far, he has held that
12 line. And in fact, there are Belarusians who are fighting
13 with the Ukrainians in Ukraine. If you look at the recent
14 meeting between President Putin and President Lukashenko
15 and just look at President Putin's body language, these are
16 not two leaders who are too fond of each other.

17 And the Russians have been irritated by Lukashenko for
18 a long time. On the other hand, he is completely dependent
19 on them now to stay in power because of their fraudulent
20 elections. So, I think I would not anticipate that
21 Lukashenko will send troops there, unless something
22 drastically changes and he is told that he has no choice,
23 but he will face real opposition domestically.

24 Senator Shaheen: Thank you. Ms. Massicot, what would
25 be the impact of China providing weapons to Russia?

1 Ms. Massicot: I think Russia has a few immediate
2 needs that China could fill. I am not a China expert and I
3 certainly don't understand whether or not they will do this
4 or not. But Russia has shell hunger.

5 They need artillery rounds now. China could fill that
6 for them temporarily until their defense industrial base
7 clicks into a higher gear, which is in progress now. It
8 may take them multiple months or the end of the year for
9 their own domestic resumption.

10 I think also Chinese ISR would help Russia try to
11 close some of the gap with Ukrainians, although the
12 Ukrainians are outclassing them in this regard, either
13 organically or through the support that we are providing
14 them.

15 Really those two things are immediate. Higher end
16 capabilities -- and this is very speculative. There are
17 multiple shared systems between the two militaries. So, it
18 could be air defense missiles. They run on the shared
19 systems.

20 Russia has been repurposing those for land attack
21 munitions. I think that is probably a very low
22 probability, but I would be looking at artillery. I would
23 be looking at drones.

24 Senator Shaheen: Well, hopefully they will decide
25 that it is not in their interest to do that. Can I ask you

1 about the Wagner group and the dynamic between the Wagner
2 group and the Russian army, and whether there is any reason
3 to think that is going to deteriorate, or have they reached
4 peace and are able to work together?

5 Ms. Massicot: I think it is deteriorating in real
6 time this week. Those two groups have had tensions that
7 date back to Syria, and it bubbles up and then it is
8 resolved. The thing about President Putin is he doesn't
9 like mess.

10 And right now, this is very messy and uncontrolled.
11 So, I think inevitably he will probably step in and resolve
12 this. Wagner, over time, is becoming less important to the
13 overall war effort. As Russia mobilizes, it has more men.
14 That critical role that they played last summer will
15 decline over time.

16 Prigozhin is misreading a lot of really important cues
17 right now. He is being told by important and dangerous
18 people to stop with the public criticism and he persists.
19 I think also they are taking a long-term approach to
20 undercut him.

21 He is not allowed to recruit from the prisons anymore
22 and they are choking back some of his artillery supplies
23 this week near Bakhmut. So, I think that this is
24 deteriorating in real time. I don't think his future is a
25 bright one.

1 Senator Shaheen: Thank you.

2 Chairman Reed: Thank you, Senator Shaheen. Senator
3 Ernst, please.

4 Senator Ernst: Thank you very much for being here,
5 for our panelists this morning. I had the great
6 opportunity this past weekend to spend time in Poland
7 Saturday and Sunday with our Iowa Army National Guard
8 troops.

9 So, we do have a couple of units that were mobilized
10 for regularly scheduled deployments. We have the 209th
11 Medical Company, as well as the 1133rd Transportation
12 Company. And I just want to say to all of our folks back
13 home, their families and loved ones, that I am so very
14 proud of, these hard charging young men and women from
15 Iowa. They are doing an incredible job supporting in
16 Poland. God bless them all.

17 So, Dr. Stent, I know you had a very powerful message
18 for all of us talking about the message we need to send not
19 only to the world, but to Americans as well, and how we
20 should be speaking to that. Can you just double down on
21 that for me, please, and how we should be talking to the
22 American people about this.

23 Because as General Kellogg pointed out, it is
24 important that Americans understand, because they do have
25 valid concerns, but they need to understand the gravity of

1 the war in Ukraine. So, what again, is that message and
2 how do we communicate that?

3 Dr. Stent: Thank you, Senator. You know, we have to
4 explain to the American people, first of all, that in the
5 last century, twice the U.S. had to intervene in a war in
6 Europe to essentially save Europe and save the world from
7 tyranny and from conquest. And so, what is happening
8 between Russia and Ukraine?

9 Russia, you know, after 77 years after the end of
10 World War II, just broke the system that we had. It
11 violated all of the sort of rules that govern the world
12 after the end of World War II. And by just invading a
13 neighbor, really on a whim, with no provocation, it was
14 saying that, you know, it could arbitrarily take over
15 another country. It didn't respect its territorial
16 integrity, its sovereignty.

17 And so, if Russia is allowed to continue, if Russia
18 were to prevail in this war, this wouldn't be the end of
19 it. It would want to take the whole of Ukraine. It set
20 its sights on other countries. It is already undermining
21 Moldova, for instance.

22 And really, it has also explicitly said that it
23 believes that Poland is still in its sphere of influence,
24 if you look at the two so-called treaties that were
25 presented to the United States and NATO in December of

1 2021. So, it is a question of -- world order, that sounds
2 very abstract, but it is a world in which Russia would like
3 a world where there are no rules. It is a disruptive
4 power.

5 It could cause instability, you know, on the European
6 continent, certainly for a long time. That has huge
7 economic impacts, and as we have seen, even global impacts
8 in the way that it's prevented the Ukrainians from
9 exporting much of their grain and fertilizers. So, I think
10 the American people have to understand it does affect them.

11 And that if Russia isn't stopped, we can't sort of
12 wall ourselves off from this conflict. And we need to, you
13 know, reestablish rules that people will abide by and
14 respect international law. So, I think that is probably
15 the best way of explaining it.

16 Senator Ernst: No, I really appreciate it. And I
17 don't think Americans want to live in a world that is
18 dominated by Russia and by China. I think it is very
19 important that Ukrainians win this war.

20 Ms. Massicot, when we talk about equipment and the
21 degradation of Russian capabilities, Ukrainian
22 capabilities, is Ukraine sufficiently equipped to suppress
23 and defeat Russia's air defenses? And what are those
24 weapons systems that the U.S. could maybe provide to
25 effectively counter the Russian air defenses?

1 Ms. Massicot: That is one of the most complicated
2 missions to do. I don't think the Ukrainians would be able
3 to do it comprehensively from the air. Russia's SIM system
4 is really quite multilayered at this point in Ukraine. And
5 Russia and Ukraine are both denying each other the use of
6 air space right now.

7 On the ground capabilities that could potentially
8 disable some of these systems, the Ukrainians have been
9 able to target them with precision munitions. So that is a
10 -- if they are provided the right type of information, they
11 act on it pretty quickly.

12 So that is really helping that degradation over time.
13 From an air to ground perspective, I think that would be
14 pretty difficult.

15 Senator Ernst: So and just in closing, because my
16 time is running out, I do believe in supporting Ukraine. I
17 think it is important that we continue to do this and do it
18 full on. Not the drip, drip, drip we have seen from the
19 Administration.

20 And really appreciate all of you being here today and
21 sharing your message with all of our folks back home as
22 well. But again, to the folks that love and support the
23 209th and the 1133rd, God bless them. They are doing well.
24 You should be proud of them. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

25 Chairman Reed: Thank you, Senator Ernst. Senator

1 Gillibrand, please.

2 Senator Gillibrand: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Dr.
3 Stent and Ms. Massicot, public reporting shows that the
4 Chinese government is considering providing lethal support
5 for Russia's invasion of Ukraine. How does a hollowed out
6 Russian army affect China's security posture, and what
7 opportunities does the PRC government see in providing
8 lethal support to Russia?

9 Dr. Stent: I will start with -- thank you, Senator.
10 I think we have to understand that the Chinese do not want
11 Russia to lose this war. You know, Xi Jinping and Putin
12 say extravagant things about each other.

13 They are each other's best friends. But when it comes
14 down to the bottom line, from the Chinese point of view,
15 Russia is the other major authoritarian country in the
16 world that shares their grievances against the West, where
17 they -- both of them talk about a post-West order. In
18 other words, they need Russia as a partner in trying to
19 change the way that the world works and make it more safe,
20 really, for autocracy.

21 And they may be very surprised and maybe even appalled
22 by the performance of the Russian military, but now that it
23 looks that, you know, Russia is really quite bogged down,
24 they do not want Russia to lose this war.

25 Because their concern is, and it is very hard for us

1 to imagine that, but if somebody were to come after
2 Vladimir Putin, who would rethink what Russia is doing,
3 rethink its ties, its antagonistic ties to the West,
4 rethink its aggressive policies, and rethink its dependance
5 on China, then from the Chinese point of view, that would
6 leave them alone.

7 Again, hard for us to understand. So, I think that
8 even though until now the Chinese have been fairly
9 restrained in what they have done materially for Russia,
10 even though they support rhetorically everything that is --
11 the Russian narrative, they certainly would not want to see
12 Russia lose.

13 And, you know, it remains to be seen whether they are
14 willing to take the risk of supplying, as we hear, possibly
15 artillery and drones.

16 Ms. Massicot: I don't have much to add to that other
17 than, again, from the they may be able to provide a short-
18 term stopgap for the Russians and provide some type of, you
19 know, artillery rounds or drones. But I agree with Dr.
20 Stent.

21 Senator Gillibrand: Dr. Stent, have the events in the
22 past year led you to revise any conclusions you made in
23 your 1990 book, 1919 book -- sorry, 2019 book, Putin's
24 World. What are the biggest changes?

25 Dr. Stent: So last week, an updated version of the

1 book came out with a chapter on the Russia, Ukraine war.
2 So obviously in that book, I certainly understood the
3 tensions between Russia and Ukraine, but I think I, like
4 many people, didn't believe that Putin would undertake a
5 full-scale invasion of Ukraine the way he did.

6 So, I think what it has led me to rethink is I had
7 always viewed Putin as someone who was a pretty smart
8 tactician and not a huge risk taker. So, in 2008, when
9 Russia invaded Georgia, it didn't go to the capital,
10 Tbilisi, and take out President Saakashvili, who of course,
11 President Putin hated. It stopped and just recognized
12 these two areas of Georgia as being independent.

13 And even in 2014, it took over Crimea fairly bloodless
14 and it didn't prosecute, continue prosecuting the war in
15 the Donbass that started the war. And so, I think what has
16 changed is the amount of risk that Putin is willing to
17 take. He was obviously woefully misinformed about the
18 performance of his own military and about the performance
19 of the Ukrainian military.

20 And so, I think we see someone who is so hell bent on
21 reestablishing what he thinks is Russia's rightful empire
22 that he is not listening to, I think, the counsel of anyone
23 else. So, I think it is the willingness to take risks and
24 to just dig himself in, and which I think has made me
25 somewhat change my evaluation of him.

1 Senator Gillibrand: With regard to the General
2 Assembly, they voted overwhelmingly last week to condemn
3 Russia's invasion, but there were 32 abstentions. Russia
4 has been aggressively spreading misinformation, not just in
5 Russia and the homeland, but also in Africa and Latin
6 America regarding the causes of the war.

