# Con Case

#### Brendan and I negate resolved: The United States should end its arms sales to Saudi Arabia, we will support this stance through the following three contentions:

## Contention One: Global Stability:

#### Saudi Arabia is key to security in the Middle East. According to Anthony Cordesmen in 2018 Saudi Arabia is our most important single security partner in the Middle East. In fact, a U.S. presence through arms shipments in the region creates a balance of forces that firmly deters Iran and has helped Saudi Arabia defeat terrorists’ threats. Saudi Arabia’s development is critical to its stability and to the region’s security.

The Hill, Anthony Cordesmen, March 21st, 2018, Anthony H. Cordesman holds the Arleigh A. Burke chair in strategy at the [Center for Strategic and International Studies](https://www.csis.org/) in Washington, D.C. He has served as a consultant on Afghanistan to the [U.S. Department of Defense](https://www.defense.gov/) and the [U.S. Department of State](https://www.state.gov/).https://thehill.com/opinion/international/379542-saudi-arabia-is-a-critical-american-security-partner-in-the-middle-east

Somewhere along the line, we seem to have forgotten that our strategy in the Middle East is dependent on Saudi Arabia as our most important single security partner. Israel’s security is certainly a key American concern, but it does not play an active role in most of America’s ongoing military engagements in the region, in dealing with Iran, or in a direct fight against violent extremist movements like ISIS and Al Qaeda. Saudi Arabia’s role as a strategic partner has also been enhanced by the fact that Egypt and Algeria are focused on their own internal stability and their roles in the region have sharply diminished, and Iraq and Syria both must deal with major instability problems and are at war. Our European allies have declining power projection capabilities, and Turkey’s role in the region is increasingly problematic. It is certainly true that Saudi Arabia needs the United States as much or more than the United States needs Saudi Arabia. Saudi military forces are steadily improving, but it is the U.S. presence in the region that create a balance of forces that firmly deters Iran and has helped Saudi Arabia defeat its own terrorist threats from groups like Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula. U.S. arms shipments, advisory efforts and exercises also play a critical role in improving Saudi forces. But the United States needs Saudi Arabia as well. Saudi Arabia is now the most critical single security partner in ensuring the stable flow of petroleum out of the Gulf region. While the United States is largely eliminating its need for direct petroleum imports, it is steadily increasing its dependence on the health and growth of the global economy and imports from Asian states like China, Japan, South Korea and Taiwan, which are critically dependent on Gulf petroleum exports. The end result is that U.S. strategic interests in the region continue to increase in spite of the steady cut in U.S. direct oil imports. This is why focusing on more U.S. arms sales to Saudi Arabia and Saudi investment in the United States, ignoring the growing role Saudi Arabia has played in fight terrorism since 2003, down playing the need to cooperate in checking Iran, and treating the war in Yemen as is if Saudi Arabia does not face real threats is not the way the United States should deal with Crown Prince Mohammed Bin Salman’s visit to the White House. Saudi Arabia’s reform and economic development plans are critical to its stability and the region’s security. The kingdom needs U.S. encouragement and an understanding that Saudi Arabia cannot implement these plans effectively without outside support. The burden sharing argument has become absurd. Saudi Arabia cannot be treated as a source of ready money every time the United States has a need. It is already spending more than 10 percent of its economy on security, which is three times the economic burden security places on the United States. This spending is too high given the kingdom’s other needs, and the United States should be focusing on better ways to make its security partnerships with Saudi Arabia, as well as the other Gulf states and Jordan more efficient and less costly, not simply on spending more. At the same time, Iran is all too real a threat. Effective joint action in dealing with Iran’s nuclear programs, its ballistic and cruise missile programs, its asymmetric threats to Gulf shipping, and expending military influence in the region are all critical common U.S. and Saudi priorities. The United States also badly needs to find some common approach to dealing with Iraq and Syria that will move both towards recovery and lasting stability, limit Iranian and Russian influence as much as possible, and help stabilize relations with Turkey. There are no easy options in either case, but Saudi Arabia is the key potential Arab partner any such efforts. The United States, especially members of Congress, needs to remember that we have had at least as many military problems in fighting the Iraq and Syria wars as Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates have faced in fighting in Yemen. Cutting U.S. arms shipments to Saudi Arabia may do little more that lead the Saudis to ignore the systems that the United States has helped set up to limit targeting of civilians and using unguided and more damaging air munitions. It raises a whole new round of questions about the U.S commitment to its partners in the region. We need to forge a common solution in Yemen, not a decoupling that leaves Saudi Arabia exposed. This would fail in both military and human rights terms, and leaves both the United States and Saudi Arabia with no options for dealing with the Houthi or Iran, seeking ways to end the war, dealing with Al Qaida or the other terrorist movements in Yemen, and without any means to help Yemen back to some form of stability and development. These challenges are also are reasons why the United States should do as much as possible to persuade Mohammed Bin Salman to end the divisions that have led Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates to split with Qatar, and to rising tensions with Oman. More unity between the southern Gulf states in dealing with Iran and terrorism can do far more to help the United states than more arms sales. Finally, more interoperability, common facilities and cooperation are key to countering Iran. We need to take this visit seriously, and stop focusing on pomp and deals. The United States is highly unlikely to find a better Saudi leader for reform and change in Saudi Arabia during the next decade, or one more committed to improving Saudi security in ways that serve the common interests of both the United States and Saudi Arabia.

#### But if America removes itself from the situation, Iran and Saudi Araba fall into direct conflict. Peter Zeihan writes for the Patterson School of Economics in 2017 that Iran and Saudi Arabia fall into direct competition when the U.S. removes itself from the situation. When this happens, that competition turns violent and into an Iranian invasion of Saudi Arabia. Without American protection, the Saudi government will be forced to respond by seeking extreme measures to purchase nuclear weapons from Pakistan, which has over 150 nuclear weapons and is more than happy to sell them.

