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Negative: Saudi Oil Boycott

GOAL / CRITERION RESPONSES - "Human Rights" shouldn't be the "goal" nor the criterion for a ballot

US national interests - duty to its own citizens - take priority over other foreign policy goals

Doug Bandow 2021 (senior fellow at the Cato Institute, specializing in foreign policy and civil liberties. He worked as special assistant to President Ronald Reagan; JD from Stanford Univ.) “Eight Ways We Can Serve US Interests and Pursue Human Rights Too” 28 May 2021 (accessed 7 Sept 2022) <https://www.cato.org/commentary/eight-ways-we-can-serve-us-interests-pursue-human-rights-too>

“The central purpose of Washington’s international strategy should be to advance the interests of the American people. That means protecting them along with their territory, constitutional system, liberties, and prosperity. These objectives transcend the many other goals routinely set by governments.”

HARMS / SIGNIFICANCE

1.  "Moral Benefits" aren't enough to justify

“Moral benefits” not enough to justify sanctions on Saudi Arabia

Rebeccah L. Heinrichs 2018 (senior fellow at Hudson Institute; adjunct professor at the Institute of World Politics where she teaches nuclear deterrence theory) “Why Breaking With Saudi Arabia Over Khashoggi Would Hurt America.” October 23, 2018(accessed 13 Oct 2022) <https://www.hudson.org/research/14636-why-breaking-with-saudi-arabia-over-khashoggi-would-hurt-america>

Damaging the U.S.-Saudi alliance will not decrease human suffering, and will not increase justice or peace and stability for Americans or for our allies. Heavy sanctions on the Saudi government, ending arms sales and military cooperation with Saudi, or demanding the House of Saud remove bin Salman would play right into the hands of America’s enemies. Doing the moral thing does not require the United States to advantage those who seek to harm us.

2. Saudi oil insignificant

Saudi oil is 6.6% of US oil imports (520,000 divided by 7.86 million barrels /day)

Christopher Wolf 2022 (journalist) 28 Feb 2022 US NEWS & WORLD REPORT "Where Does the U.S. Get Its Oil?" (accessed 19 Dec 2022) https://www.usnews.com/news/national-news/articles/2022-02-28/where-does-the-u-s-get-its-oil

Of the 7.86 million barrels per day the U.S. imported in 2020, the majority came from its North American neighbors: Canada, with 4.13 million barrels (52.5%), and Mexico, with 750,000 (9.6%). But imports coming from outside North America are significant. Russia, with 540,000 barrels a day (6.6%), was the top non-continental contributor. Roughly 11% of the imports came collectively from OPEC countries, including 520,000 from Saudi Arabia.

Saudi oil is 2.6% of total US consumption (520,000 divided by 19.89 million barrels/day)

US Energy Information Administration 2022 (agency of the US Dept of Energy) "How much oil is consumed in the United States?" Last updated: September 19, 2022, with final annual data for 2021 (accessed 19 Dec 2022) https://www.eia.gov/tools/faqs/faq.php?id=33&t=6

In 2021, the United States consumed an average of about 19.89 million barrels of petroleum per day, or a total of about 7.26 billion barrels of petroleum. This was an increase in consumption of about 1.6 million barrels per day over consumption in 2020.

3. No consistent definition of human rights

**We can't define any universal standard of Human Rights, so we can't
1) Know what the harms are, if any
2) Know if or when we've solved for them**

Our definition of “human rights” is flawed because our idea of “natural” or “self evident” rights is wrong

Cameron Hilditch 2020 (was a 2020-2021 William F. Buckley Fellow in Political Journalism at National Review Institute) 12 Aug 2020 NATIONAL REVIEW “The American Misunderstanding of Natural Rights“ https://www.nationalreview.com/2020/08/the-american-misunderstanding-of-natural-rights/ (accessed 7 Sept 2022)

“This is how the report’s authors characterize the role that classical liberalism played in informing the thoughts and deeds of the Founders:
Classical liberalism put at the front and center of politics the moral premise that human beings are by nature free and equal, which strengthened the political conviction that legitimate government derives from the consent of the governed.
The use of the word “nature” in this sentence, and in the political thought of the Founders, is an example of where American thinking about human rights often runs into trouble. How do we know which rights are “natural” to human beings? This is an important question to ask because, as the Commission’s report itself concedes, there is now “widespread disagreement about the nature and scope of basic rights.” Furthermore, how is this kind of “widespread disagreement” even possible if the rights of man are “self-evident,” as Jefferson famously argued in the preamble to the Declaration of Independence? If Jefferson was correct, a lack of popular consensus surrounding the nature and scope of natural rights should not exist among rational Americans nearly a quarter-millennium after the Founding. And yet, such disagreement persists, mainly because Jefferson was wrong. The idea that the human being’s right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is “self-evident” to the unaided rational intellect is thoroughgoing and unadulterated nonsense.”