7 Who is at fault for grain and fertilizer shortages and
8 similar topics? How can the United States and their allies
9 counter these Russian diplomatic efforts? Both for Dr.
10 Stent and --

11 Dr. Stent: So, I think we do have to be more active
12 diplomatically. I mean, we already discussed sort of
13 information war, but we do have to be more active.

14 I mean, Russia, even during this first year of the
15 war, has increased its influence in Africa, partly through
16 the Wagner group, but also partly through diplomacy. We
17 just had Sergei Lavrov in South Africa recently, and you
18 have just had this past week a joint naval exercise between
19 Russia, China, and South Africa.

20 So, I think we do have to step up our diplomatic
21 efforts really in Latin America, in Africa, and in the
22 Middle East to try and counter some of what Russia is
23 doing.

24 Chairman Reed: Thank you, Senator Gillibrand.
25 Senator Tuberville, please.

1 Senator Tuberville: Thank you. Thank very much.
2 Thank you all for being here today. General, thank you for
3 your service. I would like to say that first, I was in
4 Ukraine six months before this war started and talked to
5 President Zelenskyy. They knew this was coming. They were
6 putting people on -- they were putting troops on the border
7 through Belarus, all through the Don -- all over the place,
8 building up.

9 We didn't do one thing. We said it was going to be a
10 small incursion. That is what President Biden said. We
11 are coming off Afghanistan. We looked -- didn't look very
12 smart. What would we do different, General, now, in your
13 eyes?

14 Now we are doing it, we are waiting. We seemed like
15 we are one step behind in everything we are doing. What
16 should we have done different at the beginning? Because it
17 looks like we are going to be the defender of the free
18 world, we need to learn from our mistakes and we made huge
19 mistakes at the beginning of this.

20 General Kellogg: Yes, Senator. And thanks for your
21 question. As a former and retired military officer, I am a
22 little bit disappointed in the military and intelligence
23 community that either didn't relay this or didn't believe
24 it as well. You know, recall, we had very senior officers
25 say, one, that Ukraine would fall within three days of the

1 invasion and try to get President Zelenskyy right out of
2 town.

3 And that is when he made the comment, I don't need a
4 ride, I need ammunition. You know, you can have a beer
5 with that kind of guy. You know, the fact is we just
6 didn't really believe it and we didn't look at it hard. I
7 would really question our intelligence communities, all of
8 them, and also the military why their decision making was
9 so poor in foreseeing this. Most of us saw it. We saw the
10 indicators.

11 I am a big believer in indicators and patterns, and
12 the patterns and indicators were there. So, I think it was
13 a fault somewhere in our systems that we didn't convince
14 ourselves that it was really going to happen.

15 Part of it may have been a misunderstanding of
16 President Putin himself, and they just didn't believe he
17 would do it. I have actually heard commentators say, up
18 until the day before the invasion, he wouldn't -- he was
19 going to do it. Yes, he was. And if you read Putin, and I
20 had a fortune when I was in the National Security Council,
21 I brought Dr. Fiona Hill in on the NSC team. She came out
22 of Brookings, and she is a very well-read person on Putin.

23 And she says when he says something, believe it, he is
24 going to do it. We didn't believe.

25 Senator Tuberville: Yes. Thank you. And now we are

1 up to our ears in alligators. Looks like China is getting
2 ready -- and just a couple yes, no questions for Dr. Stent
3 and General Kellogg. You know, let's talk about China's
4 motivation. Do you think that the Chinese weapons are
5 going to further drag out this conflict? Dr. Stent, yes or
6 no.

7 Dr. Stent: Yes.

8 Senator Tuberville: General?

9 General Kellogg: No.

10 Senator Tuberville: Do you think we need to increase
11 weapons supplies to Ukraine to counter Chinese munitions?
12 Dr. Stent, since you said yes.

13 Dr. Stent: Yes.

14 Senator Tuberville: Okay. If we are increasing our
15 support in Ukraine, do you believe that that will slow down
16 shipments to Taiwan in the future, if we continue to send
17 munitions to Ukraine? You don't think it will?

18 Dr. Stent: No.

19 Senator Tuberville: All right. Ms. Massicot, at a
20 hearing on February 15th, this committee heard expert
21 testimony that if the United States were to enter a war
22 with China today, we would have just two weeks' worth of
23 munitions, our stockpiles would be out. Do you agree with
24 this assessment?

25 Ms. Massicot: I don't have enough information to make

1 an assessment. I am sorry, sir.

2 Senator Tuberville: Take a shot at it, General.

3 General Kellogg: I do not agree with that assessment
4 at all.

5 Senator Tuberville: Okay, thank you. General
6 Kellogg, do you have a clear sense of the overall U.S.
7 strategy in Ukraine, and what does victory look like for
8 Ukraine?

9 General Kellogg: I do not have an overall view of
10 what the current strategy in Ukraine is. I believe we
11 should have one. And I think you have to put, in state,
12 you have to put Russia's army at risk in Ukraine. Putin
13 has to understand he has got two options, lose his army or
14 leave. If his army loses and is defeated, he falls.

15 Senator Tuberville: Can Ukrainians win it on their
16 own?

17 General Kellogg: No. I don't -- they can win it on
18 their own, if we give them the equipment to do it.

19 Senator Tuberville: Yes. Okay. What is the most
20 dangerous course of action for the United States when it
21 comes to this conflict? What puts us in harm's way?

22 General Kellogg: By doing what we are doing right
23 now, because it is not disciplined. It is also not
24 emphatic.

25 Senator Tuberville: Okay. There was a poll out, you

1 know, the Russian people believe from a poll in Russia,
2 that they are at war right now with the United States. The
3 Russian people believe this. You think the American people
4 think we are at war with the Russia, General?

5 General Kellogg: No, I do not. And that is because
6 of the messaging.

7 Senator Tuberville: Yes. Dr. Stent?

8 Dr. Stent: No, I don't think so.

9 Senator Tuberville: How concerned -- General, are you
10 concerned about nuclear conflict -- how concerned?

11 General Kellogg: I think it has to be a consideration
12 simply because it is in the Russian philosophy to use.
13 They have got a large amount of what we -- and I hate to
14 use the term tactical nuclear weapons, and they believe in
15 using it.

16 And it is something we really don't have. In their
17 philosophy, to use it if it gets pushed, he may use it. I
18 am hoping that there will be smarter people would -- he
19 would not use it, but you always have to understand the
20 probability and possibility of it happening.

21 Senator Tuberville: Thank you. Thank you, Mr.
22 Chairman.

23 Chairman Reed: Thank you, Senator Tuberville.
24 Senator Manchin, please.

25 Senator Manchin: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again,

1 thank you all for your service, all of you. I appreciate
2 it very much. First of all, I want to say that I am old
3 enough to remember vividly the Vietnam War and all the
4 conflicts we have had since then.

5 And I believe this is the most just position the
6 United States has ever taken for the right cause, to be
7 involved for the sake of freedom and democracy and what I
8 think we all should be doing.

9 So, I am very supportive and very appreciative of our
10 efforts and all of them, but also we can do much better. I
11 always think that too. I would ask the question to -- any
12 of you all can answer on these.

13 Do you think -- do the Ukrainians have the ability to
14 produce weapons themselves? Are they manufacturing? Do
15 you all know if there is any manufacturing in Ukraine right
16 now? Mr. Massicot.

17 Ms. Massicot: Thank you, Senator. The Russians from
18 the beginning of the war systematically attacked Ukraine's
19 defense industrial base. So, a lot of those factories are
20 --

21 Senator Manchin: Since 2014?

22 Ms. Massicot: What they could range back then, but
23 especially since '22. I mean, that is part of their
24 strategy that they actually did implement. They went after
25 those factories. So, either the workers are immobilized or

1 they are fighting, or the facilities are damaged. So, no,
2 at this point --

3 Senator Manchin: They are not producing anything.
4 They are depending totally, and there is a reason for that
5 is what you are saying.

6 Ms. Massicot: It is. There is a structural reason
7 for that, yes.

8 Senator Manchin: And in Crimea right now, you know, I
9 saw this morning there was a report in television that
10 showing that most Crimeans are Russian, believe that they
11 are part of Russia, and want to remain part of Russia. But
12 I understand that Zelenskyy and Ukrainians want that to be
13 part of their country because it is.

14 So where do we go with that? How do you -- and Miss,
15 Dr. Stent, maybe you can talk to this or any of you all can
16 answer it? Is it possible that Crimea would come back and
17 be part of Ukraine, or would it remain separate?

18 Dr. Stent: President Zelenskyy has said that it is.
19 One, we do know what Ukraine's at least official war aims
20 are, and it is their aim to take back Crimea, which of
21 course, the Russians illegally annexed in 2014.

22 There are some people who believe that if the
23 Ukrainians tried to take back Crimea, if we come back to
24 the question of escalation now, that that would be a "red
25 line" for Putin and that might lead to a real military

1 escalation.

2 I think it is unlikely in this present phase of the
3 war that the Ukrainians would be able to take back Crimea.
4 Maybe they will in the longer term, depending on what
5 happens in Russia, what happens, how --

6 Senator Manchin: I know the bridge has been repaired.
7 I saw the bridge is back in operation.

8 Dr. Stent: Yes, the bridge is back in operation. I
9 don't know what you think there are but --

10 Senator Manchin: Anybody else on that?

11 General Kellogg: Senator, you know, Zelenskyy made
12 the comment the war began in Crimea in 2014 and it will end
13 in Crimea. And I think he has to take that into
14 consideration. I do think the Ukrainians with support can,
15 in fact, penetrate towards Kherson, towards Crimea, and put
16 it -- but that would be something for negotiations
17 somewhere along the line. Wars end by negotiations and
18 that would just part of it.

19 Senator Manchin: My only concern is basically it
20 seemed like the Crimean people there are sympathetic and
21 feel more connected to Russia than they do Crimea, from
22 what we are hearing in type of reports.

23 And without the citizen support, like they have the
24 rest of Ukraine, it would be quite difficult, I would
25 think. And the biggest thing I am concerned about is

1 accountability. I think our support is unwavering. It is
2 bipartisan, Democrat, Republican, overwhelmingly supporting
3 the United States effort and supporting Ukraine.

4 I am concerned about accountability. Are we basically
5 good, from Inspector General, good counting on the
6 equipment we are sending, the money that we are sending,
7 vice versa. Because if you look at what happened in
8 Afghanistan, that whole country, I mean, just was rigged
9 with corruption.

10 And I think it shows how quickly it fell as soon as we
11 left. And I also believe that we left the wrong way, and I
12 think that gave Putin much more stimulus to do what he has
13 done. Do you have any comments on that, General?

14 General Kellogg: I think we are getting better,
15 Senator, on accountability. We are not there yet. When we
16 were in Ukraine recently, they are not -- they do not
17 object to accountability.

18 I would provide a special inspector general or
19 something like that to provide on the team to ensure
20 accountability to the American people and make sure that
21 their money is being well spent out there. But are there
22 problems? Of course, there are. But they are getting
23 better at it and they are trying to fix it.

24 Senator Manchin: And General, the last move, and I
25 think has Zelenskyy has just removed one of his top

1 officers, a top military person, and replaced him. What do
2 you -- what do you read into that, any of you?