Peter Zeihan, March 13th ,2017, “How Shale is Reshaping the World,” <https://www.valuewalk.com/2017/03/shale-reshaping-world-three-new-wars/> Peter Zeihan is a geopolitical strategist who specializes in global energy, demographics and security. He analyzes the realities of geography and populations to deepen the understanding of how global politics impact markets and economic trends. , Patterson School of Economics.

Conflict number two is Iran vs. Saudi Arabia in the Persian Gulf. If the Americans remove themselves from keeping those two powers (Iran and Saudi Arabia) apart because America no longer cares about keeping oil flows out of the Persian Gulf safe then those two countries fall into direct competition. Eventually, that competition turns into an attempted Iranian invasion of Saudi Arabia. GC: How does that play out? PZ: There’s a 300-mile desert gap between Kuwait and the oil fields of Saudi Arabia, and it’s not clear that the Iranians can make it across. What the Saudis are doing right now in Yemen is target practice for that, they’re preparing, learning to use their military equipment, particularly their air force, to turn that northern desert buffer into a kill zone. Right now, they are doing it pretty well. Will it be enough? I don’t know. The Saudis would rather not face a war at all, but they know that in a post-Bretton Woods world, without American protection, over time the Iranians will bury them. So just as the Russians feel that they’re on a limited time scale to create more sustainable borders, the Saudis feel they’re on a limited time scale to crush Iran. The 2015-2016 oil price war then wasn’t really about shale, it was about Persia. And to be perfectly blunt, it hasn’t worked as well as the Saudis hoped. GC: So will the Saudis try to develop nuclear weapons? PZ: No, if it comes to that, Saudi Arabia will just buy them. They can get them from Pakistan and that conversation has already happened. Pakistan has 150 nuclear weapons, and if they can sell them for $1 billion a pop, they are happy to do it. The Saudis are already providing them with subsidized oil in order to make sure that those lines of communication never close. Assuming no one else gets caught in the crossfire, that’s potentially another 11 million barrels per day of crude off the market when these two countries go at it. And if other countries get caught in the crossfire, it goes up to 20 million barrels per day. So the Persian Gulf is War #2. GC: Is it connected or disconnected from the Russian war? PZ: Disconnected. It could start any time, it could start tomorrow. When the Iranians realize what the Saudis are up to and that it can kill them, that’s when this war begins.

#### This conflict has damaging consequences for the region and the globe. Wayne Croley writes in 2019 that a war between Iran and Saudi Arabia would require participation of the United States to assist Saudi Arabia in defeating Iran. During the conflict, the price of oil would skyrocket around the globe. The inflationary shock of skyrocketing oil prices would inflict severe economic damage to many countries around the globe. This includes China, the U.S., and Japan. The shock could lead to a severe global recession or even a global economic depression.

Wayne Croley, ProphecyProof.org, <https://www.prophecyproof.org/war-saudi-arabia-iran-scenario/>, 2019,  Holds an M.B.A. (concentrating in Finance), a bachelor’s degree in Managerial Economics, and a bachelor’s degree in Political Science.

Saudi Arabia and Iran are countries that do not like each other. I had a conversation with someone a while back about what would happen if Iran and Saudi Arabia were to ever go to war with each other. The conversation was so interesting that I thought I should share some of the things mentioned. The following items are some events/developments that could happen if Saudi Arabia and Iran were to go to war with each other in the future. A war between Saudi Arabia and Iran would unlikely be limited to just these two countries. The Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) is an organization consisting of six countries that are located near the Persian Gulf, including: Bahrain, Qatar, Kuwait, Oman, the United Arab Emirates, and Saudi Arabia. The GCC runs the Peninsula Shield, a joint-defense force whose purpose is to protect GCC member countries. A war between Iran and Saudi Arabia would likely require the participation of the Peninsula Shield in the defense of Saudi Arabia. The U.S. probably would get involved to help Saudi Arabia defeat Iran since the U.S. wants to see regime change in Iran. Israel probably would prefer to let Saudi Arabia and others work to bring down the Iranian regime than to get directly involved themselves because they risk being attacked if they get involved. However, the probable involvement of the U.S. could make the Iranian regime suspect that Israel orchestrated events or is playing a role in the conflict (the Iranian regime believes that Israel and the U.S. work together against their interests). Therefore, it would not be a surprise if Iran attacks Israel if the U.S. gets involved in the war. An attack on Israel would give Israel’s leaders little choice but to retaliate against its attacker(s). You could see Syria and Hezbollah get involved if Israel gets involved. Iran has [a defense treaty with Syria where they agree to join forces against Israel](http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0%2C7340%2CL-3818639%2C00.html). Syria also has a [a defense pact with Hezbollah](http://www.jpost.com/MiddleEast/Article.aspx?id=186456)where each side agrees to come the other’s aid in case of war against Israel. A war between Saudi Arabia and Iran would likely stoke sectarian tensions throughout the Middle East since the war would represent a war between Sunni (Saudi Arabia) and Shia (Iran). There would likely be a Shia uprising in the oil-rich provinces of eastern Saudi Arabia. Yemen, Lebanon, and Kuwait also could see unrest as they each have a sizable Shia population. OPEC could be in disarray since member countries like Saudi Arabia and Iran would be at war with each other. The price of oil would likely skyrocket due to concerns about the security of the oil fields & oil infrastructure in both Saudi Arabia and Iran and concerns about Iran shutting down the strait of Hormuz, which is a location where a substantial amount of the world’s daily oil supply travels through. Oil prices could remain elevated for an extended period of time after the conflict ends if there is significant damage to oil fields or oil infrastructure in either country. The inflationary shock of skyrocketing oil prices would likely inflict severe economic damage to many countries around the world, particularly those that import a lot of oil (i.e. China, the U.S., and Japan). The shock could lead to a severe global recession or even a global depression if prices remain elevated for an extended period of time. We could see increased political volatility worldwide from any severe economic downturn that may result from a war between Saudi Arabia and Iran since the state of the economy often drives people’s satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the leaders in power. Poor global economic conditions would likely stoke widespread dissatisfaction with the leaders in power. The widespread dissatisfaction with the leaders in power would translate to a strong anti-incumbent vote in countries that hold democratic elections and anti-government protests in countries that do not allow democratic elections. In sum, a war between Saudi Arabia and Iran would be a major event that would have a lot of adverse consequences worldwide. A war between Saudi Arabia and Iran would likely lead to severe Middle East turmoil, severe global economic turmoil, and increased political volatility worldwide.

