

Zach and I negate.

Contention One is Oil.

The price of oil has hit an all time low. Reuters '18 writes that the price of oil continues to fall bit by bit to hit a 17 year low.

This trend is set to continue, as Alkhalisi '18 of CNN finds that, despite U.S. discoveries, the price of oil is projected to stay low for the foreseeable future.

However, ending arms sales to Saudi Arabia would jeopardize this new reality, spiking prices in two ways.

First, Threatening Saudi Arabia

Saudi Arabia will respond to cutting arms by hiking oil prices, or cutting the U.S. off entirely, as Niquette '18 of Bloomberg writes that Riyadh has said publicly that, if America takes action against them, Saudi Arabia will spike oil prices by up to \$100. Since Saudi has massive control over oil markets, they choose the global price for the markets by manipulating their oil supply.

Empirically, this has happened before. Business Insider reports, When the US and Saudi Arabia's goal differed from each other in the Israel-Arab war, Saudi Arabia and other OPEC members slashed about a quarter of the total oil production, quadrupling the price.

Hence why, Egan '18 of CNN verifies that Saudi Arabia has the ability to single-handedly engineer another oil shock because its oil industry can afford reduced revenue.

Second, Jeopardizing Deterrence

Cutting off arms sales to Saudi Arabia would embolden Iran. Alasrar '18 director of Cure Violence explains that withdrawing U.S. support from Riyadh would deal a fatal blow to America's regional credibility, inviting Iran to take control of the region.

When emboldened, Turak '18 of CNBC writes that Iran along with its Houthi rebels have threatened to attack oil chokepoints in the Red Sea, which would increase oil prices.

The impact is a Global Famine

As the poor are most reliant on oil for energy, Sugiyarto '14 of the Asian Development Bank explains that rising oil prices reduce household incomes and punish those deepest in poverty.

Even worse, Groppe of USA Today explains that high oil prices increase the price of food, making it inaccessible to the poor and causing widespread famine.

Winnail of the University of Chicago writes that famine increases the probability of conflict and destroys already-destabilized regions; millions will die.

Indeed, Lucas '06 of Purdue University concludes that, due to oil price shocks in 2005, 5% of the world was thrust into poverty in just one year.

On our current path, the OECD '17 projects that global food prices will remain low for at least the next decade.

Contention 2 is a Chance for Peace.

Ryan of the Washington Post in 2018 explains that most of coalition's strategy relies on local ground forces with Saudi Arabia providing air support to those troops.

Alasrar furthers that the removal of US arms will ease the military pressure on the Houthis to negotiate a ceasefire in good faith leaving any peaceful solution in the dust.

The impacts are twofold.

First, Deviating from Peace

Gulf News explains that Houthi rebels have stolen 65% of humanitarian aid that arrives at the port of Hodeida, selling it on the black market at higher prices.

The impact of military pressure is already apparent as the Houthi rebels have changed their course opening up negotiations. Wintour of The Guardian explains three days ago that a key indicator of the Hodeida transition to UN control ceasefire holding is the absence of offensive military operations to take territory and the end of Saudi airstrikes in the area.

Without military pressure, the Houthi's have no reason to negotiate and 3/4ths of Yemen's population will stay in famine like conditions.

Second, Emboldening Iran

Guzansky of Tel Aviv University explains that Iran with a relatively low investment in the Houthi militia, Iran was able to exact a significant economic, military, and diplomatic price from its main regional rival

This is problematic as Anvi '18 of the New York Post explains that abandoning the coalition in Yemen, would hand control of the nation to Iran, and likely embolden Iran to create more regional instability and "an even worse regional catastrophe."

Analyzing the Middle East, the Center for International Crisis '19 found that Iran could potentially start 10 new conflicts harming millions.

Byman '18 of UChicago writes that when Iran gets involved in a region, they always make existing conflicts bloodier. For example, as the Iran-funded Hezbollah entered Syria, the rate of bombings on civilian targets rose, while the groups tactics doubled the number of refugees to 150,000 in areas they controlled.

Thus we negate.