3 General Kellogg: He has not only replaced with
4 military officers, he has also replaced several other
5 person people in his office because of corruption concerns
6 out there. On the other side, remember, the Russians are
7 on their fifth general and that is running this --

8 Senator Manchin: I know that, but I am saying, do you
9 think it is a smart move? Dr. Stent, do you have any
10 comments on that?

11 Dr. Stent: I think President Zelenskyy understands
12 that if the European Union is really ever to accept
13 Ukraine, it has to do a much better job of dealing with
14 corruption. So, I think some of the sackings that we have
15 seen in the past few weeks, both of military personnel, but
16 then other personnel, it is all connected to that. And
17 hopefully, you know, he will make progress with it.

18 Senator Manchin: Okay. Thank you all.

19 Chairman Reed: Thank you, Senator Manchin. Senator
20 Mullin, please.

21 Senator Mullin: Thank you. Thank you, Chairman.
22 Thank you, panel, for being here. I have got a couple
23 comments and some questions, too. Last week, I was on a
24 trip to the Middle East, meeting with the leaders over
25 there.

1 And, General, you are absolutely right, Afghanistan
2 is, the withdrawal was a very strong, negative black eye to
3 the United States. It has made us extremely weak. And in
4 our allies, those that believed that we would be there are
5 questioning if we would actually be there, if we were
6 willing to walk away from something we had so much
7 investment in and literally turn the country over to
8 terrorists.

9 The irony of that, though, is President Trump,
10 obviously, when he was in office, he put in the Abraham
11 Accord, and Abraham Accord was designed to help strengthen
12 the economy in that region, but it has actually
13 strengthened the allies in that region, too, by doing
14 business together with Israel.

15 The views that some of these world leaders have had
16 with Israel has been broken and they have realized that
17 they have a common foe, and it has strengthened themselves.
18 And so, what has started out as an opportunity for
19 businesses, has actually helped fill the void that the
20 United States have left behind. With that being said, it
21 has definitely led to Putin's aggression because of our
22 view.

23 And at the same time, the American people are
24 questioning why we are even in Ukraine and what we are
25 doing there. I feel very strongly that we need to be

1 there, but I don't feel as though we should be taking the
2 lead. I feel like it is what our NATO allies are for.
3 That is what we have alliances for.

4 And I feel like that we need to be working with them,
5 not necessarily leading. But it is obvious, too, with
6 Germany, for instance, wavering back and forth on should
7 they send weapons or shouldn't they send weapons, when the
8 United States decided that we were going to send Abrams
9 tanks.

10 No telling when that is actually going to happen,
11 though. You had Germany that finally agreed to start
12 sending in weapons. General, is -- what is your view of
13 our leadership and the lack of leadership? How is this
14 affecting what is happening in the neighbors of Ukraine and
15 their activity going on in assisting Ukraine?

16 General Kellogg: Thank you, Senator. Senator, I am
17 concerned about the decisiveness of support for Ukraine. I
18 mean, this is a fight, it is an existential fight for
19 Ukraine, and we need to support it.

20 If we don't support this fight, we are going to be --
21 and the third time, we are going to be fighting in Europe.
22 And we are not sending U.S. troops right now, and I don't
23 think we should. And no Ukrainians thought we should
24 either. Every Ukrainian commander and every civilian and
25 military leader, they do not want American troops on the

1 ground. They want the equipment.

2 They are able to fight it. But if this thing goes
3 badly for the Ukrainians and it starts to fade towards
4 NATO, then we may get involved in a fight that I would
5 prefer we not do because we have done this twice before to
6 save Europe.

7 Senator Mullin: Should NATO shut down the airspace?

8 General Kellogg: The airspace in --

9 Senator Mullin: Over Ukraine.

10 General Kellogg: Sir, the Russians have a lot of air
11 dominance over Ukraine right now. The fact is, Ukrainians
12 are still fighting with their fighters. They do not --
13 they have not established air dominance at all. What you
14 are seeing is the missiles coming in, but they are not able
15 to fly the aircraft over Ukraine.

16 Senator Mullin: Would it help if we were able to shut
17 down, if NATO were to just simply shut down the airspace
18 over Ukraine?

19 General Kellogg: You know, Senator, I think it is --
20 I don't think the airspace would concern me very much right
21 now because it is really contested and the Ukrainians are
22 doing a fine job. I think there is other things we should
23 do.

24 And the other thing that we should do is we should
25 give them the ability to actually penetrate Russian space

1 themselves and attack targets into Russia, because that is
2 where the supply lines are located.

3 The Russians are using their borders as a sanctuary.
4 So, it is not so much airspace. I go back to ground space.
5 It may be able to put the Russians at risk. We haven't put
6 - we, meaning the Ukrainians, have not been able to put the
7 Russians at risk, as they should be able to do.

8 Senator Mullin: Does Putin have the ability himself
9 to launch nuclear weapons or does it go through a process?
10 I know it used to go through a process. Is that -- is that
11 faded now? Is the lines blurred?

12 General Kellogg: Sir, they do have a process. And I
13 don't want to get into there because then I will fall back
14 on what I did at the National Security Council. But they
15 have a process. I am just hoping that if we ever get to a
16 position like that, wiser heads would prevail.

17 Senator Mullin: Well, I am familiar with the process.
18 Before I was in the Senate, I was on the House Intel, and
19 we were very aware of it, but I was concerned that it may
20 be blurred now. One last comment I will make and I will
21 make it brief.

22 The IC community, at least the ones in the field, and
23 I am not trying to defend the IC community here in
24 Washington, D.C. I think they are riddled with problems.
25 But they did call it right. And they were advising us that

1 this was eminent, that they were going, and they were very
2 precise on even the timeframe of when it was going to
3 happen.

4 Unfortunately, when we were meeting with the decision
5 makers, they weren't very positive on Ukraine's resolve and
6 that is where we misled it or misread it. We should
7 understand that Ukraine was going to fight.

8 And I will admit I even got that wrong. Now that they
9 are fighting, we should do everything we can to support
10 them and with our allies. So, thank you guys, everybody,
11 for your comments, and thanks for talking honestly and in
12 agreeance with one voice. It is refreshing. I appreciate
13 that. Thank you.

14 Chairman Reed: Thank you, Senator Mullin. Senator
15 Kaine, please.

16 Senator Kaine: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And I will pick
17 up where Senator Mullin left off. I think while you come
18 at this from different perspectives and have some
19 differences in your testimonies, I am picking up a common
20 punchline, which is we are doing a lot, but we need to do
21 more and we need to do it quicker.

22 We have to calculate and calibrate, but we should do
23 more and do it quicker. Our allies, they are doing a lot,
24 but they should do a lot more and invest a lot more because
25 they have more at stake here. General Kellogg, you talked

1 about this war in their backyard, and I think that that is
2 true.

3 So I think that that is coming through loud and clear.
4 I do want to just comment on one thing. General Kellogg,
5 in your testimony, you said this, simply saying that one
6 will support Ukraine for as long as it takes is a bumper
7 sticker, not a strategy. No number of supplemental aid
8 packages, no rounds of sanctions, and not even a
9 Presidential visit to Kyiv are substitutes for American
10 leadership.

11 Let me just offer my thoughts on that. The sanctions
12 packages that the United States have engineered, they ain't
13 a bumper sticker -- they ain't a bumper sticker. They are
14 an example of great American diplomacy.

15 The billions of dollars of aid that this Congress has
16 appropriated for military purposes in Ukraine with the
17 President's request, that ain't a bumper sticker. That is
18 American leadership. One Estonia that did it. One
19 Liechtenstein that did it. The billions and billions of
20 aid for humanitarian purposes that we have allocated. Not
21 a bumper sticker. That is American leadership.

22 100,000 Ukrainian refugees in the United States in the
23 five months after the invasion. Don't look at the Armed
24 Services committee and tell me that that is a bumper
25 sticker. That is American leadership. Engineering a state

1 of affairs where Finland and Sweden, whose popular approval
2 for accession to NATO would have been about 25 percent a
3 couple of years ago, are now on the verge of joining NATO
4 and dramatically increasing both the NATO and Western
5 defense capacity.

6 Don't tell me that is a bumper sticker. That is
7 American leadership. Engineering overwhelming votes in the
8 General Assembly and the National Security Council to call
9 out Putin's illegal war effort.

10 Admittedly, they are nations that abstain, there are
11 nations that stand with Russians that are acknowledging the
12 facts. That ain't a bumper sticker, that is American
13 leadership. I don't see any reason why anybody should be
14 Debbie Downer about American leadership that has assembled
15 a global coalition to stand for Ukraine.

16 We are not trashing Zelenskyy any more, we are
17 standing up with him. We are not undermining Ukraine
18 anymore, we are standing up for Ukraine. And if you wonder
19 about American leadership, talk to President Zelenskyy,
20 because we all do. We talk to him in person. I have
21 colleagues who visit him in Ukraine. He came and addressed
22 us right before Christmas. I had no reason to believe he
23 was lying to us when he thanked us for American leadership.

24 The global effort to stand for Ukraine against an
25 illegal invasion by a dictator, that is not only necessary

1 in all of our view to stand up against Putin but also to
2 send a message to dictators around the globe, would not
3 have happened without American leadership, by this
4 committee, by the Appropriations committee, by the Intel
5 committee, by the Foreign Relations committee, by the
6 Administration.

7 Could we do more, could we do it quicker, could we
8 look in the rearview mirror and say things might have been
9 done --? Of course. Should we exercise oversight on the
10 investments that we make in Congress? Should we be able to
11 answer questions the American public asked us about the
12 stakes or about the dollars we are investing?

13 Of course we should. Those are all really important
14 questions and they are very fair. But to suggest that the
15 coordinated effort of the Article 1 and 2 branches in
16 outreach around the world to assemble a global coalition to
17 support Ukraine is a bumper sticker rather than American
18 leadership, I don't get it. I yield back, Mr. Chair.

19 Chairman Reed: Thank you, Senator Kaine. Senator
20 Fischer, please.

21 Senator Fischer: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you
22 to our panelists that are here today. I would like to
23 begin by asking you to share your assessments on the
24 current status of war in Ukraine.

25 So, and hopefully I am going to be like Senator

1 Tuberville and we will do yes or no unless you feel a
2 driving desire that you have to explain further. We will
3 start with you, doctor. How would you assess the current
4 state of the Russian military in Ukraine?

5 Dr. Stent: Well, they are struggling to perform
6 better. On the other hand, they do have, you know, a few
7 hundred thousand more people that they can throw into this
8 war. And they have learned a little bit from their
9 mistakes, but still they are struggling.

10 Senator Fischer: Thank you. Ms. Massicot.

11 Ms. Massicot: I don't think they have culminated in
12 the Clausewitzian sense, but their combat effectiveness is
13 definitely degraded. They are trying to find a solution.
14 And I think that they are trying to use brute force tactics
15 to close on the Ukrainians as quickly as possible at a very
16 high cost.

17 I don't think they are capable of large incursions
18 anymore, not for several years until they can properly
19 regenerate armored force and rebuild their missile stocks.
20 And that being said, I do anticipate incremental gains in
21 Donetsk and Luhansk.

22 Potentially a little bit more in Zaporizhzhia. I
23 don't have a timeline on that, but probably towards the
24 summer. That is what their intentions are.

25 Senator Fischer: When you talk about the Russians

1 using brute force, brutal tactics, will the Ukrainians
2 suffer through that and remain strong?