#### A war between Saudi Arabia and Iran would be a major event that would have severe consequences worldwide. This includes severe Middle East turmoil, severe global economic turmoil, and increased political volatility worldwide. Vote CON to assure this doesn’t happen.

## Contention Two: Influence:

#### In the status quo, Russia is pushing U.S. influence in the Middle East to the brink. The Brookings Institute writes in 2018 that Russia is increasingly emerging as an enemy of the U.S., not just a rival, especially in the Middle East where Moscow has vastly expanded its influence. Russia has offered to sell weapons and the dominant U.S. position in the Middle East has slipped. Further competition with Russia throughout the Middle East would be a misstate.

Daniel L. Byman, Brookings Institute, April 13th,2018. “Pushing Back Russia from the Middle East: A Thought Experment”, <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2018/04/13/pushing-back-russia-in-the-middle-east-a-thought-experiment/>, Daniel Byman is a senior fellow in the [Center for Middle East Policy](https://www.brookings.edu/legacy/4DC53AD8-689C-4664-BB83-27886C4DB20F) at Brookings, and a Georgetown University, Professor.

Russia is increasingly emerging as an enemy of the United States, not just a rival. Although President Trump generally seems to oppose any attempt to confront Russia—with the exception of a tweet this week in which he warned the Kremlin to “[get ready](https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/984022625440747520)”—it’s worth considering how a more strategically minded administration might do so, particularly in the Middle East, where Moscow has vastly expanded its influence. During the height of the Cold War, the United States reflexively opposed the Soviet Union and the spread of communism. In addition to shoring up allies in Europe and Japan, the United States often sought to hinder or roll back Moscow’s influence in parts of Africa and Asia, regardless of the minor strategic significance of the areas in question. In the Middle East, the U.S. opposition to the Soviet Union often manifested in efforts to sway and topple governments in Iraq and Syria and a competition for influence in Egypt, among other locations. At the Cold War’s end, the Soviet Union maintained some interest in and influence over Algeria, Iraq, Libya, Syria, and South Yemen (the last of which would soon enter history’s dustbin). Yet for the most part, the United States had run the board, with close partnerships with key states such as Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Morocco, and Egypt as well as Israel and Turkey, the region’s military powerhouses. These close relationships continued after the Cold War’s end, and the United States even improved relations with several of Moscow’s former clients. The dominant U.S. position in the Middle East slipped under President Obama. Skeptical of intervention in the Middle East and [unsympathetic to long-standing allies like Saudi Arabia](https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2016/04/the-obama-doctrine/471525/), the Obama administration tried to keep its distance from the region. Although the United States intervened in response to the Islamic State’s atrocities against the Yazidis and the broader concerns about terrorism, the Obama team still tried to avoid [greater entanglement in Syria](https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2014/01/27/going-the-distance-david-remnick), [distanced itself from Egypt](http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/nationworld/ct-egypt-el-sissi-white-house-visit-20170402-story.html) after the 2013 coup, [soured on Netanyahu’s government in Israel](https://www.nytimes.com/2016/12/23/world/middleeast/israel-benjamin-netanyahu-barack-obama.html) and limited efforts to deal with trouble spots like [Libya](https://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/20/world/middleeast/us-airstrike-isis-libya.html) and [Yemen](https://www.npr.org/2015/03/27/395817273/white-house-strategy-in-yemen-represents-model-counterterrorism-strategy) to a narrow counterterrorism mission. Even the administration’s successes, like the Iran deal, seemed to alienate many traditional American friends. U.S. credibility in the region fell, and many leaders were [glad to see Obama go](https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/national/obama-legacy/middle-east-relations.html). Moscow entered into the void created by the decline in the U.S. position. Russia [backed its Syrian ally](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/03/08/world/europe/russia-syria-assad.html) when Syrian President Bashar al-Assad was on the ropes, helping Assad’s government survive and slowly turning the tide against an opposition that Washington nominally championed. Moscow delivered for its allies and [claimed victory](https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2018/02/russia-syria-putin-assad-trump-isis-ghouta/554270/) as the Islamic State receded and the Syrian state recaptured much of its lost, though now devastated, territory. Moscow has also made inroads with former U.S. stalwarts: President Vladimir Putin recently visited Turkey, probably [to coordinate the crushing](https://www.wsj.com/articles/turkey-and-russia-forge-bond-as-trump-weighs-syria-exit-1522920601?redirect=amp) of the Syrian Kurds who were the tip of the U.S. spear against the Islamic State. Russia also offered to sell advanced weapons. King Salman of Saudi Arabia, whose country had long scorned Russia, traveled to Moscow last October to talk about shoring up the [price of oil.](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-russia-saudi-terror/russia-saudi-arabia-cement-new-friendship-with-kings-visit-idUSKBN1CA1QU) Ideologically, Russia also fits in well with the Middle East. Putin, an autocrat himself, is comfortable with dictators and resents what he perceives as U.S. democracy promotion—a position that dictators in the Middle East also share. As Steven Cook [notes](http://foreignpolicy.com/2018/03/16/the-middle-east-needs-a-steady-boyfriend/), “Now it’s payback time for almost three decades of Moscow’s humiliation. And what better place to start than the Middle East, where the United States is already widely resented even among its allies.” Related [What the U.S. withdrawal from Syria means for ISIS, Iran, and Kurdish allies](https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2018/12/21/what-the-u-s-withdrawal-from-syria-means-for-isis-iran-and-kurdish-allies/) [Shuffling the deck chairs in Saudi Arabia](https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2018/12/28/shuffling-the-deck-chairs-in-saudi-arabia/) [Who are the Houthis, and why are we at war with them?](https://www.brookings.edu/blog/markaz/2017/12/18/who-are-the-houthis-and-why-are-we-at-war-with-them/) Although many of Trump’s advisers view Russia skeptically, the president remains eager to coddle Putin, [praising him](https://www.wsj.com/articles/trump-calls-putin-to-congratulate-russian-president-on-election-win-1521564314) for winning a fixed election, [denying evidence of Russian meddling](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/02/18/us/politics/fact-check-trump-russian-meddling-election.html) in U.S. elections, and [avoiding public criticism](https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2017/08/why-wont-trump-criticize-putin/536556/) of