

The President said that we were fighting Iran to change its regime. Iran has replaced one Ayatollah Khamenei with another Ayatollah Khamenei.

I would observe that, as a result of this war, it is more likely Iran and adjacent nations that have succession will have hardline leaders that share Iran's religious perspective, hell-bent on opposing the United States on every front long into the future in the form of hybrid warfare, which is the new horizon for war globally.

This war must not drain our arsenal here at home. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Defense Subcommittee, the weapons that are being exploded and the amount of money being spent mean we have to follow on very quickly, and it is not so easy to do.

We have lost members of our military, as I have said, and the President's approach has alienated too many of our allies and made us new enemies. Caution. No more blood for oil. No more blood for oil. In an era of hybrid warfare, the President's impulsiveness could yield reactions for which the American people are not prepared.

I ask the question, Mr. Speaker: What does victory look like in this war? What is the endgame? What is the plan?

The President wanted to overthrow the Government of Iran, destroying its nuclear capacity, to ignite a nationwide revolt and remake the Middle East as he thinks it should be. What does that look like? Who is going to help?

There are a lot of people with money over there—not a single democracy—they will be the beneficiaries. What are they paying?

Therefore, U.S. military efforts have not been able to keep the Strait of Hormuz open. Adjoining nations have placed zero troops into theater. To me, the undemocratic oil kingdoms appear to have the U.S. at their beck and call. That is not in the interests of the United States of America.

This administration has not prepared our citizens for the consequences of its hasty actions. So far, they expect Americans to pick up the tab, the whole tab, rising each week by billions and billions more dollars.

What is it about the allure of these undemocratic oil kingdoms that draws such attention from our President? Recklessness and undemocratic Middle East oil markets have led us to repeated disastrous consequences and more forever-on wars.

The American people have already paid the price. Let the phenomenally rich oil kingdoms, undemocratic oil kingdoms, their sheikhs and their Kings send their own troops and pay the price of their own security, instead of indebting the people, the good people, of the United States of America.

Today, I say enough is enough.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### DRAINING THE SWAMP

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. SCHWEIKERT of Arizona was recognized for 30 minutes.)

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I have a number of things to go over.

Mr. Speaker, do you remember over the last few years the number of discussions we would have at home, saying drain the swamp? What was the term, swamp critters?

We have been collecting a number of articles and trying to figure out why it is so hard to actually do policy that makes our brothers' and sisters' lives easier, better, healthier, and more prosperous.

I am starting to come to the conclusion that for so many of our brothers and sisters who are at home who are watching Members of Congress, and they somehow think this is the swamp, it is part of it.

We came across a number of stories that looked like they had been properly vetted, where the lobbyist community is handing out money to people. This was more on the conservative side, particularly some of our conservative publications, handing them cash to write stories to promote whatever that lobbyist wanted.

I have been behind this microphone before, and I have actually shown repeatedly, here are influencers on the internet, more from my side, here are some MAGA influencers that were taking money. Maybe we should have caught it more quickly when it was the 23-year-old attractive person talking about Medicare Advantage and saying: I am sure she is an expert on Medicare Advantage.

It turns out we had a series of I guess it was the broker community and those things in Medicare part C paying them to warp the information for the American people to try to understand for those who of us to get up here and try to reform this place, reform how we are trying to spend our money, to try to take on the U.S. debt, that the swamp is now on your information that is coming through this device.

You have to understand, Mr. Speaker, I actually have some articles from 1 year ago. It turns out, some of the biggest snack food producers were trying to stop Congress through social media influencers. They were paying social media influencers to stop having a conversation about GLP-1 semaglutides like Ozempic. That is how perverse this place has become.

I have learned, and I truly believe this, that almost everything in Washington, D.C., is actually about the money.

What happens when the armies of folks are walking up and down our Halls here? Are they here because they want a freer society? Is it because they are fixated on the morality of the prosperity of growth and of opportunity for all people? Are they here to try to get us to put up pieces of legislation that stop their competition and that stop

creative destruction in the economy, even though that is how you get better, faster, and cheaper? Is it how they want us to hand them cash?

Mr. Speaker, I am going to show some boards from the Treasury's detailed balance sheet. The level of financial trouble our Republic is in is remarkable.

If anyone is watching C-SPAN over the last day or 2, how many people have you actually seen coming behind these microphones that actually care?