3 Ms. Massicot: Their will to fight is very strong, but
4 this is taking a toll on them. That is not only a high
5 casualty situation for them as well, there is also a lot of
6 psychological distress because, again, we are talking about
7 mowing down human waves every day.

8 Also, they have specific needs that are emerging from
9 this type of fighting. And we are talking about
10 ammunition, small arms, 50 caliber mortars, artillery
11 shells to counter this. So, you know, I know we talk a lot
12 about ATACMS and F-16s, but I would just like to point out
13 that they have immediate small arms needs, to include
14 morphine.

15 Senator Fischer: Thank you. And General?

16 General Kellogg: Senator, thank you. And I think you
17 are heading to our war of attrition like we are seeing
18 around Bakhmut right now. The longer this war goes, it
19 accrues to Russia's favor. That is why it must be
20 terminated as quickly as it can while Ukraine still has the
21 advantage. Russia will have the advantage.

22 Russia is learning right now, as we are seeing around
23 Bakhmut, where they are changing how they fight, the
24 tactics they are using by sheer mass and heavy use of
25 artillery. They are going back to the way the Russians

1 used to fight before.

2 Senator Fischer: General, how important is it that
3 the United States and our allies continue to be supportive
4 to Ukraine for their psychological reasons and to show the
5 Russians that we will be supportive to the Ukrainians? How
6 does that play into your previous analysis that you just
7 stated?

8 General Kellogg: Well, I think the Ukrainians can do
9 more. If you look what the Kiel Institute just said, and
10 that is out of Kiel, Germany, the European Union only
11 committed 6 percent of their total stores of military
12 stock, where the British have committed 25 percent of their
13 total stock, and we are committing a lot of our stock as
14 well.

15 So, I think when it comes down, and referring back to
16 what Senator Kaine said a minute ago, is there isn't a
17 question about Presidential leadership, not with what this
18 Congress has done, which has been enormous.

19 But where you lead is from the top and where those
20 decisions are made are from the top. The issue is getting
21 the other allies to contribute more. They are not
22 contributing what they can contribute to this fight.

23 Senator Fischer: Mr. Massicot, how would you analyze
24 that? What -- how important is it for Congress, for our
25 Administration, to be vocal about our support and our

1 continued support, and also for our allies for NATO to step
2 up? How does that play not just on the Ukrainians, but on
3 the Russians as well?

4 Ms. Massicot: So, I was in the Pentagon in 2014, the
5 first time Russia invaded, and I could say that the
6 response from this government is fundamentally very
7 different. Our intel collection prior to the war was very
8 different.

9 Our response is very different. I do think the
10 Russians are deterred from the upper end of their
11 escalation. I think they remain absolutely terrified of
12 our air power. They don't engage us in cyber-attacks.

13 Senator Fischer: Are we too slow in getting to
14 Ukraine what they need?

15 Ms. Massicot: I don't have all the information, but
16 it is my assumption that the logistics to get these weapons
17 dug out of every corner from different parts of the globe
18 is complicated logistically.

19 I don't -- from what I understand from the outside, I
20 don't think it is a deliberate metering of things not to
21 give it to them. I think there is a lot that is
22 complicated in getting it to them. I don't know how to
23 improve the logistics.

24 Senator Fischer: But to show our resolve and getting
25 it there is important?

1 Ms. Massicot: I do.

2 Senator Fischer: Thank you. Thank you. Dr. Stent,
3 how would you respond?

4 Dr. Stent: I would -- you know, it seems to me that
5 we have been doing this incrementally, and we, first of all
6 say, we are not going to send this --

7 Senator Fischer: And then we do.

8 Dr. Stent: -- and then we do send it. And so, in the
9 end, we do the right thing. But probably some of these
10 things could have been sent more quickly. And I think
11 obviously, what we are all awaiting now is what the outcome
12 of this question about whether we are going to supply them
13 with fighter jets, the F-16s will be.

14 Senator Fischer: Air power earlier would have
15 prevented some of the devastation we see on their
16 infrastructure within their own country, and made them more
17 reliant on the United States and our allies, wouldn't you
18 say?

19 Dr. Stent: Yes, I think so.

20 Senator Fischer: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

21 Chairman Reed: Thank you, Senator Fischer. Senator
22 King, please. Excuse me, Senator Kelly. I am sorry.

23 Senator Kelly: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank
24 you, Senator King. General Kellogg, and for everybody here
25 today, thank you for testifying. I want to follow up a

1 little bit on Senator Fischer's questions about the aid we
2 have given to Ukraine.

3 As you know, the United States in this close
4 partnership with Ukraine, we have provided, I think the
5 number to date is \$29.8 billion in security assistance
6 since this brutal attack occurred around a year ago.

7 Equipment from the United States has included
8 everything from ammunition, grenades, bombs, MVDs, HIMARS,
9 155-millimeter artillery pieces, counter fire, fire radars,
10 much of what is in our inventory. Not everything but much.
11 And I also want to commend our allies for their support.

12 Nearly 50 countries providing \$13 billion in security
13 assistance, most recently agreeing to provide tanks. And
14 this is going to be critical for Ukraine with the approach
15 that they are going to need to take this spring. So,
16 General Kellogg, can you provide your assessment on the
17 effectiveness of both U.S. and partner military equipment.

18 If you see any gaps, if there is something you think
19 is not working well and something that we should address, a
20 gap in capability, I would like to hear that. And then
21 from a combat assessment, what has provided the greatest
22 return on investment for the Ukrainians?

23 And what do you think the most important thing for us
24 to continue to supply, if you have a sense for -- you know,
25 what I heard when I was in Munich a couple of weeks ago was

1 that they need 155-millimeter artillery shells, that that
2 supply is going down.

3 They also made some other requests, some of which we
4 are going to deal with here in the United States Senate.
5 But if you could share your assessment, I would appreciate
6 that.

7 General Kellogg: Thank you, Senator. Senator, what
8 you really need is all the equipment you just mentioned,
9 but more. We developed a package during the Cold War
10 called a salt breaker.

11 The salt breaker where the Abrams tanks, the Bradley
12 fighting vehicle, a pallet 155 self-propelled Howitzer, the
13 Apache fighting system, all of those systems together
14 allowed us to fight in the combined arms fashion. The
15 combined arms fashion assault will break the Russians'
16 back.

17 The Russians are not capable of handling that. But we
18 haven't given them the full suite. We haven't given the
19 Ukrainians ATACMS. That is the long-range missile that
20 fits into the pod of either HIMARS or MRS systems out
21 there. It gives you extended range of 200 miles. It is
22 GPS guided. It can attack their supply lines deep.

23 We only give them 31 tanks. 31 tanks is a battalion,
24 you need much more than that. Give them brigades levels so
25 they can actually fight combined arms, and then maybe we

1 have to do separately, you give the Europeans with the
2 Challenger tanks from Britain, maybe they have one unit --

3 Senator Kelly: You know, my sense is in discussing
4 with, you know, our highest military leadership including,
5 you know, folks on the Joint Chiefs, that they are capable
6 of using combined arms to fight. I think what you might be
7 alluding to is they need to do it on a bigger scale.
8 Certainly there are gaps.

9 I mean, they are not using, you know, nor do they have
10 Apache helicopters. That would be an entire another issue.
11 But being able to combine ground troops with, you know,
12 artillery, you know, with long range fires is something I
13 think they have done rather effectively. Maybe not at the
14 scale that you think.

15 General Kellogg: Not at the scale that is needed to
16 win.

17 Senator Kelly: So give me a sense of what you feel
18 the greatest return on our investment has been from the
19 standpoint of equipment that we have provided them.

20 General Kellogg: I would believe the best system that
21 we have given them has been the HIMAR system. That is the
22 one that has given deep fires, and the fires have been able
23 to compensate and overcompensate for the Russian fires. So
24 if you have to pick, artillery generally, even I am an old
25 infantryman, artillery will win your fights, and we need to

1 have as much artillery to dominate that.

2 Plus one other system that is not really a military
3 hardware system in the sense it is kinetic, but we need to
4 give them more advanced intelligence systems that is able
5 to use jammers, because they are using, Russians are using
6 jammers to great effect right now, especially against the
7 drones the Ukrainians have had. That is something we
8 haven't really done. We probably should do more.

9 Senator Kelly: I appreciate that. Just, if I could
10 just take another 30 seconds, Mr. Chairman. The HIMARS,
11 they view as -- it was a game changer for them. And I
12 agree, that is, you know, a good example of a weapons
13 system that has been very effective, and really, you know,
14 changed the momentum in this fight. Beyond that, what
15 would be the next thing you think would be a game changer
16 for them?

17 General Kellogg: Well, again, sir, what I just talked
18 about, it is not a kinetic system, but the ability to do
19 anti-jamming in the intelligence type of collection and
20 electronic warfare. The Russians do that very, very well.

21 And that is causing problems with the drones of the
22 Ukrainians as well. It is also be able to target the
23 Ukrainians much deeper. It is something that is really not
24 thought about because it may not be sexy, but the fact is
25 those are the kind of systems they need to support. It

1 allows better targeting, longer range targeting, and with
2 greater effects on the battlefield.

3 Senator Kelly: Thank you, General.

4 Chairman Reed: Thank you, Senator Kelly. Senator
5 Cotton, please.

6 Senator Cotton: I want to thank all of the witnesses
7 for their very informative testimony. General Kellogg, I
8 especially appreciate your testimony. It is clear eyed and
9 hard-nosed, as you would expect from a seasoned statesman
10 and military man like yourself who spent a lot of time on
11 the battlefield and less time the halls of the Pentagon, so
12 thank you.

13 Because I think there are some important lessons for
14 the Administration and Democrats to learn, and also
15 Republicans to learn. I just want to revisit a few points
16 of your testimony and make sure I have it correct.

17 It sounds like one key point you are making is it is
18 possible to support Ukraine without supporting President
19 Biden's Ukraine policy, is that correct?

20 General Kellogg: Correct.

21 Senator Cotton: And if I could synthesize the
22 critique, I have heard about President Biden's Ukraine
23 policy maybe down to a few points.

24 First, in 2021, he did what Winston Churchill
25 cautioned that we should never do with dictatorships but

1 especially Russia, gave them temptations to a trial of
2 strength by giving away the START and the New START treaty,
3 and NordStream 2, turning the cheek on the Colonial
4 Pipeline hack, inviting him to a big summit in Europe.

5 Is that one part of the -- one part of your take is
6 that President Biden tempted Vladimir Putin to achieve what
7 he has always wanted to achieve, which is subjugating
8 Ukraine to a new Russian empire?

9 General Kellogg: Yes, Senator -- Senator, I am a big
10 believer in patterns. We all have patterns. We go to the
11 shore the same way, by the same service station, and so do
12 leaders. And Putin saw it in the leadership of President
13 Biden, a pattern, and he was able to exploit it.

14 Senator Cotton: Second, over the year of the war, it
15 sounds to me like your critique is that the President
16 Biden, the Administration has been pussyfooting around
17 their support for Ukraine, constantly providing them just
18 enough to avoid a catastrophic defeat, not enough to win.
19 It is, as you say, a pattern we have seen from the very
20 beginning. We will give them ammunition, but not
21 artillery.