the Russian dictator [even as Trump lambastes longstanding U.S. allies](https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/top-us-officials-tell-the-world-to-ignore-trumps-tweets/2018/02/18/bc605236-14a2-11e8-942d-16a950029788_story.html?utm_term=.442644e65d06). To be clear,(further) across-the-board competition with Russia throughout the Middle East would be a mistake. The United States worked with Russia to secure the Iran deal, and even in Syria, where Washington and Moscow have been on different sides, there is a role for working together to try to forge a peace deal. But what if the president changed his policy in general, and United States sought to push back on Russian influence in the region? Here are several steps to consider. One U.S. measure might be to step up anti-regime efforts in Syria, whether by increasing aid to the opposition, having more boots on the ground, or otherwise increasing America’s role. At the very least, the United States would not withdraw from Syria and would work with local Kurdish allies and otherwise maintain a stake in the country. Providing reconstruction aid would also allow the United States to outcompete local actors. The Syrian regime, working with Iran and Russia, is [consolidating control](https://syria.liveuamap.com/en/time/02.04.2018) in parts of Syria that the United States and its local allies helped liberate from the Islamic State as well as pushing back the Syrian opposition in other areas. Hindering this consolidation would limit the power of a key Russian ally and demonstrate to the regime’s foes, like Saudi Arabia, that the United States is willing to take steps that are politically difficult and involve a long-term U.S. role in the region. Trump, however, seems [eager to remove](https://www.cnn.com/2018/03/29/politics/trump-withdraw-syria-pentagon/index.html) the U.S. presence from Syria as soon as possible. Related Books [Tariff Negotiation and Renegotiation](https://www.brookings.edu/book/tariff-negotiation-and-renegotiation/) By [Anwarul Hoda](https://www.brookings.edu/search/Anwarul%2BHoda/) 2018 [Competition Policy, Intellectual Property Rights and Trade in an Interdependent World Economy](https://www.brookings.edu/book/competition-policy-intellectual-property-rights-and-trade-in-an-interdependent-world-economy/) By [Robert D. Anderson](https://www.brookings.edu/search/Robert%2BD.%2BAnderson/), [Nuno Pires De Carvalho](https://www.brookings.edu/search/Nuno%2BPires%2BDe%2BCarvalho/), and [Antony Taubman](https://www.brookings.edu/search/Antony%2BTaubman/) 2018 [Competition Policy, Intellectual Property Rights and Trade in an Interdependent World Economy](https://www.brookings.edu/book/competition-policy-intellectual-property-rights-and-trade-in-an-interdependent-world-economy-2/) By [Robert D. Anderson](https://www.brookings.edu/search/Robert%2BD.%2BAnderson/), [Nuno Pires De Carvalho](https://www.brookings.edu/search/Nuno%2BPires%2BDe%2BCarvalho/), and [Antony Taubman](https://www.brookings.edu/search/Antony%2BTaubman/) 2018 If a greater military role is too much, more diplomacy might be attempted though, without force to back it, it would be far less effective. No matter how the Syrian conflict ends, some deal will occur (either due to stalemate, an Assad victory, Assad controlling a portion of the country, or somehow a resurgence by the rebels) and the United States must determine how to engage with the post-war regime. The United States could play a stronger role in preparing for this now. As [the most recent round of peace talks](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/14/world/middleeast/syria-peace-talks-un.html) dissolved in December, it became clear that only Russia could bring Assad to the table. Holding Russia’s feet to the fire in the peace deal while also emphasizing that any deal must have U.S. backing would increase U.S. influence in the region. The United States might also try to ingratiate itself with longstanding U.S. allies, warts and all. That would mean looking the other way as the Erdogan regime in Turkey steadily transforms the once-promising democracy into a dictatorship. In Egypt, the United States would work with the Sisi regime and offer full-throated military aid, forgetting that the Egyptian leader came to power in a coup. In Saudi Arabia, the Trump administration’s efforts to cozy up to the regime have gained it Riyadh’s goodwill, and the Netanyahu government in Israel also appreciates the Trump administration’s uncritical support. These efforts would continue. More importantly, though more ineffably, the United States would also try to exert leadership in the region beyond counterterrorism. This might involve getting allies to work together instead of egging them on when they clash, as the Trump administration regrettably did when Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates stepped up pressure and isolated Qatar. The United States should lead efforts to negotiate ends to the region’s many wars and, in so doing, show its diplomatic power and reduce openings for Russia to exploit. If Trump is determined to limit U.S. involvement in the Middle East, another approach is to do what Russia does so well: escalate elsewhere. One reason that Russia has been able to become so aggressive in the Middle East is that it can continue influencing its former satellite states without strong pushback from the United States and its allies. By trying to increase U.S. influence on Russia’s periphery—but remaining willing to limit this if Russia in turn backs off in the Middle East—the United States could gain leverage. At the very least, the Trump administration should try to stop Russia’s influence from growing in the Middle East, effectively containing it and ideally reversing it in new areas. Russia’s inroads in the region extend beyond Syria. While Putin had a better hand to play in Syria due to the long-standing relationship between Damascus and Moscow, Russia [lacks the same affinity for Libya](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/02/07/world/africa/trump-libya-policy-russia.html), especially the U.N.-backed Government of National Accord, even though it is trying to increase influence there. Algeria might also be a place to try to increase U.S. influence, though the prickly regime there has often rebuffed U.S. efforts to improve relations and might simply play Washington off Moscow, increasing the cost to the United States with little influence to show in the end. The Trump administration has evinced little desire to push back against Russia in the Middle East or elsewhere, so I don’t expect any change. Moreover, some of the above policy options hinder other goals, such as restarting the peace process or limiting U.S. casualties. All require the United States to become more involved in a troubled region where U.S. policy has often failed —and a few might just be too nauseating to take. What’s more, Russia’s response to U.S. pressure has been far from predictable. Sanctions on Ukraine did not lead Moscow to back down—quite the opposite. But given Russia’s rise and the threat it poses to the United States across an array of regions, a time may come when the United States may want to regain its strong position in the Middle East and diminish that of its rising enemy, and worth weighing the options and their limits before we move forward.