4. [If AFF claims Saudis are "helping Russia"] Not helping Russia

Saudis are not "helping" Russia

Laura Kelly and Alex Gangitano 2022 (journalists) 21 Oct 2022 "Saudi Arabia unfazed by US backlash on oil as Russia reaps benefits" (accessed 21 Dec 2022) <https://www.cbs42.com/hill-politics/saudi-arabia-unfazed-by-us-backlash-on-oil-as-russia-reaps-benefits/> (first brackets for Ibish added; other brackets and ellipses in original)

[senior resident scholar at the Arab Gulf States Institute in Washington, Hussein] Ibish said that any benefit to Russia is not a concern in Riyadh.  “The key thing I think for the Saudis is, Russia is really important because of the OPEC+ deal. They have this crucial national security issue that is not really appreciated here enough, which is they have about 25 years to transform their economy,” he said. “In the context of the Ukraine war … [it] looks like helping Russia, that’s not the way they’re thinking about that. They’re thinking about their own plans, which is dire for them. But it looks to the Western world like ‘Oh, you’re backing up the Russians.’” Saudi officials say their actions have made clear they support Ukraine, even as they maintain relations with Russia.  “We have actually been in touch with the leadership of Ukraine and with Russia, we have offered to mediate between the two because we do maintain good relations with both,” Nazer said Monday. Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelensky has not issued any criticism.

SOLVENCY

1. US internal hypocrisy blocks success on human rights

We must fix US human rights gap before we can fix problems in other nations

 Report of the Commission on Unalienable Rights July, 2020 (The commission, composed of academics, philosophers, and activists, was charged with providing the U.S. government with advice on human rights grounded in our nation's founding principles and the principles of the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights.) “Report of the Commission of Unalienable Right” July 2020 (Accessed Sep 7, 2022) <https://www.state.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/Draft-Report-of-the-Commission-on-Unalienable-Rights.pdf>

“2. The power of example is enormous. A crucial way in which the United States promotes human rights abroad is by serving as an example of a rights-respecting society where citizens live together under law amid the nation’s great religious, ethnic, and cultural heterogeneity. [**END QUOTE**] Notwithstanding many failures to live up to the nation’s own ideals, Americans rightly take pride in their constitutional tradition. The American experiment in freedom, equality, and democratic self-government has had a significant influence on how human rights are understood around the world — not necessarily as a model to be copied, but as evidence that a rights respecting society is achievable. The country’s experience in addressing conflicts among diverse groups in society and in dealing with tensions among rights and rights claims has provided encouragement to others engaged in similar struggles. [**THEY CONTINUE LATER IN THE CONTEXT QUOTE**:]At the same time, it must be recognized that the American model will serve as an inspiration to others only so long as we ourselves recognize the gap between our principles and the imperfections of our politics and can demonstrate, as we ask of others, tangible efforts at improvements. The more the United States succeeds in modeling the principles it champions, the more powerful will be its message and the more inspiring its example for people longing for freedom. The maintenance of the American rights tradition is a continuing challenge that builds on what has come before and requires hard work by each succeeding generation.”

We can’t get anywhere on human rights until we stop hypocrisy of criticizing some countries but not others

Doug Bandow 2021 (JD from Stanford Univ.; Senior Fellow, Cato Institute; former special assistant to Pres. Reagan) 23 June 2021 “The Biden Administration Is Committed to Human Rights: Except When It Isn’t” (accessed 7 Sept 2022) https://www.cato.org/commentary/biden-administration-committed-human-rights-except-when-it-isnt

“Hypocrisy is inevitable in any activist foreign policy. Most governments operate on the principle of getting as much for themselves while claiming to be looking out for humankind. However, more than most nations the US tends to leaven hypocrisy with sanctimony, which makes it uniquely indigestible. As with Washington’s policy toward human rights. No doubt, Biden cares about the issue, but not enough to apply the same standard to all. Of course, Moscow should release political prisoners and hold free elections. But so should Egypt, Saudi Arabia, UAE, and Bahrain, American allies all which are even less free than Russia. If the administration wants to bolster its credibility and increase its impact on human rights, it should demand the most of its allies. If Washington instead makes its foreign policy business as usual – arming, subsidizing, and otherwise supporting those governments friendly to America – then its claimed commitment to human rights will be exposed as fake news. And will provide few if any benefits to the oppressed around the world.”