22 We will give them artillery, but not HIMARS. We will
23 give them HIMARS and not armor. We will give them
24 Bradleys, but not Abrams. We will give them Abrams but not
25 cluster munitions and F-16, which is where we are now.

1 And therefore, these dragged out the war longer than
2 we should have if we had just provided Ukraine with what it
3 needed to defend its territory from the very beginning. Am
4 I right about that?

5 General Kellogg: You are correct, Senator. Senator,
6 and you will appreciate this, this is like doing a river
7 crossing. Once from the near bank to the far bank, you
8 don't get to the middle on a river crossing and you said it
9 was not a good idea. Once you commit, you go.

10 Senator Cotton: And to a point you were making
11 earlier and Senator Kaine discussed with you, is that
12 President Biden keeps talking about supporting Ukraine for
13 as long as it takes, which is a substitute for helping
14 Ukraine win as quick as it can, is that right?

15 General Kellogg: I believe so, because if this goes
16 to a long range fight, it is an endless war and they cannot
17 win a war of attrition.

18 Senator Cotton: So from the beginning, it shouldn't
19 have been about supporting Ukraine as long as it takes. It
20 should be helping them win as quick as they can. For the
21 record, Senator Kaine talked a lot about seeing through the
22 rearview mirror. I think you were making these very points
23 a year ago, weren't you, when you were looking through the
24 windshield, not the rearview mirror.

25 General Kellogg: Correct, sir.

1 Senator Cotton: And I think a lot of us were. And
2 then the third take, after the first one, that President
3 Biden tempted Vladimir Putin to go for the jugular and then
4 he spent a year pussyfooting around in support for Ukraine,
5 is that he has also allowed Europe to get away with not
6 doing enough, especially on financial support and in
7 particular Germany, France, and the European Union. Is
8 that right?

9 General Kellogg: I believe Europe has been very
10 laggard.

11 Senator Cotton: Okay. Now, I also hear you making a
12 few other points as well that I want to pursue. Sometimes
13 we hear a criticism of President Biden that he seems to
14 care more about Ukraine's border than America's borders.

15 I think that is fair criticism of President Biden.
16 But it sounds like you believe, and that it is the case,
17 that you can care about America's borders and protect our
18 borders, while also help other countries protect their
19 borders too, is that right?

20 General Kellogg: That is correct, Senator.

21 Senator Cotton: Recently since the terrible train
22 wreck in East Palestine, Ohio, and President Biden's trip
23 to Kyiv last week, I have heard some say that the President
24 will go to Kyiv, but he won't go to East Palestine.

25 I agree that is a fair criticism of President Biden.

1 It sounds to me like you think it is possible to both go to
2 East Palestine and support the people there who have been
3 harmed by this train wreck, but also travel to Kyiv and
4 show our support for the Ukrainian people and their fight
5 against this war of aggression from Russia. Is that right?

6 General Kellogg: My experience that Air Force One can
7 go anywhere it wants to go.

8 Senator Cotton: Thank you for that. Now, on
9 negotiations, we also hear a lot of criticism that we are
10 not doing enough to have a negotiated end to this conflict,
11 that we need to get negotiations underway. I think you are
12 -- one of your key points in terms of supporting Ukraine
13 now, backing them to the hilt as quick as we can, not for
14 as long as it takes, is that the only way to get a
15 negotiated settlement is to convince Vladimir Putin he has
16 more to lose in the battlefield than he does at the
17 negotiating table, Is that right?

18 General Kellogg: That is correct, Senator. And what
19 you need to push pressure on him, if he loses his army, he
20 loses, and that is what you put him at risk of.

21 Senator Cotton: So this idea that, well, if we stop
22 supporting Ukraine or if we gradually draw down our support
23 for Ukraine, then we will magically have a negotiated
24 settlement that protects America's interests.

25 What you are saying is that, no, what we would do is

1 further embolden Vladimir Putin, exactly what Joe Biden did
2 in 2021 to try to achieve maximalist gains first in Ukraine
3 and then down the road against NATO partners. Is that
4 right?

5 General Kellogg: That is correct. It is fool's gold
6 if you think you can reduce aid.

7 Senator Cotton: Okay. Thank you, General.

8 Chairman Reed: Thank you, Senator Cotton. Senator
9 Blumenthal, please.

10 Senator Blumenthal: Thank you all for your testimony,
11 which has been very helpful and instructive. And General
12 Kellogg, particularly to you, thank you for your service.
13 I have visited Ukraine three times over roughly the last
14 year, the last two of them with Senator Graham taking the
15 overnight train into Kyiv.

16 And I respect particularly, General, your visit to
17 Ukraine and the lessons that you have learned. One of the
18 lessons that come to me over this past year is that the
19 world, and particularly the United States, has consistently
20 underestimated the Ukrainians.

21 I came back from my first trip before the invasion
22 telling anyone who would listen, including the President,
23 that the Ukrainians are going to fight to the last person,
24 with pitchforks if necessary. That is what President
25 Zelenskyy told me. And he wasn't leaving that country.

1 So I have strong confidence in Ukrainians, which has
2 been bolstered by my visit just 10 days ago to the U.S.
3 Army base in Bavaria, where American soldiers are training
4 Ukrainians in the use of those Bradley armored vehicles.
5 And to quote one of them, they are quick studies, as you
6 would expect, when you are defending your homeland, your
7 children, your family, as we would be.

8 Americans, in fact, the American soldiers training
9 them said to me, you know, they fight just like we do. So
10 I have come back from each of these visits urging more
11 military aid, more Stingers and Javelins, more of the air
12 defense. Senator Graham and I came back last July urging
13 that we provide the Patriot system, which we did after some
14 hesitation and caution. In fact, delay.

15 And now, I am urging that we provide the F-16s, the
16 air support that are necessary. The aircraft that they say
17 are necessary for them to break through the air defenses
18 that the Russians have established. Would you agree with
19 me, General, that we should provide the F-16 and begin
20 training those pilots immediately?

21 General Kellogg: Senator, I would provide them
22 everything we could possibly provide them to win this fight
23 because it prevents American troops being deployed later if
24 they can defeat the Russian military.

25 And if it takes the F-16, because it does have better

1 avionics than the MiG-29 does, and you could upload the ARM
2 88 missiles, as an example, the answer is I would provide
3 everything I can.

4 Senator Blumenthal: What I have heard repeatedly, and
5 not just from the Administration, from some on both sides
6 of the aisle here, that providing these weapons systems is
7 too complicated, too costly, too difficult in terms of
8 training.

9 What I saw, and what I have heard from our American
10 military, is that the training obstacles can be overcome
11 and the costs of failing to provide these weapon systems
12 now will be greater later.

13 We will pay more in terms of cost if we have to commit
14 troops after one of our NATO allies is involved or attacked
15 than we would now, because right now President Zelenskyy
16 doesn't want and doesn't need American troops on the
17 ground. He wants the weapons systems that he needs to win
18 the war. Would you agree?

19 General Kellogg: I totally agree, Senator. My
20 experience with the Ukrainians and those that fought with
21 the Ukrainians, they are very capable. They are very
22 smart. It is a very educated population. And they are
23 fighting for the life of their country, and they will
24 devote everything they can to do it. Yes, sir.

25 Senator Blumenthal: There is a hitch here. It is the

1 challenge that I regard as really paramount right now here
2 in the United States, which is our defense industrial base.
3 ATACMS, I fully support providing ATACMS, but what I have
4 been told is that we don't have enough right now. That we
5 need to produce more.

6 The same with some of the ammunition that has been
7 mentioned. We need to produce more of it. We need a
8 trained workforce that will provide the skills and the
9 person power that is needed. Would you agree that we need
10 to focus on the production of these weapon systems, not
11 just talk about what is needed on the battlefield?

12 General Kellogg: Sir, absolutely. And the defense
13 industry is working on a peacetime schedule. We either get
14 them to a wartime footing to actually ramp up the equipment
15 that they are providing, which is actually backfilling the
16 American military, which is more modern equipment.

17 And the Stinger line, we shut down for years. We need
18 to bring those lines back on to make sure it is -- and
19 actually put the entire defense industry on a wartime
20 footing. Not only get the munitions that are needed to
21 defeat the Russians, the Ukrainians defeating the Russians,
22 but also to bring our stocks back up to good levels.

23 Senator Blumenthal: I hope we can have bipartisan
24 agreement on that last point that you made, General,
25 because I think it is the key to meeting those needs on the

1 Ukrainian battlefield and being prepared to send a message
2 to China, continued message about our resolve. Thank you.

3 Chairman Reed: Thank you, Senator Blumenthal.
4 Senator Scott, please.

5 Senator Scott: Thank you, Chairman. Thank you, each
6 of you, for being here. Thank you for your testimony and
7 thank you for answering all these questions. General
8 Kellogg, the -- you know, we have seen the atrocities.

9 We know Russia has a despicable government. We, our
10 heart goes out to the Ukrainians for all their losses. It
11 is -- I mean, when you see that Putin is sitting there
12 wanting to kill women and children, it is just despicable.

13 But if you were thinking about it, and just from the
14 standpoint of American security, how important is this to
15 American security that we make sure that the Ukrainians win
16 and Russia loses? And if the opposite happened, how
17 adverse would that be on our own personal and our own
18 security, which is our primary role up here in Congress to
19 provide for the security of Americans?

20 General Kellogg: Thank you, Senator. Senator, I
21 believe if you can defeat a strategic adversary and not use
22 any U.S. troops, you are at the acme of professionalism,
23 because letting the Ukrainians defeat that, it takes a
24 strategic adversary off the table and then we can focus
25 what we should be focusing against our primary adversary,

1 which is China at this time.

2 And the concern I have got is I don't think we need to
3 put American troops there. And if we fail in this, we may
4 have to fight another European war, which would be the
5 third time. And I don't think we should do that or need to
6 do that as well.

7 Senator Scott: General, why -- I mean, I think we
8 have to worry about -- I think, we need to make sure Russia
9 loses, in my opinion. We need to make sure the Ukrainians
10 win. Why haven't -- why hasn't Germany stepped up?

11 I mean, this is not -- you know, I don't know how
12 close how many miles it is from the Ukrainian border to
13 Germany. But why hasn't Germany stepped up and done its
14 part on lethal aid. I mean, it seems to me that they
15 should be, have a bigger concern than we do.

16 General Kellogg: I believe Germany is a non-player in
17 Europe right now. I think you look more toward the Poles
18 as being the major player.

19 While it is a very obviously important country, I
20 think they are feckless. They just haven't supported it.
21 They should support -- they should be all in this fight
22 because it is -- they have seen the experience of us coming
23 over in two years and actually defeating Germany in two
24 wars.

25 They just, the leadership they have gotten has not

1 displayed the leadership you would expect from a wartime
2 leader.

3 Senator Scott: You think that -- I mean, a lot of
4 people believe that we can negotiate a settlement with
5 Putin. Is there any type of settlement you believe that
6 Putin, one, would be interested in doing, and then two,
7 that would be worth anything if he agreed to?

8 General Kellogg: Senator, I believe at the end, I
9 believe the two experts to my right would say this, the
10 only thing that Putin understands is power and strength.
11 And you have to basically put your knee on his throat. And
12 how you do that is defeat the only thing that really counts
13 for Putin, and that is the Russian army in Ukraine. Defeat
14 that army and I believe Putin falls.

