



Written by [Veronika Kyrylenko](#) on August 29, 2025

Trump Administration Transfers \$825 Million in Arms to Ukraine

With peace efforts stalled and [violence in Ukraine](#) rising, the Trump administration doubled down by sending more weapons to Kyiv. On Thursday, the State Department [announced](#) approval for the sale of \$825 million worth of advanced munitions. That brings the total of President Donald Trump's aid to Ukraine to about \$2 billion.

Under the latest deal, Ukraine will receive up to 3,350 Extended Range Attack Munition missiles and as many GPS-based navigation systems to guide them. The package stretches well beyond the missiles themselves. It covers containers and pylons to mount the weapons, spare parts and consumables, and the software needed to operate them. Mission-planning hardware, technical manuals, and both classified and unclassified documentation are included. Ukrainian personnel will also receive training, while U.S. contractors provide engineering, logistics, and transportation support to keep the system running.



Oleksii Liskoni/iStock/Getty Images Plus

Funding comes not only from Washington but also from NATO allies. Denmark, the Netherlands, and Norway will chip in. Contractors [Zone 5 Technologies](#) and [CoAspire](#) are set to build and deliver the systems. For the U.S. defense industry, the war continues to generate steady profits.

Washington's Botched Logic

The State Department claims the deal advances American interests and casts the warring Ukraine as a "stabilizing force,"

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States by improving the security of a partner country that is a force for political stability and economic progress in Europe.

The language is polished, but the reality points elsewhere. First and foremost, continued transfers don't advance a careful or noninterventionist policy of America. Instead, they deepen America's entanglement in a war it cannot end and reinforce an interventionist reflex that has long *harmed* U.S. interests. Far from enhancing security, each new shipment risks drawing Washington into direct confrontation while eroding trust with partners who see the U.S. as fueling escalation rather than fostering peace.



Written by [Veronika Kyrylenko](#) on August 29, 2025

The economic argument is even more fragile. War drains resources, disrupts trade, and drives instability. For Europe, the conflict has brought energy shocks, inflation, and recessionary pressures. For the U.S., it means billions more in spending funded not by surpluses but by debt. Expenditures on war fuel inflation at home, since they demand continuous deficit financing and, in practice, nonstop money printing. Every new appropriation adds to the long-term strain on American households.

Despite official reassurances that no U.S. troops will deploy and “defense readiness will not suffer,” the policy carries hidden costs. What Washington describes as stability looks, in practice, like a cycle of escalation abroad and fiscal burdens at home.

Earlier Transfers

This is not Trump’s first arms transfer to Ukraine since returning to office.

[According to data](#) from the Defense Security Cooperation Agency (DSCA), in May, the administration approved a \$310.5 million package focused on training and sustainment for Ukraine’s incoming F-16 fighter fleet. That deal included spare parts, ground support equipment, and technical assistance. The agency said the goal was to help Ukraine “keep pace with current and future threats” and ensure it could operate and maintain the jets over the long term. It signaled that Washington was not just sending weapons, but investing in Ukraine’s military infrastructure.

By late July, the pace of approvals had accelerated. On July 23 and 24, the State Department cleared four separate deals: \$150 million for Bradley infantry fighting vehicles and maintenance capability, \$172 million for the HAWK Phase III missile system, \$150 million for M109 self-propelled howitzer maintenance, and \$180 million for air-defense sustainment. Together, they totaled \$652 million in just two days.

In early August, the administration added \$99.5 million for transportation and consolidation services and \$104 million for repair and sustainment of M777 howitzers. These smaller packages, though less dramatic than headline missile sales, underscored Washington’s deep involvement in keeping Ukraine’s existing arsenal operational.

NATO Deliveries

The July 23-24 approvals worth \$652 million appeared to mark the rollout of a new delivery mechanism. On July 14, Trump [explained](#) at a press event held with NATO Secretary-General Mark Rutte:

We are going to make top of the line weapons and that will be sent to NATO. NATO may choose to have certain of them sent to other countries where we could get a little additional speed where the country will release something. It will be mostly in the form of a replacement.

In practice, the plan works like this: European allies send weapons from their stockpiles to Ukraine right away, and the U.S. promises to backfill those arsenals later with new, American-made replacements paid for by allied governments. The structure is meant to speed up deliveries and provide flexibility as Ukraine’s needs shift.

Trump stressed that “NATO is paying for the weapons.” Such a framing suggested the U.S. stands outside the alliance, when in reality American taxpayers will ultimately carry much of the burden by funding the replacement contracts.



Written by [Veronika Kyrylenko](#) on August 29, 2025

It is also worth noting that in late July, the bipartisan House Foreign Affairs Committee [advanced](#) [“much-needed” legislation](#) to streamline the U.S. arms-sales process.

“Tough on Russia”

The pattern is not new. To this day, Trump openly brags that he was the first U.S. president to send lethal weapons to Ukraine. In late 2017, his administration approved the sale of Javelin anti-tank missiles, breaking with Barack Obama’s policy of limiting aid to non-lethal items such as body armor, night-vision gear, and blankets. The deal was formally presented to Congress in March 2018, and became central to Trump’s claim that he was “tougher on Russia” than his predecessor.

At the same time, Trump was dismantling agreements meant to stabilize relations with Moscow. The most prominent was the 2019 withdrawal from the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces Treaty, the Reagan-Gorbachev accord that banned an entire class of missiles and had served as a cornerstone of arms control. He also allowed the Open Skies Treaty to collapse, ending joint aerial inspections designed to build trust. Each exit stripped away guardrails that had taken decades to construct.

Washington justified these moves by accusing Russia of violating the treaties’ terms. But if violations were the issue, the logical response would have been to enforce compliance or strengthen verification — not to walk away altogether. Abandoning the treaties signaled a shift back to confrontation rather than cooperation. Combined with the steady flow of lethal aid to and intensified military cooperation with Ukraine, these decisions hardened relations with Russia instead of normalizing them.

Related:

[Foreign-policy Failure](#)



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative,
non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



Subscribe

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.