Hypocrisy failure example: Middle East

Rafiah Al Talei 2021 (editor-in-chief for Sada in the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace’s Middle East Program). Published May 27, 2021. Accessed September 7, 2022. <https://carnegieendowment.org/sada/84632>

“The United States suffers from a fundamental problem in its attempts to promote democratization in the Middle East. Unwavering U.S. support to Israel significantly accentuates its unfavorable image among an Arab public that is still recuperating from the atrocities of the recent Israeli attack on Gaza. President Biden’s plan to promote democracy and support human rights in the Middle East will face longstanding concerns, serious doubts, and perhaps total rejection from pro-democracy activists and human rights defenders across the region.”

2. Vagueness blocks solvency

Vague definition of human rights means we can't tell if plan is needed or has succeeded or when it should end

Prof. Eric Posner 2014 (Professor at Univ of Chicago Law School). “The case against human rights” Published December 4, 2014. Accessed 7 Sept 2022. <https://www.theguardian.com/news/2014/dec/04/-sp-case-against-human-rights>

“The central problem with human rights law is that it is hopelessly ambiguous. The ambiguity, which allows governments to rationalise almost anything they do, is not a result of sloppy draftsmanship but of the deliberate choice to overload the treaties with hundreds of poorly defined obligations. In most countries people formally have as many as 400 international human rights – rights to work and leisure, to freedom of expression and religious worship, to nondiscrimination, to privacy, to pretty much anything you might think is worth protecting. The sheer quantity and variety of rights, which protect virtually all human interests, can provide no guidance to governments. Given that all governments have limited budgets, protecting one human right might prevent a government from protecting another.
[**END QUOTE. HE CONTINUES LATER IN THE CONTEXT QUOTE:]**Thus, the existence of a huge number of vaguely defined rights ends up giving governments enormous discretion. If a government advances one group of rights, while neglecting others, how does one tell whether it complies with the treaties the best it can or cynically evades them?”

3. Unilateral approach fails

Unilateral action (US alone) fails. We need to build an international consensus and coordinate action with other nations

Simon Lester 2013 (Associate Director, Herbert A. Stiefel Center for Trade Policy Studies, Cato Institute) 11 Jan 2013 "The Wrong Way to Do Human Rights" (accessed 22 Dec 2022) https://www.cato.org/commentary/wrong-way-do-human-rights

When there are practices of foreign governments that concern us, we — and here it is Congress that is mostly to blame — should not act unilaterally to deal with them. Talk to others in the international community, and work with them to coordinate any action. For example, reach out to the European Parliament or national governments in Europe and Canada, which have considered actions similar to those taken by the United States, as well as others around the world. This approach has two benefits. First, it lends credibility to the action. It is less likely to be seen as U.S. bullying (which is hardly unprecedented) if there is a large coalition involved, and will carry more weight if multiple countries lend their voice. And second, it makes an irresponsible reaction difficult. It will be more challenging if the government in question has to identify human rights that have been violated by the whole coalition, rather than simply look for the rich target that is the United States. Human rights are complicated, and international relations are complicated. There are no easy answers to how governments can get along in this regard. But the dangers of unilateral penalties for human rights violations seem to have been exposed. If we want to actually accomplish anything on these issues, let’s try a new approach, one in which we are a little more humble about our role as the protector of human rights around the world.

4. [If "War in Yemen" is one of the AFF justifications for the plan] Won’t solve war in Yemen

Cutting off U.S. support for Saudi Arabia will not end the war in Yemen

Michael Knights, Kenneth M. Pollack, and Barbara F. Walter 2019. (Knights is the Lafer Fellow at the Washington Institute for Near East Policy. Pollack is a resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute; Walter is Professor of Political Science at the University of California–San Diego’s School of Global Policy and Strategy) “A Real Plan to End the War in Yemen.” May 2, 2019. Foreign Affairs (published by the Council on Foreign Relations, a non-profit and nonpartisan membership) (accessed 13 Oct 2022) <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/yemen/2019-05-02/real-plan-end-war-yemen>

True peace in Yemen will remain elusive unless both sides accept that they have nothing to gain from more fighting. We are not there yet. To get there will require not cutting off U.S. support for Saudi Arabia but threatening to double down on it unless the Houthis honor their commitments to the UN and are ready to disgorge most of their initial conquests. If Washington is serious about ending the war, it must come to terms with this uncomfortable fact.