This is the chart I have typically started with, and the reason I do this is to say: Hey, you see this blue portion of this board? That is what we get to vote on as Members of Congress. Everything else in the red is on autopilot. We only vote on about 25 percent of the spending here in Congress. The rest is formula. It is mandatory spending.

□ 1820

However, it is worse than that. A couple days ago, the Treasury, as they are required by statute, did the sort of here is the balance sheet of America, here is where we are financially.

Did anyone see the stories—you have got to read some of the geeky sort of financial press—that America actually had negative? Functionally, here is what was on the Treasury's balance sheets, saying, hey, America, currently—these are current liabilities. These aren't the unfunded liabilities for the future. These are current obligations. We owe \$47.8 trillion in current liabilities, and we have \$6 trillion in assets. This is from the Treasury statement.

Doesn't this terrify anyone? Is it still just a calculator/math-free zone or is it more important that when the paid influencers, the paid person on conservative media by a lobbyist is saying: Oh, they might actually look at making us reform our program. We are going to hand some money to one of these authors so they will say: Oh, reform is bad, it's not Republican.

Of course, it is Republican. We believe in markets. At least we used to.

Let's actually talk about how bad this math is. I am going to go straight to the punch line. If you actually just do the 75-year Social Security and Medicare obligations, you are at \$88.4 trillion of unfunded liabilities, and these numbers probably aren't dystopian enough.

Look, a week ago, I did a whole presentation here, and we partially talked about the unified theory of how we stabilize the debt. I have seen the applause in some of the financial articles on CNBC, Bloomberg saying: Well, there are some Members of Congress trying to do a piece of legislation to get us to 3 percent of debt to GDP. Wonderful idea.

At this moment, just interest is well above 3 percent of GDP. So far this year—so we are 6 months into the fiscal year—over 7.3 percent of the entire economy is being borrowed by the Federal Government. But don't worry, we

are going to do that 3 percent thing even though the latest GDP numbers are below that.

If I had told you a decade, two decades ago that just the interest being paid by the Federal Government on our debt is bigger than the growth of the country, you would have thrown up your hands and said: Well, it is all over then.

Yet, we look the other way because we are too busy doing the damn shiny objects around here that will get us on cable news tonight or on social media. We can do the shiny object, get some dopamine hits, maybe get some people giving us money on text message fundraising.

We are heading to well over \$38 trillion in liabilities. What do we do?

I came here a month ago and showed part of the report that said a child born today, if you use a 6 percent generational discount rate—that might be a little bit high, it is a little geeky, but it is within the margin—this country needs 104 percent of that child's lifetime earnings just to pay the Federal Government pensions.

I have a 3-year-old. Our obligations right now require taking every dime my little Matthew will ever earn just to pay the Federal Government pensions.

Part of this, Mr. Speaker, is the math of demographics. We don't have enough people. We don't have enough children. We are functionally at zero population growth. There is a math set—I had some of the Heritage demographers in my office today. They have a model that says in the next few years we could actually go negative in population as a country.

For some people, oh, yay, that is great, less traffic. Okay. You tell me how I am going to finance Social Security. You tell me how I am going to finance Medicare. In now less than 6½ years, the Social Security trust fund is empty. In less than 6½ years, the Medicare trust fund is empty. At that time, we double the poverty of seniors, we will double the number of baby boomers who live on the street. That is the morality now of this place.

Why am I the only idiot who comes behind the microphone and does this every week?

Okay. God gave me a gift. I am pretty good at math. I will have Members of Congress who see me in the hallway and turn around and walk away from me because I am going to pitch them an idea of here is how we save Medicare Advantage, here is how we save Social Security, here is how we do this. I have pieces of legislation to do some of these things.

Oh, DAVID, you don't understand, we have been told by our political—and this is Democrats, too—we have been told by our political consultants we are not allowed to use those words because we might actually have to explain what the hell is actually going on.

You have the same number of 18-year-olds today as we had 20 years ago.

We have double the number of 65 and up. I turned 64 a couple weeks ago. Maybe I am pathologically optimistic. We have adopted a 3-year-old, and I have a 10-year-old. Do they deserve to live better?

Every math set right now says our kids will be the first American generation to be poorer than their parents. A child born today, my 3-year-old, let's use my 3-year-old as an example. When my 3-year-old is, I think it is 22, 21, 23, right in there, every tax, every one, every single tax in America needs to be doubled just to maintain baseline services.