15 Senator Scott: Is there any -- you know, a lot of
16 what we hear is that we have spent a lot of money. Germany
17 is not, you know, they have not done the lethal aid. They
18 have done other types of aid.

19 But how can we quantify to the American public the
20 importance of this? Because, you know, some people, like
21 in my State they ask me why we spend over \$100 -- or
22 committed, not spent, but committed \$100 billion.

23 And is there a way that we can make sure the Biden
24 Administration does what I think most, a lot of us believe
25 in is we need to go all in now rather than piecemeal.

1 General Kellogg: Senator, I believe it is fight there
2 rather than here. It is better that we have to fight an
3 adversary overseas, not use U.S. troops to do so. And
4 Ukrainians don't want U.S. troops. Everyone I have talked
5 to said we can fight this fight as long as we get the kit
6 to do it.

7 And I think if we don't -- we need to tell the
8 American people, you can basically walk and chew bubble gum
9 at the same time. We should be addressing all of those
10 issues that we have both here in the United States and
11 overseas, and I think that balance can be displayed.

12 And I think that needs to be done, which I believe,
13 through Presidential leadership. I think the President
14 should pick up the phone and be asked to and call President
15 Putin. You know, even right now, when he sees Lloyd
16 Austin, Secretary of Defense, they will not pick up the
17 phone and talk to him, nor will the Chinese. And I think
18 that is a huge mistake.

19 Senator Scott: So what is the takeaway for Xi right
20 now with regard to how the Biden Administration has acted
21 and how when you look at, you know, part of the American
22 public questions what we are doing there. What is Xi's
23 takeaway?

24 General Kellogg: Well, the huge takeaway is that we
25 are in a drift and we are not displaying Presidential

1 leadership, you know. What I mean by Presidential
2 leadership is being very, very definitive on what is it
3 going to take to win this fight.

4 We are taking a backseat to letting Ukraine drive this
5 decision. This decision of the free world decision of how
6 we fight and how we win on the battlefield, and I believe
7 Presidential leadership does count, decisive leadership
8 does count.

9 And Putin needs to understand that decisive
10 leadership, and that he is actually fighting us and the
11 free world in this endeavor.

12 Senator Scott: Thank each of you. Thank you,
13 Chairman.

14 Senator Blumenthal: Thank you, Senator Scott.
15 Senator King, please.

16 Senator King: Thank you. I think General Kellogg,
17 the Germans would be surprised to be called feckless. They
18 have made about 180 degree turn in their orientation toward
19 conflict in arms and armament. And I think clearly the
20 United States has been the major donor, if you will, both
21 in terms of military and humanitarian aid, in terms of
22 dollars.

23 But I think, I was in Munich last week, I think in
24 terms of percentage of GDP, we are like 12th behind a lot
25 of other countries, particularly Poland, which has stepped

1 up in an enormously consequential way. Both regard
2 refugees, acting as a conduit for weapons.

3 So I don't -- I just don't think it -- I just don't
4 think it is accurate to say that the rest of the world and
5 Europe is not stepping up. Because as a percentage of
6 their economy, they are actually countries that are doing
7 more than we are.

8 I do have a specific question about, and I think, you
9 know, General Kellogg, you will agree with me on this one.
10 And that is, we go through these long debates about whether
11 to send tanks, whether to send jet fighters.

12 Then if we decide, yes, as we have learned with the
13 tanks, there is this long lag time, three or four months.
14 That mostly involves training. It seems to me that one way
15 to shorten that is to say, well, we haven't decided yet
16 about jet aircraft or tanks, but let's do the training now.
17 Does that make sense?

18 General Kellogg: Senator, it really does. Train now
19 with any system they have got and prepare for the future.
20 I think it is there. Sir, I spent five years in Germany.
21 The Germany, I remember when I was there, and spent five
22 years in there, is not the Germany I see today, both in
23 leadership and their military capacity and capability.

24 So I understand it is a harsh statement, but I stand
25 by the statement as well. But you are absolutely right, if

1 we can train them on all the systems that we may provide
2 them, they are very smart, they are very quick learned, and
3 I think it would help out.

4 Senator King: Professor Stent, a question about, one
5 of the things that is puzzling to me, I remember when this
6 started a year ago, all the talk was the sanctions are
7 going to cripple Russia. They are going to be just out of
8 business and riots in the street. Absolutely hasn't
9 worked.

10 Talk to me about why. Were the sanctions -- were they
11 the wrong sanctions? Were they not applied well? Did we
12 underestimate the Russian capacity to circumvent them. Why
13 have the sanctions regime not played a bigger part in this
14 conflict?

15 Dr. Stent: So I think we always tend to think the
16 first reaction to something like the Russian invasion is to
17 impose sanctions. I think we forget how resilient that
18 Russian economy is despite the sanctions.

19 The IMF said that Russia's economy was going to
20 contract by 8 percent last year. It contracted by 2
21 percent. They have been able to do this because they have
22 had a smart policy of stabilizing the ruble, and because
23 they have earned, you know, windfall profits last year from
24 their oil and gas sales. And they have managed to keep the
25 war machine going despite sanctions.

1 That is changing now. We have the oil price cap.
2 They probably won't make those windfall profits anymore.
3 But still, you know, India has now become the largest
4 purchaser of Russian oil, other countries, China. So they
5 do still sell the hydrocarbons, even though the Europeans
6 have now weaned themselves off the Russian imports. And --

7 Senator King: But don't you think we underestimate
8 other countries, particularly a country like Russia, their
9 ability to absorb pain?

10 Dr. Stent: Yes, I think we do. And I think --

11 Senator King: They go back -- he is invoking
12 Stalingrad. And also sanctions against a dictatorial
13 regime, the problem is the dictator will always have his
14 Mercedes and caviar. And so the sanctions don't have
15 directly effect, and it is a country that doesn't have much
16 in the way of political opposition, then I am not sure
17 where the sanctions go. Are there additional sanctions we
18 should be applying now?

19 Dr. Stent: I mean, there is still some Russian banks
20 we could sanction. We have sanctioned many of them. I
21 think we also misunderstand the relationship between Putin
22 and the oligarchs.

23 I mean, and the people who lost their bank accounts
24 and their yachts and everything else. They are not going
25 to get together and say, you know, we have to rid ourselves

1 of this leader. That is not how the system works.

2 Senator King: That hasn't worked.

3 Dr. Stent: Right. I think the only other thing I
4 would say is that I think the export control sanctions will
5 be -- will bite more this year, particularly the lack of
6 access to semiconductors and components for manufacturing.

7 So the Russians already started closing down some
8 assembly lines with automobiles and things like that, and
9 that will then hit the general population. But so far --

10 Senator King: That is where I want to follow up. Ms.
11 Massicot, what is the status of the Russian defense
12 industrial base? How are they -- are they going to be able
13 to keep producing ammunition and weapons?

14 Ms. Massicot: Well, we found since the beginning of
15 the last year of war that Putin has delayed decisions that
16 he thinks are risky and well beyond when he should have
17 done. Russia has not activated its full wartime
18 authorities to command that defense industrial base to
19 really go 24/7.

20 There are some sectors of it that are. My
21 understanding is that some of their longer range precision
22 munitions, they are working triple shifts to try to get
23 those missile stocks back up. My understanding is that
24 artillery shells, it is pretty simple for them to construct
25 it if they have the access to the raw materials, which they

1 do.

2 There is a bit of a delay right now. I think they
3 will probably overcome it by the fall, maybe the late
4 winter. So in the interim, I am not sure what they are
5 going to do. I know they are trying to get it from North
6 Korea. They are trying to get it from China.

7 Senator King: The big question, and I know it has
8 been covered. I was in another hearing downstairs, but the
9 big question is, will China bail them out? And is there a
10 yes or no answer to that? What do we think? What do we
11 think China is going to do? Are they going to -- so far,
12 they have been content to stand on the sidelines and hold
13 Russia's coat. Are they going to actually step in and
14 start supplying weapons?

15 Ms. Massicot: I think there probably is an answer for
16 a China expert. I am not that person, but I would say that
17 if they did intervene right now, it would fill a critical
18 gap for the Russians for the next several months. I am not
19 sure.

20 Senator King: I raise the question, what our response
21 is to that. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

22 Chairman Reed: Thank you. Senator King. Senator
23 Schmitt, please.

24 Senator Schmitt: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do have
25 a couple of questions, but let me -- so let me try to give

1 voice to what I think a lot of folks out there who are not
2 sitting in these chairs feel about where we are at with
3 regard to this policy. They have seen an Administration's
4 disastrous withdrawal from Afghanistan.

5 Hundreds or tens of billions of dollars' worth of
6 equipment left behind, critical intelligence. They are
7 told about respecting the sovereignty of other countries'
8 borders but do nothing about the millions of people
9 streaming across our Southern border and the fentanyl that
10 is killing 300 people a day in every single one of our
11 communities.

12 The violence, the humanitarian crisis. Human beings
13 being trafficked by drug cartels. They see a President go
14 to Ukraine before he goes to Ohio where there is a toxic
15 chemical spill. And a lot of people who feel forgotten in
16 all of this are frustrated.

17 And so, I suppose my first question, I guess, to all
18 of you, briefly because I have limited time, is \$113
19 billion. Now we can talk about percentage of GDP, but for
20 most folks out there, that is a lot of money. \$1 billion
21 is a lot of money. \$113 billion is a lot of money when you
22 have a porous open border.

23 In fact, it is more money than we spend on the
24 Department of Homeland Security every year. What can be
25 done to ensure that these dollars are fully accounted for

1 beyond what we are doing right now? And I guess that is
2 the first question I have, for each of you, if you have a
3 point of view on that.

4 Dr. Stent: Senator, my understanding is that we do
5 have mechanisms in place, and this has been discussed --

6 Senator Schmitt: My question is, let's say you are
7 not satisfied with that. What else can be done?

8 General Kellogg: Senator, I think you can provide
9 more -- we don't have, for example, a special inspector
10 general that is currently in Kyiv. We should probably put
11 a full team on board to make sure that the accountability
12 is there. It is a matter of emphasis.

13 And what you saw, we had the same thing in Afghanistan
14 and places like that before, we put in a special IG that is
15 able to track all of that. So if you are saying what to do
16 more, that is kind of what I would say. And the Ukrainians
17 are very willing to accept that. They understand they have
18 got corruption issues.

19 They told us that when we were there. They are not
20 running from it. You know, I think it would behoove us to
21 actually improve that accountability. And the second, you
22 asked a great question. I think we have a terrible
23 messaging problem with the American people.

24 Right now, we can walk and chew bubble gum at the same
25 time. You can do all of this if you want to, you just have

1 to be committed to it. And I don't think we are committed
2 to it.

3 Senator Schmitt: Well, let me just -- so we have
4 heard a lot about this, you know, existential threat to
5 Ukraine and to Europe. I suppose, again, part of the
6 frustration is the American people, the American taxpayers,
7 they don't see these European countries stepping up. They
8 just, they don't.

9 And we can talk about percentage of GDP, but Germany
10 has walked away. There is other countries in Europe that
11 could be doing a lot more. And so I guess my question is,
12 General Kellogg, to you, what specifically can those
13 European countries do? This is in their backyard.