Withdrawing U.S. support will not increase the likelihood of a peace agreement

Michael Knights, Kenneth M. Pollack, and Barbara F. Walter 2019. (Knights is the Lafer Fellow at the Washington Institute for Near East Policy. Pollack is a resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute; Walter is Professor of Political Science at the University of California–San Diego’s School of Global Policy and Strategy) “A Real Plan to End the War in Yemen.” May 2, 2019. Foreign Affairs (published by the Council on Foreign Relations, a non-profit and nonpartisan membership) (accessed 13 Oct 2022) <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/yemen/2019-05-02/real-plan-end-war-yemen>

Historically, civil wars like Yemen’s end either when one side wins a decisive military victory or a third party negotiates a settlement among the warring factions. In the Middle East, the former option—letting the fighting run its course—often means accepting horrific bloodshed and ethnic cleansing.[**END QUOTE**] Examples abound: the leveling of Hama, Syria’s onetime opposition stronghold, in 1982, or Saddam Hussein’s systematic mass murder of Iraqi Kurds in the late 1980s, or his violent suppression of a nationwide rebellion in 1991. Those “victories” ended the conflicts swiftly and surely, but at the cost of tens or hundreds of thousands of lives. **[THEY GO ON TO SAY QUOTE:]**A negotiated settlement can end a war earlier and thus with less bloodshed. But combatants generally don’t agree to such settlements until they have reached a military stalemate such that all sides are convinced they cannot win a military victory. Even then, the warring parties need to know that they can disarm without being slaughtered—a condition that can sometimes be met only with an outside peacekeeping commitment for a decade or more. And once the parties have come to the table, any successful negotiated settlement will have to include a power-sharing arrangement that grants all factions political power and economic benefits roughly commensurate with their demographic weight (adjusted for military realities). In the case of Yemen, withdrawing U.S. support—which has largely consisted of intelligence and logistical assistance—from the Saudis will hinder the coalition’s war effort and embolden the Houthis and their Iranian supporters, making them much less likely to accept a nationwide cease-fire and a power-sharing agreement.

DISADVANTAGES

1. Higher oil prices

Reason 1: Because of the Jones Act. Replacing imported oil with US domestic oil can be done but it's more expensive because of the Jones Act

Colin Grabow 2022 (research fellow at the Cato Institute’s [Herbert A. Stiefel Center for Trade Policy Studies](https://www.cato.org/herbert-stiefel-center-trade-policy-studies)) 9 March 2022 "Russian Oil Is Off the Table but the Jones Act Serves as a Barrier to Using Domestic Supplies" (accessed 20 Dec 2022) https://www.cato.org/blog/russian-oil-table-jones-act-serves-barrier-using-domestic-supplies

With imports of Russian oil (as well as coal and natural gas) now [banned](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2022/03/08/remarks-by-president-biden-announcing-u-s-ban-on-imports-of-russian-oil-liquefied-natural-gas-and-coal/), the country’s refineries must decide on alternative sources. The good news is that there are U.S. grades of crude oil [well‐​suited](https://rbnenergy.com/were-not-gonna-take-it-what-do-us-refineries-import-from-russia-and-what-if-they-stop) for refineries on the East and West Coasts. The bad news is that the protectionist [Jones Act](https://www.cato.org/project-jones-act-reform) stands in the way of getting this oil from where it is produced in the United States to other parts of the country where it is needed. Passed in 1920, the Jones Act restricts the domestic waterborne transportation of goods—including energy products—to vessels that are U.S.-flagged and built as well as mostly U.S.-crewed and owned. Meeting these requirements isn’t cheap. A U.S.-built tanker is estimated to cost nearly four times more than one built overseas ([$150 million](https://www.americanshippingco.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2022/01/AMSC-Company-Presentation-Jan-2022.pdf) versus [$40 million](https://compassmar.com/reports/Compass%20Maritime%20Weekly%20Market%20Report.pdf)) while operating costs are also [significantly](https://www.gao.gov/assets/gao-18-478.pdf) higher. The inevitable result is expensive shipping rates that can make it [cost‐​prohibitive](https://www.ft.com/content/b1ea86dc-ade6-11e7-aab9-abaa44b1e130) to transport oil within the United States, thus tipping the scales in favor of imports.

Reason 2: Even without a lot of oil coming from Saudi Arabia, the Saudis can still have a big impact

Steven A. Cook 2022 (Senior Fellow for Middle East and Africa Studies and Director of the International Affairs Fellowship for Tenured International Relations Scholars, at Council on Foreign Relations) 28 Sept 2022 The Saudi Exception (accessed 21 Dec 2022) https://www.cfr.org/podcasts/saudi-exception

Canada's by far the biggest supplier of oil to the United States. And of course the United States is the world's leading producer of oil. The United States produces somewhere in the neighborhood of 18 and a half million barrels a day, but it also consumes 21 and a half million barrels a day. And that's why it is so important in thinking about a global oil market. What are markets made of? You know, at the very basics, your economics 101, supply and demand. And so when the market is out of balance, Saudi Arabia is often looked upon as what energy analysts and others call the swing producer, a country that can ramp up production relatively quickly at a relatively inexpensive manner to bring the oil market back into balance. So, this gives you a sense that even though Saudi Arabia is not hugely important to the domestic oil market, because it's a global market and as I said, because Saudi Arabia is kind of the low cost producer of choice and can metaphorically turn the spigot on and off, that's what makes it very, very important.