#### By eliminating arms sales, Russian leaders say Moscow is willing to fill in the U.S. void if need be. Kevin Sullivan writes for the Washington Post in 2018, that Business ties between the U.S. and Saudi Arabia are far too valuable to be disrupted. In fact, what worries him the most is that Russia would be the beneficiaries of any American reluctance to do business in Saudi Arabia. As an American it concerns me to see that Russia is jumping on this opportunity as Americans back out. But furthermore, Mark Garber, the Russian chairman of a Moscow- based investment firm says that “Russia is ready to fill the void of American firms leave.”

Kevin Sullivan, October 23rd, 2018, The Washington Post, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/middle_east/despite-khashoggi-case-us-firms-and-saudi-prince-show-up-at-davos-in-the-desert/2018/10/23/a726ec8a-d6d1-11e8-8384-bcc5492fef49_story.html?utm_term=.26b04f8cf927>, Education: University of New Hampshire, BA; Georgetown University, Japanese, 1994-1995; John S. Knight Fellowship, Stanford University, Spanish, 1999-2000Kevin Sullivan is a Pulitzer Prize-winning senior correspondent and associate editor.

RIYADH, Saudi Arabia — Gathered under grand domes and crystal chandeliers for a glitzy investment forum nicknamed “Davos in the Desert,” business leaders on Tuesday called the death of Saudi journalist Jamal Khashoggi terrible and sad but said it shouldn’t derail their dealmaking or U.S.-Saudi relations. They knew that Saudi agents killed Khashoggi three weeks ago at the Saudi Consulate in Istanbul. And they knew that their host, [Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman](https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/the-dashing-prince-with-a-dark-and-bullying-side/2018/10/13/61f64ea0-ce41-11e8-a360-85875bac0b1f_story.html?tid=sm_tw&utm_term=.83020ad84116), was widely suspected of being involved, despite vehement official denials. Marquee-name sponsors and chief executives, including Jamie Dimon of JPMorgan Chase, Stephen Schwarzman of Blackstone and AOL founder Steve Case, had pulled out in protest. The conference website was [crippled Monday by hackers](https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2018/10/22/saudi-investment-conferences-website-has-been-hacked-taken-down/?utm_term=.cfdb23801078) angry about Khashoggi’s killing. But thousands still came, in a wave of black Mercedes-Benzes and Chevrolet Suburbans, through the conference center’s enormous stone archways and past elegant fountains, with security agents manning a machine gun mounted atop a Dodge Ram pickup. And when Mohammed arrived, they gave him a standing ovation. American executives interviewed at the conference said they were jolted by Khashoggi’s gruesome killing. But they also said business ties between the United States and Saudi Arabia are far too valuable to be disrupted by it. Kellyanne Conway: Trump is not 'slow-moving' in response to Khashoggi death Several members of Congress on Nov. 18 expressed a desire to take a hard line with Saudi Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman over the killing of Jamal Khashoggi. (Patrick Martin /The Washington Post) A U.S. executive who advises sovereign wealth funds said that although the Khashoggi case was “shocking,” ultimately it would be only a “hiccup” in the business world. “You support your friends in good times and bad,” the executive said. “The trajectory [in Saudi Arabia] is toward more openness and transparency, but there are going to be bumps in the road.” He, like others, spoke on the condition of anonymity because of the sensitivity of the subject. [[Turkish president says killing of Jamal Khashoggi was ‘planned’](https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/turkeys-president-to-deliver-speech-expected-to-describe-how-khashoggi-was-killed/2018/10/22/4098c300-d60c-11e8-8384-bcc5492fef49_story.html?utm_term=.5796244d9c7e)] Todd Albert Nims, a Texan who lives in Riyadh and runs a filmmaking company, said he was born in Saudi Arabia, the son of an oil company executive, and has spent “half my life” in the country. Nims said the [killing of Khashoggi](https://qz.com/1427352/the-timeline-of-jamal-khashoggis-disappearance-and-alleged-murder/), who contributed opinion columns to The Washington Post, was “horrifying” but should not damage U.S. relations with Saudi Arabia. Kellyanne Conway: Trump is not 'slow-moving' in response to Khashoggi death Several members of Congress on Nov. 18 expressed a desire to take a hard line with Saudi Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman over the killing of Jamal Khashoggi. (Patrick Martin /The Washington Post) “It’s not who these people are,” he said. “Saudi Arabia has been a friend. They have been a huge stabilizer in this region. We shouldn’t trash it all over one thing. It’s like a marriage. This is one day in the life of a marriage.” President Trump has said [Khashoggi’s killing must be investigated](https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/trump-satisfied-saudi-response-khashoggi-killing-risk-arms/story?id=58670976), but he has stopped short of criticizing Mohammed, who has close ties to Jared Kushner, Trump’s adviser and son-in-law. Trump has said he does not want the incident to interfere with billions of dollars in U.S. arms sales to Saudi Arabia. Reflecting Trump’s