

We affirm the resolution: The United States should end arms sales to Saudi Arabia.

c1) Stabilizing the Middle East

Cammack in 2018 describes the current tensions in the middle east as the byproduct of antagonisms between Saudi Arabia and Iran. The perception that the United States is giving an advantage to the Saudi Arabians incentivizes Iran to proliferate. Asmar in 2018 reports that the reason why Iran is proliferating is not to embark on active offensive military campaigns but rather to create deterrence against Saudi Arabia, which he described as being fueled by “aggressive world powers” such as the United States. He furthers that as long as they do so, he will “produce or acquire any weapons they need.”

Cammack in 2018 contextualizes this, saying that the United States influx of weapons has “poured fuel on the fire and made conflicts lengthier as well as deadlier” He furthers that in the middle east, arms sales don’t help end wars, “but rather invite a counteraction by opposing states, thereby feeding civil wars rather than extinguishing them.” For example, when the United States started weaponizing Saudi Arabia, Iran responded by militarizing in turn. *When the United States provided weapons for Syrian Rebels, Iran escalated in response.*

c2) Yemen

Saudi Arabia has been conducting a bombing campaign in Yemen since 2015, *supposedly* targeting the Houthi Rebels. However, the BBC in 2018 quantifies that more than 60% of civilian deaths have been the result of Saudi-led air strikes.

Stopping arms sales can alleviate the war in Yemen in two ways

First, cutting off capability

Riedel 2018 from Brookings finds that “The Saudi Air Force *must* get spare parts, technical upgrades, maintenance, [and] expertise, ... from the United States every single day in order to operate [because planes are damaged with air pressure and combat]. If that flow of spare parts came to a close tonight, the Royal Saudi Air Force would be *grounded* tomorrow morning.

This is because Saudi Arabia can’t switch suppliers

Guay 2018 from the Conversation explains that “Military personnel must be retrained on new equipment, spare parts need to be replaced, and operational changes may be necessary.

After being so *reliant* on U.S. weapons systems for decades, the transition costs to buy from another country could be *prohibitive* even for oil-rich Saudi Arabia.

Second, by removing the safety net.

[Trevor Thrall of Cato in 2017](#) confirms that By selling the Saudis weapons, the United States will *embolden* Saudi hawks to continue pressing for a military approach [in Yemen]

This is because US arms sales demonstrate to Saudi Arabia that the US *will* intervene should Riyadh start losing.

Kristof 2018 from the New York Times writes that Saudi Arabia buys our weapons because they come with an *implicit* guarantee that we will bail the Saudis out militarily if they get in trouble with Iran.

As a result of this safety net, the Saudis have no incentive to negotiate in good faith.

Bazzi 2018 from The Atlantic warns that “as long as the coalition believes it can crush the Houthis, there’s little incentive for it to negotiate”

The Stratfor Institute confirms in 2018 that despite negotiations, “the Saudi-led coalition [went through the motions of peace talks *only* so they could have more] diplomatic leeway for an offensive to take [Hodeidah,] Yemen's largest port,.

This continues to happen, as Abdulkarreem from four days ago reports that *even* after Saudi Arabia said that they were going to pull out of Hodeida, they *only* bolstered military offensive there.

As a result, Wintour 2019 from the Guardian finds that the [ceasefire is] on the *verge* of collapse. Furthering that the Saudi-led coalition [has called] for the UN to *declare* the ceasefire is over. [in order] to *renew* their offensive [on Hodeidah]

Removing this safety net makes Saudi Arabia much more likely to *disengage* from the war, because now the costs of losing are much higher.

Bazzi continues, “Saudi Arabia and its allies are more likely to accept a peace process if it is *clear* that the United States won’t support an *open-ended* war in Yemen”

The impact is saving lives

Conflict in Yemen kills people directly as

The Independent 2018 contextualizes that The number of people killed by the violence in **Yemen** has *risen* to over 60,000 since the start of 2016. It has also created a devastating humanitarian crisis because the fighting has made it impossible to get food aid into the country

[Daniel Byrman of Brookings in 2018 explains that](#)

By itself, **an end to the Saudi bombing campaign** and blockade **would be a milestone**. The air strikes have killed thousands of Yemenis, including many children. **The bombing** also **destroyed** much of **Yemen’s** already-tottering **infrastructure, making medical care and food distribution** even more **difficult**. Less visibly, but more deadly, the Saudi blockade of many of Yemen’s ports and airport—done in the name of stopping Iranian arms from entering Yemen—has prevented food and humanitarian aid from entering the country as well. This has contributed to the massive famine.

Thus we affirm.