2. Human Rights turn. AFF violates human rights while trying to uphold human rights

Yes, governments should uphold human rights. And one of those rights is the right to contract and trade freely with your private property (which AFF violates by banning trade)

Prof. Fernando R. Teson and Prof. Jonathan Klick 2012. (Teson - former diplomat for the [Argentina Foreign Ministry](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Argentina_Foreign_Ministry) in [Buenos Aires](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Buenos_Aires); permanent visiting professor, [Universidad Torcuato Di Tella](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Universidad_Torcuato_Di_Tella), Buenos Aires, Argentina Klick - Professor of law at the University of Pennsylvania. ) "8 - Global Justice and Trade" GLOBAL JUSTICE AND INTERNATIONAL LAW (accessed 22 Dec 2022) https://www.law.upenn.edu/live/files/11158-justicepdf

In addition, we suggest rethinking the law and philosophy of human rights. An improved, economically literate version of human rights law should move away from the dichotomy of civil-political–socioeconomic rights and put forth instead a trilogy of recommendations. First, states should respect civil and political rights. The reasons for this are many and obvious, and they include the fact that enjoyment of civil and political rights facilitates development. Second, states have a prima facie obligation to alleviate poverty. Discharging this obligation requires making trade-offs and establishing priorities among various development needs. Whether the fight against poverty requires laissez faire politics or, on the contrary, government intervention in the economy (provided it respects property and contract) is an issue of institutional design that depends on context and cannot be decided in advance. Third, states should secure economic liberties. In other words, they should not interfere with rights to private property and freedom of contract to such a degree that would create significant disincentives to productive activities and economic growth.

Trade sanctions violate human rights: They punish US citizens for human rights violations committed by others

Robert A. Sirico 1998. (co‐​founder and president of the Acton Institute for the Study of Religion and Liberty) 17 July 1998 " Free Trade and Human Rights: The Moral Case for Engagement" (accessed 22 Dec 2022) https://www.cato.org/trade-briefing-paper/free-trade-human-rights-moral-case-engagement

Trading with a country is not the same thing as placing a moral imprimatur on the government of that country. Some Christian activists have demonstrated an embarrassing lack of understanding of that basic fact. To say, “I support trade sanctions on country X,” really means, “I think that American consumers ought to be punished by higher taxes for their desire to buy products from country X. American producers ought to be forced by their own government to invest someplace where they are less likely to make money. The U.S. government, not markets, ought to determine where and what people buy and sell across borders with their own money. Moreover, the people in country X ought to be denied essential goods and services and the right to enjoy the fruits of the international division of labor.”

3. Saudi Retaliation #1: Dumping US Treasury Bonds

Link: AFF plan intentionally reduces and damages US/Saudi relationship

That's the entire goal of their plan

Brink: US/Saudi relations are on the brink due to multiple controversies & tensions. Worst it's ever been!

Matt Egan 2022 (journalist for CNN BUSINESS) 28 Oct 2022 " America and Saudi Arabia are locked in a bitter battle over oil. The stakes are massive" (accessed 21 Dec 2022) https://www.cnn.com/2022/10/28/economy/saudi-arabia-biden-opec-oil/index.html

The relationship between the United States and Saudi Arabia is one of the most important on the planet. And lately, it’s also been one of the most awkward. Angry officials in Washington vowed “consequences” after Saudi-led [OPEC sharply cut oil production](https://www.cnn.com/2022/10/05/energy/opec-production-cuts) earlier this month, driving up pump prices just weeks before the midterm elections. [US lawmakers are threatening](https://www.cnn.com/2022/10/07/energy/opec-plus-production-slash-fury) steps that were unthinkable not long ago, including [banning weapons sales](https://www.cnn.com/2022/10/11/energy/saudi-arabia-opec-richard-blumenthal) to Saudi Arabia and [unleashing the Justice Department](https://www.cnn.com/2022/10/06/business/grassley-opec-legislation-collusion)tofile a lawsuit againstthe country and other OPEC members for collusion. Riyadh has been caught off guard by the thirst for revenge from US politicians. And Saudi officials are hinting at payback – including dumping US debt – that could have huge ripple effects in financial markets and the real economy. Neither side is even trying to hide the tension. After a top Saudi official suggested the kingdom has decided to be the more mature party, a top White House official responded by saying, “It’s not like some high school romance here.” What happens next is critical. If this decades-old relationship devolves into a full-blown break-up, there could be enormous consequences for the world economy, not to mention international security. “This is a new low. We have seen a degradation in the US-Saudi relationship for years but this is the worst it’s been,” said Clayton Allen, director at the Eurasia Group.