ambivalence, Treasury Secretary [Steven Mnuchin canceled his scheduled appearance](https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/2018/10/22/mnuchin-meets-with-saudi-crown-prince-mohammed-bin-salman-despite-outcry-over-governments-role-journalists-death/?utm_term=.a39b26eccc7b) at the conference but came to Riyadh anyway and met with Mohammed on Monday. On Tuesday, Mohammed posed for selfies with delegates, and he sat with Jordan’s King Abdullah II during a panel discussion. Chief executives attending the conference include Patrick Pouyanné of the French oil company Total and Paal Kibsgaard of Texas-based Schlumberger, the world’s largest oil-field-services company. The event, officially called the Future Investment Initiative, an annual gathering that started last year, was a feast of gaudy Saudi excess. It was held under the sandstone domes of the King Abdul Aziz International Conference Center, in a vast main hall where waiting on every seat was a large hardcover book titled, “A Blue Print for the Twenty Second Century.” [[CIA director flies to Turkey amid controversy over Khashoggi killing](https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/cia-director-flies-to-turkey-amid-growing-controversy-over-jamal-khashoggi-killing/2018/10/22/47d406d9-9f36-49fc-a187-a9a495b70a62_story.html?utm_term=.1d2a251f7d34)] As the lights went down in the packed hall, an actor on stage danced with a lighted drone flying above him. A voice boomed from massive speakers, mentioning Marie Curie, Thomas Edison, the Wright brothers and Mark Zuckerberg: “dreamers.” “The next generation of game changers is here, in this room,” the voice said to the vast crowd. The opening was filled with loud music, laser lights and video on big screens. But, for a moment, the great hall was also filled with Jamal Khashoggi. Lubna Olayan, an influential Saudi business leader, stepped to the stage to moderate the first panel discussion. But first, she told the audience that she had known the journalist and said, “May he rest in peace.” “I want to tell all our foreign guests, for whose presence with us this morning we are very grateful, that the terrible acts reported in recent weeks are alien to our culture and our DNA,” she said. “And I’m confident that with the support of the government, concerned authorities and leadership, the truth will emerge. I am sure that we will grow and emerge stronger as a result of the crisis of the last few weeks.” When she finished, a tentative round of applause rippled through the crowd, as though people weren’t sure whether it was okay to clap about a murder investigation. But then it was down to business, and she began moderating a panel discussion about sovereign wealth funds. Many people seemed just as happy to mingle in the cavernous halls outside, amid long tables filled with fresh juices, coffee and hillocks of pastries. “Last year, there was a real air of intensity and emotion, and the excitement was wall to wall. But this year has been a little suppressed,” said Tarik Solomon, an official with the American Business Group of Riyadh. Still, he said, there were “lots of executives here, and deals are still being cut.” Many people said that although some chief executives had dropped out, most had sent ­lower-ranking executives. [[Khashoggi death throws new light on Saudi prince’s crackdown on dissent](https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/middle_east/khashoggi-death-throws-new-light-on-saudi-princes-crackdown-on-dissent/2018/10/22/8b9b72da-d56c-11e8-8384-bcc5492fef49_story.html?utm_term=.23b93e2960cd)] In the crowded hall, nametags identified people from Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, India, Pakistan, Britain, Canada and China. The Americans were more scarce. “You’re the first American I’ve seen!” a U.S. executive said when approached by a Post reporter. The Khashoggi case “is a Saudi matter at the end of the day,” said a different American, a financial services executive from the East Coast. “It’s unfortunate, obviously, and we hope the regime will listen and change,” he said. “But they do things their own way here.” He also said he thought the Khashoggi matter was small compared with the huge amounts of investment and trade between the two nations. He said it would not be a long-term problem. “Knowing how the news works, by next Wednesday, it will be something else,” he said. Nims, the film producer, also said he worried that Russia and China would be the beneficiaries of any American reluctance to do business in Saudi Arabia. “As an American, it concerns me that I see Russia and China jumping on this opportunity as Americans back out,” he said. Mark Garber, the Russian chairman of GHP Group, a ­Moscow-based investment firm, smiled when asked whether Russia and China (is)were ready to fill the void in Saudi Arabia if American firms leave. “I think there are real opportunities here. A lot of Americans have pulled away.”

#### This is problematic because we must strive to maintain our influence because our leadership has been the single greatest force for peace the world has ever known. According Barnett of the U.S. Naval War College in 2011, America introduced globalization that resulted in democracy, human rights, liberation for women, doubling of life expectancy, tenfold global GDP increase, and a 99% reduction in death due to conflict.