Why am I the jerk that gets up and does math and people look at him and say, oh, DAVID, we are not allowed to talk about that. We will deal with that after the next election.

Have you noticed there is always another election?

I have been getting that same answer for 15 years here: DAVID, we can't talk about that. It is mandatory spending. We can't go around and tell the truth.

It is fixable. There are things you can do. We have presented over and over and over and over ways you could crash the price of healthcare using technology, the morality of cures, the morality of helping our brothers and sisters get healthier, convincing the bond markets that we are creditworthy.

Right now we pay more—so, Greece, today Greece can sell a 10-year bond cheaper than the United States. That is what the world debt markets think of us.

I could geek out and walk through what happened a couple days ago in the 2-year auction we had and how badly subscribed it was. Maybe it is the war, maybe it is other things. This isn't a game, and this is somewhat unique.

Look, I have some books. I collect economic books. One of my books talks about 5,000 years of economic history. There are lots and lots and lots of stories of societies that built up lots of debt and collapsed. Okay.

I could not find a story in there that walked through the economics of a society that built up lots of debt and started to have fewer people, zero population growth. Tell me how that math works.

We have a unified theory. I have been behind this microphone dozens and dozens and dozens of times. I am saying, the adoption of technology, synthetic biology, deregulation, smart regulation, a talent-based immigration system—we basically have a dozen things that have to go into this just to stabilize where we are in debt.

Mr. Speaker, do you think this place is intellectually prepared to do anything that is difficult? We are going to go home and stand in front of our constituents and talk about shiny objects.

Mr. Speaker, as of today, we are borrowing \$88,000 a second. Mr. Speaker, as of today, we borrowed, I think, \$7.5 billion today, yesterday, tomorrow.

□ 1830

Maybe we just shouldn't give a damn about math, but it is going to win. The math always wins.

Look, my staff wanted me to use this board to try to put it in perspective of if it was your household. In your household you basically earn \$52,000 a year. This is the Federal budget right now, but you spend \$73,000 this year. If you do the accumulation beyond the fact that you went 20 grand into debt this year, if you add up all the years of debt for your household, and this would be your household as divided by the Federal debt, it is \$1.3 million upside down.

Next year, these numbers get worse and the year after that it gets worse. Part of the reason is—help me grow the economy, help me find how we balance our tax base.

I am a free market economist. I believe in as low taxes as possible. But is borrowing a tax? This is a really interesting, intellectual question that the left has to have and we on the right have to have. Is borrowing a tax?

The family budget this year, you made \$52,000. We are going to spend \$73,000, so we borrowed \$20,000 this year. I am going to argue it is a tax. It is just a tax with interest.

Are you and I going to pay it? Because the philosophy around here is it is going to be our kids that are going to pay it and our grandkids that are going to pay it, and I am going to argue the numbers are eroding so fast.

Remember, 6.5 years from now, the Social Security trust fund is gone. Mr. Speaker, 6.5 years from now, the Medicare trust fund is gone.

Just to cover that shortfall for the first year is \$638 billion. You run for United States Senate, this happens in your first term. This is not way off in the future. It is here. Yet, when some of us have tried to do the debt and deficit commission, we get these people coming in, lobbying, beating the crap out of us on social media, on conservative press, and now we find out they are being paid.

It is absolutely immoral what we are doing, and it is your retirement, and it is my kids and every child out there. How is accepting a society that says: Oh, screw it. We are just going to make sure our kids are poorer, but at least we are going to get stuff until the bond market decides they are actually in charge of this country. It is almost there.

Let's actually do some more math. We have some new ways to try to describe the scale of the problem. I know this is hard to read, but I am going to do my best to make this understandable.

You actually see net receipts by category.

Do you see this dark blue here? That is individual income taxes. That is one of the crazy things those of us on Ways and Means need to actually start having a conversation on how we are going to deal with, because we are seeing right now in the GDP growth we are

getting in the country, more of it is coming from capital than workers.

We are building big datacenters, automation, the technology, but it is not necessarily from wage growth, which actually is a whole other speech and freaks me out because we have got to raise wage growth to make up for the years of the Biden inflation.