Link: Saudi Arabia threatens to retaliate by mass selling US Treasury bonds, which would destabilize markets and drive up interest rates

Matt Egan 2022 (journalist for CNN BUSINESS) 28 Oct 2022 "America and Saudi Arabia are locked in a bitter battle over oil. The stakes are massive" (accessed 21 Dec 2022) https://www.cnn.com/2022/10/28/economy/saudi-arabia-biden-opec-oil/index.html

Saudi Arabia could respond to penalties from Washington with drastic steps of their own,ratcheting up the conflict further. Saudi officials have privately warned that the kingdom [could sell US Treasury bonds](https://www.wsj.com/articles/u-s-saudi-relations-biden-mbs-animosity-11666623661) if Congress passes NOPEC, The Wall Street Journal reported this week, citing people familiar with the matter. At a minimum, dumping US debt would create uncertainty in markets at an already-perilous moment. A fire sale would drive up Treasury rates, destabilizing markets and raising borrowing costs for families and businesses.

Link: Higher interest rates raise government borrowing costs and substantially raise the federal deficit

Prof. John H. Cochrane 2011. (Professor of Finance at the University of Chicago School of Business, a research associate of the National Bureau of Economic Research, and an adjunct scholar at the Cato Institute) Inflation and Debt, Fall 2011 (accessed 22 Dec 2022) https://www.nationalaffairs.com/publications/detail/inflation-and-debt

Low interest rates can climb quickly and unexpectedly, as Greece and Spain have learned. A rise in interest rates can lead to current inflation in the same way a change in investor views about long-term deficits can. Every percentage point that interest rates rise means, roughly, that the U.S. government must pay $140 billion more per year on $14 trillion of debt, thus directly raising the deficit by about 10%. If we revert to a normal 5% interest rate, this means about $800 billion in extra financing costs per year — about half again the recent (and already "unsustainable") annual deficits. And this number is cumulative, as larger deficits mean more and more outstanding debt.

Impact: Every increase in the federal deficit harms the economy

Dr William Gale and Benjamin Harris 2010. (Gale - PhD in economics, Stanford Univ.; senior fellow at the Brookings Institution and co-director of the Urban-Brookings Tax Policy Center; former assistant professor of Economics at UCLA, and a senior economist for the Council of Economic Advisers under President George H.W. Bush; Harris - master’s degree in economics from Cornell Univ and master’s degree in quantitative methods from Columbia University; senior research associate with the Economics Studies Program at the Brookings Institution) “A VAT for the United States: Part of the Solution” (notes about the date: This article is one of several in the overall publication at this source. The publication date was 2011, but this article was written in 2010) https://www.taxpolicycenter.org/sites/default/files/alfresco/publication-pdfs/1001418-A-Value-Added-Tax-for-the-United-States-Part-of-the-Solution.PDF (accessed 26 Jan 2022)

But even in the absence of a crisis, sustained deficits have deleterious effects, as they translate into lower national savings, higher interest rates, and increased indebtedness to foreign investors, all of which serve to reduce future national income. Gale and Orszag (2004a) estimate that a 1 percent of GDP increase in the deficit will raise interest rates by 25 to 35 basis points and reduce national saving by 0.5 to 0.8 percentage points of GDP.

4. Saudi Retaliation #2: World oil supply reductions

Link & Brink: US/Saudi relations are on the brink and AFF makes them worse

Cross apply the Link and Brink cards from Disad 2

Impact: Saudi retaliation raises gas prices, worsens inflation, raises recession risks to the US economy

Matt Egan 2022 (journalist for CNN BUSINESS) 28 Oct 2022 "America and Saudi Arabia are locked in a bitter battle over oil. The stakes are massive" (accessed 21 Dec 2022) https://www.cnn.com/2022/10/28/economy/saudi-arabia-biden-opec-oil/index.html

Another risk is that Saudi Arabia, the de facto leader of OPEC+, could remove further supply from world oil markets – or at least refuse to respond to future price spikes as the West continues to crack down on Russia. Further curbs on OPEC supply would lift gasoline prices and worsen inflation, raising already-high recession risks. All of this explains why a full-blown breakdown in relations between the United States and Saudi Arabia may be the[last thing the fragile economy needs](https://www.cnn.com/2022/10/25/business/jamie-dimon-david-solomon-future-investment-initiative) right now.