Thomas P.M. Barnett 11 Former Senior Strategic Researcher and Professor in the Warfare Analysis & Research Department, Center for Naval Warfare Studies, U.S. Naval War College American military geostrategist and Chief Analyst at Wikistrat., worked as the Assistant for Strategic Futures in the Office of Force Transformation in the Department of Defense, “The New Rules: Leadership Fatigue Puts U.S., and Globalization, at Crossroads,” March 7 http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/8099/the-new-rules-leadership-fatigue-puts-u-s-and-globalization-at-crossroads

It is worth first examining the larger picture: **We live in a time of arguably the greatest structural change in the global order yet endured**, **with this historical moment's most amazing feature being its** relative and absolute **lack of mass violence**. That is something to consider when Americans contemplate military intervention in Libya, because if we do take the step to prevent larger-scale killing by engaging in some killing of our own, we will not be adding to some fantastically imagined global death count stemming from the ongoing "megalomania" and "evil" of American "empire." We'll be engaging in the same sort of system-administering activity that has marked our **stunningly successful stewardship of global order** since World War II. Let me be more blunt: **As the guardian of globalization**, **the U.S. military has been the greatest force for peace the world has ever known**. Had America been removed from the global dynamics that governed the 20th century, the mass murder never would have ended. Indeed, it's entirely conceivable there would now be no identifiable human civilization left, once nuclear weapons entered the killing equation. But the **world did not keep sliding down that path of perpetual war**. **Instead, America stepped up and changed everything by ushering in our now-perpetual great-power peace**. **We introduced the international liberal trade order known as globalization** and played loyal Leviathan over its spread. **What resulted was the collapse of empires, an explosion of democracy**, the **persistent spread of human rights**, the liberation of women, **the doubling of life expectancy**, a roughly **10-fold increase in adjusted global GDP** **and a profound and persistent reduction in battle deaths from state-based conflicts.** That is what American "hubris" actually delivered. Please remember that the next time some TV pundit sells you the image of "unbridled" American military power as the cause of global disorder instead of its cure. With self-deprecation bordering on self-loathing, we now imagine a post-American world that is anything but. Just watch who scatters and who steps up as the Facebook revolutions erupt across the Arab world. While we might imagine ourselves the status quo power, we remain the world's most vigorously revisionist force. **¶** As for the sheer "evil" that is our military-industrial complex, again, let's examine what the world looked like before that establishment reared its ugly head. **The last great period of global structural change was the first half of the 20th century, a period that saw a death toll of about 100 million across two world wars.** That comes to an average of 2 million deaths a year in a world of approximately 2 billion souls. Today, with far more comprehensive worldwide reporting, researchers report an average of less than 100,000 battle deaths annually in a world fast approaching 7 billion people. Though admittedly crude**, these calculations suggest a 90 percent absolute drop and a 99 percent relative drop in deaths due to war. We are clearly headed for a world order characterized by multipolarity,** something the American-birthed system was designed to both encourage and accommodate. **But given how things turned out the last time we collectively faced such a fluid structure, we would do well to keep U.S. power, in all of its forms, deeply embedded in the geometry to come.¶** To continue the historical survey, after salvaging Western Europe from its half-century of civil war, **the U.S. emerged as the progenitor of a new, far more just form of globalization -- one based on actual free trade rather than colonialism.** America then successfully replicated globalization further in East Asia over the second half of the 20th century, **setting the stage for the Pacific Century now unfolding.**

#### By ending arms sales to Saudi Arabia, the U.S. would be allowing Russia to take vast control over influence in the country and region. Make sure this doesn’t happen with a negative ballot.

## Contention Three: Terrorism:

#### The U.S.-Saudi Arabia coalition is critical in fighting terrorism. The U.S. Department of State writes in 2018 that Saudi Arabia plays a crucial role in maintaining security in the Middle East, due to its economic, political, and cultural importance and its strategic location. As a result of U.S. security cooperation, the kingdom has foiled numerous terrorist attempts against Saudi and foreign targets, as well has been able to successfully deter external attacks.

BUREAU OF POLITICAL-MILITARY AFFAIRS, October 16, 2018, U.S. State Department. https://www.state.gov/t/pm/rls/fs/2018/279540.htm

Saudi Arabia plays a crucial role in maintaining security in the Middle East, due to its economic, political, and cultural importance and its strategic location. Given the complex and dynamic security challenges facing the region, which include countering violent extremism from the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) as well as other extremist groups, the United States works with Saudi Arabia to support counterterrorism efforts and our shared interest in regional stability. In addition, building on the May 2017 Riyadh Summit, we are working to increase cooperation on maritime security, military preparedness, arms transfers, and cybersecurity. As a result of U.S. security cooperation, the Kingdom has foiled numerous terrorist attempts against Saudi and foreign targets, and has been able to successfully deter external attacks. The United States remains committed to providing the Saudi armed forces with the equipment, training, and follow-on support necessary to protect Saudi Arabia, and the region, from the destabilizing effects of terrorism, countering Iranian influence, and other threats. Toward that end, the United States will continue to collaborate with Saudi Arabia to improve training for special operations and counterterrorism forces, integrate air and missile defense systems, strengthen cyber defenses, and bolster maritime security. Saudi Arabia is the United States’ largest foreign military sales (FMS) customer, with over $114 billion in active cases. With the signing of the May 2017 $110 billion agreement to pursue Saudi Armed Forces modernization by President Trump and King Salman, we expect a significant increase in FMS and DCS cases. To date this initiative resulted in over $14.5 billion in implemented FMS cases. In January 2017, the United States approved a possible FMS case to Saudi Arabia for a Persistent Threat Detection System (PTDS), also known as a 74K Aerostat System, for an estimated cost of $525 million. In May 2017, the United States approved an FMS sale to Saudi Arabia for continuation of a naval blanket order training program for an estimated cost of $250 million. In June 2017, the United States approved the continuation of a blanket order training program that includes flight training, technical training, professional military education, specialized training, mobile training teams, and English language training, valued at $750 million. In June 2017, the United States approved a possible sale of 26 AN/TPQ-53(V) Radar Systems and related training and equipment for an estimated cost of $930 million. As part of a Saudi Arabia eastern fleet modernization, in October 2017, the United States implemented a $6 billion FMS case for a 4 ship Multi-Mission Surface Combatant program. In October 2017, the United States approved the potential sale of 44 Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) launchers, 360 THAAD Interceptor Missiles, 16 THAAD Fire Control and Communications Mobile Tactical Station Group, seven AN/TPY-2 THAAD radars, and associated support equipment, for an estimated cost of $13.5 billion. The Saudi-led coalition is supporting the legitimate Yemeni government and defending its territory from an incursion by Houthi rebels. The United States continues to work with the Saudi-led Coalition in an effort to reduce and minimize civilian casualties in this conflict. The Saudi government is taking measures to improve its targeting processes and has also adopted mechanisms for investigating alleged incidents of civilian casualties and addressing them operationally, as appropriate. The Saudis have agreed to receive training from U.S. forces on Law of Armed Conflict (LOAC) and best practices for preventing civilian casualties. Planned training events for the Royal Saudi Air Force and other Saudi security forces will specifically include further training on the LOAC and air-to-ground targeting processes. Future bilateral and multi-lateral training is designed to improve the Saudi security forces’ understanding of identifying, targeting and engaging correct targets while minimizing collateral damage and civilian casualties.