Then take a look over here. This is payroll taxes. This is the taxes you pay for your Social Security, for your Medicare, for unemployment. Part of the deep secret here, please don't tell anyone on Social Security, an average couple retiring today gets about a \$76,000 spiff.

Here is what we paid in, you get an extra \$76,000. Horrible, horrible rate of return. However, Democrats made sure that 20 years ago, 25 years ago when there was a temp saying: Could we build a little, tiny 15 percent sidecar, you can invest in the market. That would mean you would have been dramatically wealthier today. They killed that. They should be responsible for much of the poverty that is going to exist in our senior population. It was Democrats that chose to do that.

The dirty secret on this portion here is that same couple for every dollar they put into Medicare tax, they are getting \$6 to \$7 back. That is one of the primary drivers of U.S. sovereign debt, that and interest, healthcare and interest.

We got older, and we owe \$39 trillion. \$30 trillion is functionally sold to the markets, but that other \$9 trillion that we borrow internally, we still pay interest on it. It is still a liability. We still have to pay it back. These little slivers over here are customs and corporate taxes. That is our receipts.

Here is our net outlays. You notice this little black box here? This is all borrowed. This is what the taxes cover. A week ago, we had a balance budget amendment, which I voted for, but folks had no understanding that the economic literature basically says: If you want to balance the budget today, you have to cut almost half of U.S. spending. Understand that.

Last year, for every dollar that came in, we spent a \$1.43. With the economic effects, if you said tomorrow, David, I demand you balance the budget. I can do it. Tell me which half of the spending you want me to cut. Because right now—this is Social Security right here.

Actually, I think Medicare is here. Other mandatory, this is your VA pension. Those things that are built-in that we are obligated to formula.

You start to look over here, this is net interest. Remember, net interest—actually, it should be gross interest. Total interest right now is the second biggest expenditure in your Federal Government. Defense is actually number 5. The thing that is in the Constitution is number 5 on our stack: Social Security, interest, Medicare, Medicaid, and ObamaCare subsidies and defense.

If you came in here right now and said: DAVID, balance the budget. I can

do it. You tell me how much defense, nondefense, Medicaid, they all have to go away, and because of the economic effects, this black line moves in and you would actually have to start cutting Medicare.

It is math. It is not personal. It is just something that comes off of a calculator and someone who is literate enough to actually look at the numbers. DAVID, it is really bad politics telling people the truth.

I am in a 50/50 district. Now, I am in one of the best educated districts in America. It turns out you can get elected in a real tough district. You can even get—don't tell anyone, but you can get smart, educated Independents and Democrats to vote for you. They may not like you, but they, at least, know you are intellectually credible. When was the last time we actually gave a damn about being intellectually credible around this place?

Net outlays for interest over 10 years. Right now, remember, I mentioned just interest—and actually the number is higher than this—my math is coming in at \$1.2 trillion of interest this year. You are well over 3 percent.

We are going to go down to 3 percent. That is actually what the Treasury Secretary and others say. I agree, but we are borrowing 7.3 percent of the economy at this moment. You tell me what part you want me to cut.

CBO's report, what was it, 2 weeks ago, basically says that in 9 years we are going to be borrowing \$3.1 trillion a year. That is before the war. That is before the request for supplementals. That is before these new healthcare calculations. We are going to be borrowing \$3.1 trillion. This is couple weeks ago, CBO report. \$2.1 trillion of that will just be interest, one will actually be structural deficit.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona has 4½ minutes remaining.

□ 1840

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I apologize. I am going to talk faster. No, I won't do that to you. As some of you know, I have a coffee problem, and I have only had like nine cups today. I am not shaking, and I am trying not to talk like a machine gun.

Mr. Speaker, I have this chart. You can find this chart if you really care about it. It basically talks about interest fragility. What is interest fragility? It is when interest goes up, interest rates go up, and what that means to the debt.

When you start looking at a chart like this—so, think about this. For 1 year, a 10-percent increase, so essentially 10 basis points, it is about \$4.1 billion. You start to see when you actually go out 10 years and start looking at, hey, if we had 1 point of interest—

now, this is on the base debt right now, publicly sold debt, not the full debt, but the publicly sold debt. That comes out to \$3.1 trillion, a single point for 10 years.