5. Lose US/Saudi Alliance

Link & Brink: AFF plan reduces US/Saudi relations, which are on the brink right now

Cross apply the Link and Brink evidence from Disad 2.

Impact: Terrorism. US alliance with Saudi Arabia is key to fighting terrorism

Deborah Amos 2018 (International Correspondent for National Public Radio (NPR). She covers the Middle East for NPR News; degree in broadcasting from the Univ. of Florida) 19 Mar 2018 “Saudi Arabia: The White House Loves It. Most Americans? Not So Much,” <https://www.npr.org/sections/parallels/2018/03/19/595018861/trump-may-love-saudi-arabia-but-many-americans-do-not> [brackets added] (accessed 13 Oct 2022)

Backers of a close U.S.-Saudi relationship note that Riyadh has been a strong strategic partner for decades thanks to oil and regional politics. Saudi Arabia serves as counter-balance to Iran and the Saudis have helped the U.S. battle extremism. The U.S. needs Saudi assistance in a battle of ideas against al-Qaida and ISIS, says [professor of international affairs at Texas A&M, F. Gregory] Gause: "Liberal democracies are not going to talk them out of what they are doing. The Saudis can rebut them with their own language." "If the Saudis don't succeed, what does it mean for the region?" asks [retired intelligence officer who served with the CIA in the Middle East, Norman] Roule. He believes Saudi Arabia is too big to fail. "To me the answer is clear. We have to do everything we can to support him."

Impact: Reduced US national security. The Saudis greatly enhance America’s security

Thomas J. Barrack Jr. 2016 (International private equity investor and the founder and executive chairman of Colony Capital; foreign policy and economic advisor to Donald Trump), 22 Oct 2016, “What the Middle East Needs Now from America,” <http://fortune.com/2016/10/22/middle-east-isis-syria/> (accessed 13 Oct 2022)

Through the safeguarding of the Holy Cities of Mecca and Medina, which remain open to tens of millions of foreign visitors and differing Islamic beliefs, the Kingdom has a unique window into the actions and motivations of radical fundamentalists who pass in and out of those always accessible cities. By sharing that intelligence, the Saudis greatly enhance America’s security.

6. Human rights backlash

Target country gets hardened and backlashes against human rights pressure

Sanja Dragić 2019 “On the Concept of the ‘Human Rights Backlash’”, IWM Junior Visiting Fellows’ Conference Proceedings, Vol. XXXVII, 2019 <https://www.iwm.at/publications/5-junior-visiting-fellows-conferences/vol-xxxvii/on-the-concept-of-the-human-rights-backlash> (accessed 8 Sept 2022)

“The term agents of change is used to refer to international institutions as well as domestic and international NGOs (sometimes also called ‘human rights promoters’). These agents use tools of law to target norm-violating states and through mechanisms of coercion and persuasion achieve norm internalization i.e. acceptance of a norm by a state as its own and behaving accordingly. Empirical observations point towards ‘backlash’ being a form of resistance by the target state against the agents of change and tools of human rights internalization. Consequently, ‘human rights backlash’ is understood as ‘a strong negative reaction by a state against international human rights law and/or its promoters’.”

Our human rights intervention backfires: They view it as outside interference and reject human rights even more

Rochelle Terman 2013. (Asst Prof. of Political Science at Univ. of Chicago) “Backlash: The unintended consequences of western human rights intervention” Open Democracy, 10 December 2013. https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/5050/backlash-unintended-consequences-of-western-human-rights-intervention/ (accessed 8 Sept 2022)

“Not only are local human rights organizations hurting, but there is also good reason to suspect that they are hurting because of Western human rights intervention, not in spite of it. Repressive governments have come to keenly appreciate the symbolic and political threat of NGO “boomerang politics”, and many are trying to disrupt those links as best they can by blocking funding or confiscating records. In fact, the boomerang pattern might have worked too well, as governments grow increasingly fearful of foreign influence in the form of rights-based advocacy. As [some scholars note](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09614520701778884), the governmental offensive is inadvertently supported by the dependence of many Southern NGOs on Northern funding, which disconnects them from local constituencies and allows opponents to portray them as foreign agents. In this later case, the boomerang pattern of transnational activism – in which local actors appeal to foreign groups to put pressure on states from outside – appears in distinct reversal: the State and nationalist groups gesture towards transnational developments and discourses – particularly around the “War on Terror” and the threat of neo-imperialism – in order to justify a rejection of the human rights norm. This is the global human rights backlash.