#### But, ending arms sales triggers fallout in the region –Ending U.S. support would trigger unintended consequences that would undermine U.S. national security risks in the area. Madyson Posey writes for the Heritage Foundation in 2018, A cutoff of U.S. support would hurt the internationally recognized government of Yemen. Those who rush to blame Saudi Arabia entirely for the suffering of the Yemeni people, ignore the war crimes by the Al Qaeda affiliate Ansar Allah. Ansar Allah regularly attacks the Saudi border, launches missiles into Saudi Arabia, and diverts international medical and food aid to its own supporters to sell on the black market. Those who advocate for withdrawing U.S. support for Saudi Arabia apparently believe in a one-sided strategy that penalizes its allies and boosts Ansar Allah, a group that chants “Death to America” every day. The U.S. cannot afford to abandon its allies and hope for the best.

Madyson Hutchinson Posey, Senior Research Fellow, The Heritage Foundation 1-22-2018, "Ending U.S. Military Support for Saudi Arabia in Yemen Would Trigger Dangerous Consequences," Heritage Foundation, https://www.heritage.org/middle-east/commentary/ending-us-military-support-saudi-arabia-yemen-would-trigger-dangerous

The killing of Khashoggi was certainly abhorrent, but ending U.S. support for the multinational coalition in Yemen is not the proper solution. It risks dangerously conflating two separate issues and would inevitably trigger unintended **consequences that would undermine U.S. national security interests in the region.** Senators must remember that Saudi Arabia is not the only belligerent in Yemen. A cutoff of U.S. support would also hurt the elected and internationally recognized government of Yemen, which was ousted by Iran-backed Houthi rebels in 2015 in a bloody coup that violated a U.N.-brokered ceasefire. Withdrawing U.S. support would also harm the interests of other U.S. allies fighting in Yemen, including the United Arab Emirates and Bahrain. The war in Yemen is complex. Those who rush to blame Saudi Arabia entirely for the suffering of the Yemeni people ignore the war crimes and heavy-handed treatment meted out by the Houthis to their opponents and the ruthless role that Iran plays in supporting the Houthi Ansar Allah (“Supporters of Allah”) movement, a Shia Islamist extremist group. The Saudis are rightly criticized for not doing more to prevent civilian casualties as they target Ansar Allah positions. But the Houthis should not be given a free pass for deliberately targeting civilian targets in Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates with increasingly sophisticated Iranian ballistic missiles. Ansar Allah also deserves criticism for its violent role in destabilizing Yemen and creating the conditions that led to the current humanitarian disaster. Ansar Allah regularly attacks the Saudi border, launches missiles strikes into Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, and diverts international medical and food aid to favor its own supporters and sell on the black market. Ansar Allah also has targeted U.S. Navy vessels, those of allied nations, and civilian shipping in the Red Sea with Iranian-supplied missiles, gunboat attacks, and boat bombs. Undermining the Saudi-led coalition in Yemen risks exacerbating this threat to international shipping and giving Iran the opportunity to threaten oil shipments through the Bab al-Mandab Strait, just as it has threatened to do in the Strait of Hormuz. Those who advocate withdrawing support for Saudi Arabia apparently believe that they can somehow end the current conflict in Yemen through a one-sided strategy that penalizes allies and boosts Ansar Allah, a group that chants “Death to America” and looks more like Hezbollah, Iran’s Lebanese proxy group, every day. Never mind that Saudi Arabia is supporting the internationally recognized government of Yemen in this effort. Never mind that leaving Ansar Allah to run amuck will not bring an end to the humanitarian suffering, but only prolong it. The U.S. currently extends only limited support to Saudi Arabia in Yemen centered on intelligence and information sharing. There are no U.S. troops involved in combat operations, except for occasional commando raids and air strikes against Al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula, a Sunni terrorist group that continues to target the U.S. homeland, as well as Saudi Arabia, France, and other countries. The Trump administration already has stopped the aerial refueling of Saudi warplanes involved in the Yemen conflict and called for a negotiated settlement. But the United States cannot afford to abandon its allies and hope for the best. Undermining the Yemeni government and the Saudi-led coalition would make an acceptable political settlement impossible. The Yemeni government and Saudi Arabia will continue to fight this war with or without U.S. support. Those who would connect two unrelated issues, condemn Saudi involvement, and ignore Iran’s hostile role inside Yemen will only do more harm to innocent Yemeni civilians and empower Iran and its Yemeni proxies.

####  It because the U.S. coalition to eliminate threats to globe is only harmed by eliminating arm sales, we urge a ballot in negation. Thank you.