14 And you mentioned, you know, fight them there or fight
15 them here. I don't know if that is a -- you know, I don't
16 think that most Americans believe that we are at a point
17 where we are going to be fighting the Russians on American
18 soil.

19 So we are in the European theater here. What can
20 these European countries do to step up? Because they got a
21 lot of money for a lot of their social welfare programs in
22 those countries, but they don't seem to have a lot of money
23 for this, you know, existential threat.

24 General Kellogg: Well, the comment you made is
25 accurate because, for example, as I said, use the Kiel

1 Institute, which tracks this very, very well. Only 6
2 percent of the European stocks in the European Union,
3 military stocks have been used.

4 Unlike the Brits, who -- 25 percent of their stock has
5 been used. They do need to step out more. And how you get
6 them to step up more, you very candidly, is do what
7 President Trump did, to stand up and use the presidency as
8 a bully pulpit and say this is what needs to get done. And
9 we need to tell them that.

10 We cannot continue -- be continuing to expect that
11 United States of America will carry 50 percent of the load.
12 And that is what it is carrying when you analyze these
13 other 41 countries. It is in their backyard. You know,
14 over a year ago, before this war started, I said this is a
15 European fight before an American fight.

16 Once the fight was joined, they said, okay, now we are
17 into the game. Now we have to fight. But, yes, you are
18 absolutely correct, they are not doing enough. But you
19 have to get the President willing to say that and force
20 them to do that, and they are not doing that right now.
21 And we are not pushing them into supporting to the degree
22 they should support.

23 Senator Schmitt: Thank you. My time is up. Thank
24 you, Mr. Chairman.

25 Chairman Reed: Thank you, Senator Schmitt. Senator

1 Rosen, please.

2 Senator Rosen: Thank you, Chairman Reed. Of course,
3 Ranking Member Wicker isn't here, but we really appreciate
4 that you are holding this timely hearing on the ongoing war
5 in Ukraine, which sadly comes shortly after the one year
6 anniversary of Putin's brutal and unjustified invasion over
7 Ukraine sovereign territory. And as I have said before,
8 the United States and our allies, I believe, must stand
9 with Ukraine for as long as it takes for the Ukrainian
10 people to win.

11 Now is not the time to back down, especially with
12 spring, as we know, the weather presents an opportunity for
13 Ukrainian counteroffensive. So, Ms. Massicot, what is your
14 assessment of the ability to rapidly and effectively
15 provide some of these newer weapons systems and advanced
16 technologies to Ukraine?

17 And I want to also bring up this point, how can the
18 Pentagon, do you believe, improve its acquisition system to
19 quickly adapt and maybe field some of the off the shelf
20 technologies that are going to enable Ukraine off the
21 battlefield, things we can do there?

22 Ms. Massicot: Thank you, Senator. I think about
23 needs for Ukraine on two different timelines. There is the
24 immediate needs, which we have talked about, artillery
25 shells and additional small arms to prevent these Russian

1 frontal assaults.

2 I think some of the more advanced systems that we have
3 talked about today, like the F-16s or ATAMCS, there is a
4 lead time with that, with training. But I agree with my
5 panelists, if you never start the process, you never start
6 the process. You know, we, when the war kicked off, I
7 believe that it was really urgent for the Ukrainians to
8 receive air defense systems, and I still think that is a
9 really urgent thing that we must sustain.

10 The Russians are working at chipping away at that over
11 time with missile salvos at Ukrainian cities using Iranian
12 Shahed drones. If they are able to treat the Soviet era
13 SAMs, or some of our IRIS-T or NASAMS that have been
14 provided, it would allow the Russian air force to come back
15 in a very large way, and I worry that that would be very
16 dangerous for the Ukrainians.

17 Senator Rosen: Thank you. I want to move on. I am
18 going to come back to you, Ms. Massicot, but I want to move
19 on to Dr. Stent, because we have been hearing some of the
20 conversation here.

21 But of course, during Putin's address to the Russian
22 people just last week, he reiterated his warnings to the
23 West, and I am going to quote, he said, global
24 confrontation. And so, are his threats intended for our
25 domestic consumption or for us here in the United States?

1 Just for domestic consumption inside Russia?

2 Do you foresee a more aggressive Russia? I am
3 thinking about his global confrontation posture. Perhaps
4 cyber that he hasn't really played much. You say, well,
5 maybe they don't see them marching here, but the cyber-
6 attacks can hit you pretty hard as well. So, Dr. Stent,
7 what is your opinion on that?

8 Dr. Stent: Thank you, Senator. I think his speech
9 was directed both to the domestic audience and to the
10 foreign audience. He is telling his own people this war is
11 a war with the West, with the United States.

12 It is going to go on for a long time and we are going
13 to prevail. He said, we are going to win on the
14 battlefield. And he is basically telling them that they
15 have to accept it. And for us, he is threatening us, that
16 there are things that he hasn't done yet that he could do.
17 Now, having said all of that, he wants to intimidate
18 everyone.

19 The Russians haven't done some things that we thought
20 they might do. They have not attacked any of the convoys
21 carrying weapons into Ukraine, either from Poland or
22 Romania. I think at this point Putin still is not willing
23 to get into a direct conflict with NATO. And there has
24 been less cyber.

25 I mean, there has been obviously some issues, but

1 there have been less cyber attacks than we maybe feared
2 that there might be. So that indicates to me that until
3 now, he is observing some of his own, I know, red lines or
4 limits, but he wants us to believe that he could go much
5 further.

6 And so I think it is our test to try and discriminate
7 between what are probably just empty threats and things
8 that we should take seriously.

9 Senator Rosen: Thank you. And I am going to build on
10 that with you, General Kellogg, then, because we think
11 about these threats, and of course, they come maybe cyber
12 and they also come with missiles.

13 And we know Russia's stockpile of missiles, they have
14 fired thousands since the beginning. They are using their
15 Soviet era munitions more and more. So what do you believe
16 is the status of Russian munitions and their supply chain?
17 And how, if they are running low, as Ms. Massicot talked
18 about, maybe having to move back up production, how will
19 this counteract, how will this play in this
20 counteroffensive actions in just in the next few months?

21 General Kellogg: Senator, thank you. Senator, they
22 are at a stretch right now. Look, Senator, they are
23 refurbishing T-62 tanks. Those tanks have been out of the
24 inventory for over 40 years. But the amount of losses they
25 have sustained in their modernized armored forces have been

1 tremendous. They are falling back on systems that we
2 haven't seen in the inventory back in the Cold War, back
3 when I was stationed in Germany years ago.

4 So, their stocks are running low. That doesn't mean
5 they don't have a lot there, but you can see they are using
6 munitions that are not guided. That is where I would be
7 concerned, where either the Iranians or Chinese are going
8 to step up and provide them the munitions they currently
9 don't have, to be able to use.

10 That is reason why I believe the United States has an
11 ability to continue to put pressure on them. And I realize
12 it is a heavy lift, but the more we do it, it counters the
13 Russian ability to continue to fight this war.

14 They are basically, in my opinion, the Russians are on
15 their heels, both tactically, operationally, and
16 strategically, and their supply chain is being broken right
17 now.

18 Senator Rosen: Thank you. I appreciate that. I am
19 going to submit a question for the record on what you all
20 might think will be their next -- if they are on their back
21 heels, what you might predict will be their next form of
22 aggression that we need to look forward to. But my time is
23 up, so I will send that for the record. Thank you.

24 Chairman Reed: Thank you very much, Senator Rosen.
25 Senator Sullivan, please.

1 Senator Sullivan: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to
2 thank the witnesses for their important testimony today. I
3 just want to make a statement, Senator Schmitt's point
4 about the Europeans doing more. General, you highlighted
5 this. But I really think the 2 percent GDP commitment they
6 have all made under NATO membership is really important.

7 Now, I hear from folks back home in Alaska that, you
8 know, they know how important this is, but if the Europeans
9 can't meet their commitments, you are going to continue to
10 see waning support in America. And I think all our
11 European allies need to understand that. So, but what I
12 want to do is I want to turn to a topic that surprisingly
13 hasn't come up yet, that I know a number of you, Dr. Stent,
14 in particular, know and care about.

15 That is the topic of energy. And I would like to
16 recount this story. My good friend, Senator John McCain
17 and I were in a meeting with a very brave Russian, a
18 Russian who is actually now in jail, Vladimir Kara-Murza.
19 And I had asked him, what more can we do to undermine the
20 Putin regime? This is a number of years ago. And he said,
21 Senator, the answer is very simple, produce more American
22 energy. So American energy is this huge, important
23 instrument of American power.

24 Do you all agree with Vladimir Kara-Murza's statement
25 on just how important energy is? Similar to tanks and

1 aircraft carriers, relative to Russia, and relative to
2 China. Xi Jinping fears American energy dominance, which
3 we did such a good job of during the Trump Administration.

4 This Administration now from day one has actually been
5 attacking American energy, trying to shut down American
6 energy, make it harder to produce. Literally insane.
7 Makes no sense. But can you talk very briefly, because I
8 have a number of questions, on the importance of American
9 energy, not just for Americans, but as an instrument of
10 American power as it relates to Russia.

11 Dr. Stent, why don't you begin? I know you and your
12 husband know a little bit about energy.

13 Dr. Stent: Thank you, Senator. No, I mean, I would
14 agree with you. Russia was an energy superpower before
15 this war began. It will no longer be an energy superpower.

16 Senator Sullivan: And we are, if we want to be. If
17 we could be, if we had the Federal Government's not help,
18 just get the hell out of the way, right.

19 Dr. Stent: Right. So there is obviously a
20 contradiction between the Administration's policy on
21 hydrocarbons and what would actually be needed to make it
22 less easy for Russia to project its own power. I agree
23 with you.

24 Senator Sullivan: Thank you. General, do you have a
25 view on that? I am sure you do.

1 General Kellogg: Senator, my family is an oil well
2 drilling family, so yes, I get it. Yes, sir.

3 Senator Sullivan: And that is a really important
4 instrument of American power if we are the world's energy
5 dominant -- and by the way, all of the above. I want wind,
6 solar, you know, as long as we are not buying it from
7 China, but oil and gas, too, right?

8 General Kellogg: Yes, sir.

9 Senator Sullivan: Ms. Massicot, do you have a view on
10 that?

11 Ms. Massicot: You know, I do. I think there are
12 elements of sanctions that are less impactful. Russia is
13 able to find alternative customers for its main imports.

14 Senator Sullivan: But America producing energy as a
15 way to undermine Putin's power is a no brainer, isn't it?

16 Ms. Massicot: I don't have an informed view, but that
17 seems logical to me.

18 Senator Sullivan: Okay. Let me -- we are working on
19 a project called the Willow Project. Just a quick -- it is
20 in Alaska. It has been under permitting God knows how
21 long, 20 years. It would be mass production about 200,000
22 barrels a day, 2,500 jobs to build it.

23 We could start building it tomorrow if we get the
24 President to approve it. Would a project like that help
25 America's National Security, an additional 200,000 barrels

1 a day, highest environmental standards in the world? Just
2 real quickly, yes or no, to each of the witnesses. Dr.
3 Stent.