Impact: Things get worse. Outside pressure discredits local human rights advocates and sets back the movement

Rochelle Terman 2013. (Asst Prof. of Political Science at Univ. of Chicago) “Backlash: The unintended consequences of western human rights intervention” Open Democracy, 10 Dec 2013 https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/5050/backlash-unintended-consequences-of-western-human-rights-intervention/ (accessed 8 Sept 2022)

When human rights causes are “purchased” from local activists (meaning, with their consent and guidance), they are more likely to lead to positive change. But when they are “stolen” (picked up without the consent or guidance of on-the-ground informants), they are more likely to lead to a backlash. My point in raising these risks causes is not to reject, dismiss, or disparage Western attention to human rights concerns. Nor is it to implicitly condone the accusations made by repressive governments by suggesting that we cut off all international solidarity ties lest we be misconstrued as “imperialists.” My main concern is that we ought to know the consequences – intended and unintended – of our actions. Oftentimes, Western-based human rights supporters take action with good intentions, but with poor consequences. “

7. Death & Destruction in Yemen

Link: Bad guys will win in Yemen if we fail to adequately support Saudi Arabia

James Phillips & Nicole Robinson 2022 (Phillips - Senior Research Fellow, Heritage Foundation. Robinson - Senior Research Associate, Heritage Foundation) 7 April 2022 "Time to Hold the Houthis Accountable in Yemen" (accessed 16 Oct 2022) https://www.heritage.org/middle-east/report/time-hold-the-houthis-accountable-yemen

The Biden Administration’s “diplomacy first” approach has failed because it pays inadequate attention to the balance of forces fighting inside Yemen and the security threats posed by Houthi attacks outside of Yemen. Ending the war and easing Yemen’s humanitarian catastrophe are worthy goals, but a one-sided focus on pressuring the Arab coalition while giving Iran’s allies the benefit of the doubt has emboldened the Houthis to step up their military efforts and cross-border attacks. U.S. goals are not likely to be realized as long as the Biden Administration turns a blind eye to Houthi aggression and continues its “virtue signaling” on Saudi Arabia.

Impact: War & carnage prolonged

Dr. James Jay Carafano 2018. (expert in national security and foreign policy challenges; vice president of Heritage's Kathryn and Shelby Cullom Davis Institute for National Security and Foreign Policy and a former senior fellow at the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments; PhD from Georgetown Univ, and master's degree in strategy from the U.S. Army War College) “Chaos Will Erupt in the Middle East If U.S. Leaves Yemen.” March 7, 2018. The Heritage Foundation. <https://www.heritage.org/middle-east/commentary/chaos-will-erupt-the-middle-east-if-us-leaves-yemen> (accessed 13 Oct 2022)

If Congress forces the administration to abandon our allies, Tehran, ISIS, and al-Qaida would feel emboldened and likely double-down on expanding the war. Meanwhile, Washington would lose its ability to influence how Saudi Arabia and the UAE conduct coalition operations. Without our mitigating presence, the carnage of this vicious war would only increase.

Backup: Ending support for Saudi Arabia would embolden terrorists and increase carnage in Yemen

Dr. James Jay Carafano 2018. (expert in national security and foreign policy challenges; vice president of Heritage's Kathryn and Shelby Cullom Davis Institute for National Security and Foreign Policy and a former senior fellow at the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments; PhD from Georgetown Univ, and master's degree in strategy from the U.S. Army War College) “Chaos Will Erupt in the Middle East If U.S. Leaves Yemen.” March 7, 2018. The Heritage Foundation. <https://www.heritage.org/middle-east/commentary/chaos-will-erupt-the-middle-east-if-us-leaves-yemen> (accessed 13 Oct 2022)

The greatest threats to Middle East stability and security are Iran and transnational Islamist terrorists groups, principally ISIS and al-Qaida. And it is precisely these forces that are fueling the Yemen war.

If Congress forces the administration to abandon our allies, Tehran, ISIS, and al-Qaida would feel emboldened and likely double-down on expanding the war. Meanwhile, Washington would lose its ability to influence how Saudi Arabia and the UAE conduct coalition operations. Without our mitigating presence, the carnage of this vicious war would only increase.[**END QUOTE]** And Russia would be tempted to further complicate the situation. Moscow has already vetoed a draft U.N. Security Council resolution to hold Iran accountable for providing Yemen's rebels with the long-range missiles recently fired at the Saudi capital. Putin would interpret an American withdrawal as a green light for additional Russian meddling – the type that Moscow has brought to the Syrian civil war. [**HE GOES ON TO SAY QUOTE**:] Instead of turning our back on Yemen, the U.S. should focus on ending the war. The longer the conflict persists, the more the chaos benefits terrorist groups in the region and the more the main rebel group, the Houthis, becomes dependent on Iran.