4 Dr. Stent: Yes.

5 Senator Sullivan: General.

6 General Kellogg: Yes.

7 Senator Sullivan: Ms. Massicot. Was that a yes or
8 no, maybe?

9 Ms. Massicot: It is outside of my area of expertise.

10 Senator Sullivan: Okay. And then finally, just we
11 have a member of the Administration, he won't admit it, and
12 maybe he should come out and deny it. Mr. Kerry, not sure
13 what to call him. He is not a Senator, is not Secretary of
14 State.

15 By the way, if he were up for confirmation, he
16 wouldn't get confirmed in the Senate. He goes around the
17 world, especially in Asia, telling -- cautioning countries
18 not to buy American LNG. Is that a good idea from a
19 National Security perspective? Dr. Stent, you have a view
20 on that?

21 Dr. Stent: I think I will pass on that one.

22 Senator Sullivan: All right. General, how about you?
23 Good idea to go to Asia and say, hey, don't buy American
24 LNG?

25 General Kellogg: No, I don't think that is a very

1 good idea.

2 Senator Sullivan: No, it is really ridiculously
3 stupid. Let me just ask one final question, on the F16s,
4 and this is just for all of the witnesses. I hosted some
5 Ukrainian pilots last summer. Very brave, incredible young
6 men.

7 We wrote a letter to General Milley, Secretary Austin,
8 last summer on the F-16s. I was very well informed that
9 the Pentagon was moving towards approving F-16s. We have
10 been working on it for months.

11 And then the President got off the helicopter the
12 other day and said, no, we are not going to do it. He
13 looked very uninformed, but whatever, that is not always
14 surprising. The Washington Post today came out with an
15 editorial on moving forward with the F-16s.

16 What I worry about is this Administration is going to
17 do what they have been doing the whole time, which is
18 eventually approve them, looked like they were going to
19 before the President's statement.

20 So, can you, any or all of you, just opine very
21 quickly on why that is important, this weapon system now,
22 not, you know, five months from now like they have been
23 doing on other ones?

24 General Kellogg: Sir, the reason why those systems
25 are important is American technology is the best in the

1 world. Our fighters, our bombers, the stealth technology,
2 you name it, is the best in the world, and we should give
3 them the best to have those fights. So it makes sense to
4 give them systems like that if they believe it can improve
5 the fight. It is a good -- the F-16 is an example.

6 It is a good air to air and air to ground system out
7 there. We can put the most modern avionics on it, most
8 modern weapon systems. Give them -- I have always said
9 this repeatedly, give them the systems, the best systems in
10 the world to win the fight. Those best systems happen to
11 be, I believe, American systems.

12 Senator Sullivan: Any other views on the F-16 in
13 particular?

14 Ms. Massicot: Yes, I just would like to caution that
15 we can give them an air platform, but we can't give them
16 Western air power. There is a lot of additional enablers
17 that go into that. That is not my decision to make about
18 what is in them.

19 But it is not just the pilots that need to be trained.
20 It is the spare parts, it is the logisticians, it is
21 everything else that goes into it. And what do we assume
22 risk wise if we invest in that capability?

23 Is there something that comes off the table for the
24 Ukrainians in the near term? I don't have that answer, but
25 you all do and I know you are making very difficult

1 decisions every day. Just there is risks involved in
2 everything, and there is no easy ways forward now.

3 Senator Sullivan: Dr. Stent, do you -- thank you, Mr.
4 Chairman.

5 Chairman Reed: Thank you, Senator Sullivan. Senator
6 Peters, please.

7 Senator Peters: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And to our
8 witnesses, thank you for being here today. It has been a
9 quite of a wide-ranging discussion. I think a lot of
10 questions have already been asked that I was going to ask,
11 so but I will be brief. And just kind of drilling down on
12 some of the responses that I have heard.

13 On the last question about a weapon system of the F-16
14 and understanding that it is not just a platform, you have
15 got to have a whole system around those platforms, and
16 going into combat as well. It is a complicated combined
17 arms type of tactics that you have to use. But one
18 question I had is contribution that the Germans have made.

19 There has been questions related to European
20 contributions. And the Germans, I believe, made a pretty
21 significant contribution with the Leopard 2 tanks. But I
22 am curious as to your assessment of that tank going into
23 combat.

24 Clearly, a tank by itself is not a game changer. It
25 has to be part of a broader system. But Ms. Massicot,

1 General Kellogg, could you talk a little bit about what you
2 think the Leopard 2 will bring to the defensive and
3 offensive capabilities of the Ukrainian military.

4 General Kellogg: Sir, it is one of the three best
5 tanks in the world. When you look at that, I happen to
6 think the Abrams tank made by the United States is the best
7 tank in the world. The Challenger 2 system that the
8 British are providing is very good and so is the Leopard 2
9 system. They are all high quality.

10 I think all three of them overmatch anything the
11 Russians currently have, if they fight them together. But
12 at the same time, I am saying that put them together in
13 sets. If you are going to put the Leopard system with it
14 out in the field, put the Marder system, the personnel
15 carrier with it.

16 If you are going to put the Abrams in the field, you
17 put the Bradley with it. The Challenger doesn't really
18 have a sister vehicles as good as ours that is out there.
19 You kind of put the Bradley with it as well. But those
20 systems are very good, and I think they just need to commit
21 to giving those systems.

22 I think the Germans would admit they would prefer not
23 to have the Russians back on their front doorstep again, so
24 push those systems forward. They are all good systems.
25 They overcompensate the Russian systems very, very well.

1 And the Ukrainians can fight those systems. They are good
2 enough. They are smart enough to figure them out.

3 Senator Peters: And they are training them right now.
4 And you mentioned the T-62s that are being refurbished by
5 the Russians. A Leopard will -- is a good match for that
6 one, isn't it?

7 General Kellogg: It is beyond a good match. It is an
8 overmatch, which is okay by me.

9 Senator Peters: Overmatch is always better.

10 General Kellogg: Yes, sir.

11 Senator Peters: Ms. Massicot.

12 Ms. Massicot: I think we need a long term strategy
13 for Ukraine because they have been cut off from receiving
14 all of their Russian equipment. And I think the Leopards
15 are a start in that. I am not sure how the Ukrainians are
16 planning on using those in the year ahead, whether it is
17 keeping them in reserve and keeping them back and putting
18 some of the older equipment forward to engage with the
19 Russians directly.

20 But counteroffensives are hard. They are hard for the
21 Ukrainians. And it is not just tanks that will enable that
22 success. It needs continued U.S., Western -- U.S. and
23 Western intelligence support and planning guidance.

24 Senator Peters: Clearly. You need more than just
25 tanks, you need artillery and you need air support, you

1 need intelligence, all of those factors. And that is just
2 part of the list, long list of what is necessary.

3 One of the weapons systems that is changing warfare
4 dramatically, and I think we saw this in Azerbaijan, was
5 the use of drones. And drone warfare continues to advance
6 pretty rapidly, and we are going to see increased
7 developments as AI systems power drones as well. My
8 question to you is, Iran is now providing drones.

9 Do we have any assessment as to how those drones are
10 being used? Are they effective? Give me a sense of what
11 you think that is bringing to the battlefield, Iran's
12 involvement, working with Russia in regards to drones. Ms.
13 Massicot, do you want to start, and then General Kellogg.

14 Ms. Massicot: Thank you, Senator. Yes, the Shahed
15 drones, they don't exactly have a very large payload, but
16 it is complicating the picture for Ukrainian defenders. In
17 the early days when Russia introduced that capability into
18 Ukraine, the Ukrainians were using surface to air missiles
19 to engage those drones. That is a really quick way to
20 attrite that capability. And they have changed over time.

21 I think they are using anti-aircraft guns now. They
22 are doing other things to bring those down. There are
23 rumors that Russia and Iran are potentially going to open
24 up some kind of production capability inside Russia to
25 create hundreds of those. That is a way for Russia to

1 augment its precision strike capabilities.

2 I mean, again, the payload is very small. They are
3 using it to go after soft targets, cities. It just, it
4 stresses Ukrainian defenses, and I think that is another
5 issue we have to really look at, is the status of Ukrainian
6 air defense interceptor missiles.

7 Senator Peters: Talk a little bit more about the
8 production that you -- we may see in Russia.

9 Ms. Massicot: From what I understand, the rumors in
10 the press, it would be a Iranian, Russian effort to
11 produce, I think, a few hundred drones. That is what I saw
12 in the press.

13 Senator Peters: General Kellogg.

14 General Kellogg: Iran has got a massive drone
15 inventory, and they have figured out how to use these,
16 primarily when they used them against the Saudis. They use
17 kamikaze drones and swarm technology. It would have been
18 putting massive amounts of drones against Ukrainians that
19 they -- that Ukraine just can't manage all of those targets
20 at the same time.

21 So, the fact is they are giving all of these drones,
22 yes, he changes the nature of the battlefield.

23 Individually though, they are effective, but not -- they
24 are not going to change the nature of the battlefield, but
25 you put them in combination with your artillery, your

1 ground forces as well, and it starts to change. It is a
2 new technology. Iranians have perfected it and they are
3 passing that to the Russians.

4 Senator Peters: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

5 Chairman Reed: Thank you very much, Senator Peters.
6 We have been having a discussion about who gives what, how
7 much, etcetera. And, General Kellogg, you have made
8 reference to the Kiel Institute, I believe, in terms of
9 some of your comments, the Kiel Institute for the World
10 Economy.

11 Well, they have an interesting chart that shows, and
12 it is based on gross domestic product, because that is the
13 only, I think, reasonable way to measure the capacity as
14 well as the commitment of a country. In that chart, which
15 I will make available to you, the United States is 10th in
16 its contribution, because what it includes also is the
17 absorption of immigrants.

18 You realize there are millions of Ukrainians who have
19 left. The number one country is Estonia, two is Latvia,
20 three is Poland, four is the Czech Republic, five is
21 Lithuania, six is Slovakia, seven Norway, eight is
22 Bulgaria, nine is the United Kingdom, and the United States
23 is tenth. And Germany, as we have talked about, is
24 fourteenth.

25 So, I think this graphically displays, from a very

1 authoritative source, the level of commitment of our
2 allies, which is astounding. In fact, frankly, I don't
3 think it could be generated in the previous Administration.
4 Indeed, I am still recoiling from President Trump's comment
5 on the day of the invasion that Putin was a genius. Do you
6 believe he is a genius?

7 General Kellogg: I think Putin is not a genius and he
8 has proven that in spades.

9 Chairman Reed: Well, you might have a call with your
10 former boss on that. And also, I think just to clear up a
11 confusion, your earlier response about the aircraft, you
12 made a suggestion which I thought was absolutely brilliant,
13 which is rather than F-16s, more MiGs, which they are
14 familiar with flying, would be a much more adequate
15 platform. Is that true?

16 General Kellogg: The MiG-29s, because they are so
17 familiar with it, is a good aircraft. Is it as good as an
18 American aircraft? No, but it is very effective against
19 the Russians.

20 Chairman Reed: Right. So, in terms of time, essence
21 of being able to move quickly, those M-29s could be flown
22 almost immediately by their pilots?

23 General Kellogg: Yes.

24 Chairman Reed: Well, thank you. I thought the panel
25 was extraordinarily insightful. I want to thank you all,

1 Dr. Stent, Ms. Massicot, General Kellogg. Again, thank you
2 for your service. And as we said before -- thank you, sir.
3 With that, I will adjourn the hearing. Thank you.

4 [Whereupon, at 11:47 a.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25