What happens when the bond market has more influence and changes our spending patterns more than this place does? I had people say—as we were trying to do the big, beautiful bill, and then we were supposed to do the second reconciliation to pay for a big chunk of it—but that would be too difficult. We might have to talk about fixing Medicare and Medicare Advantage.

Look, go read the reports that are stacked up on my desk that say you have a couple of trillion dollars of waste, fraud, and misalignment. The Wall Street Journal does article after article after article, full-page things on it, saying, hey, the high grading, that is \$100 billion a year. We are going to do what about it, Mr. Speaker? Oh, but we would have to explain it. What is wrong with us?

Unless we convince the world debt markets—remember, we are the biggest debtor in the world. You want lower mortgage rates? Convince the debt markets because the Federal Reserve only affects the short end of the curve. Your mortgage is based off the 10-year. The 10-year is a market rate, not a Federal Reserve rate. How many politicians around here: We have to beat up the Federal Reserve to lower interest rates. That is on the 2-year, the short end of the curve, maybe even less. Convince the debt markets that we are actually going to stabilize our debt.

We have a 40-year cycle. Those of us who are baby boomers, to move on to our reward before we get back to the more normal demographics—those normal demographics may never come because the fertility rate in the Western world continues to fall.

Look, there are things we can do. This is the type of improper payments. I have been working on this for years. Stop the waste and fraud in government. It is billions and billions of dollars. If you are borrowing \$220 billion to \$230 billion every single month, we can get rid of every improper payment. We don't even cover a month's worth of borrowing. We still have to do this.

It turns out that the most powerful way to fix something like this, Mr. Speaker, is not a whole bunch of new laws, not buildings full of auditors, buildings full of lawyers. It is data scientists.

Look, I chair the Oversight Subcommittee of Ways and Means. We have investigations going on into Medicare part C, hospice care, and organ procurement. How are we finding these things? We hired a data scientist.

Mr. Speaker, there is hope. There is a way to do this. We just need to step up our game and become more intellectually curious and robust. With that, maybe we can stabilize the future for your retirement and our kids.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SHARAREH MOGHADDAM'S  
DETENTION

(Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2025, Mr. SHERMAN of California was recognized for 30 minutes.)

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of the House and to the American people a truly heartbreaking, desperate, and unfair situation involving Ms. Sharareh Moghaddam.

She resides in my district with her U.S. citizen husband and is currently being detained hundreds of miles from her home by immigration officials, despite the fact that a Federal immigration court has already ruled in her favor. According to that court, she should be home with her family in the San Fernando Valley, pursuant, in part, to the green card or permanent residency card that she has held for many years.

Sharareh Moghaddam is pictured here with her family. She is a respected resident of the Los Angeles area's great San Fernando Valley. She is respected throughout our community, as evidenced by the hundreds of constituents who have contacted my office through a written petition and the nearly 100 telephone calls that have come into my office.

The fact is that she and her husband are well-known small business owners in our community. They are beloved members of our community. Specifically, over 400 constituents have signed a petition to our office describing Sharareh Moghaddam as a valued member of our community. As I said, over 100 people have called our office.

Wherever I go in the San Fernando Valley, I have talked to dozens of people who come up on their own and say, Congressman, why is Sharareh Moghaddam still imprisoned? What can we do?

Along with her husband, Sharareh Moghaddam was pursuing the American Dream when they founded a small business, Elegant Balloons, located at 4052 Laurel Canyon Boulevard in Studio City. They have served the San Fernando Valley for years, and hundreds and hundreds of residents describe that business as a beloved mainstay of our community.

Balloons. Why is a woman imprisoned in Arizona when she should be with her balloons and with her family in our community?

Arguably, most importantly, she is the primary caregiver for her 75-year-old husband, a U.S. citizen who is re-

covering from two heart surgeries. She, herself, has diabetes, and in her detention, this has only worsened. She has not received the care or medication regimen recommended by her physician. Her release would help her health and be critical to the health of her U.S. citizen husband.

This is a family that needs to be reunited in the San Fernando Valley. This is not the profile of someone who would abscond from her responsibilities, abscond from her family, abscond from her community.

Despite this, DHS has detained Sharareh Moghaddam for over 7 months, as she is in declining health and her husband needs her care, as well.

□ 1850

It is time to send her home. There is simply no reason to insist that she continue in detention to the detriment of her health and her husband's health.

There is considerable evidence, overwhelming evidence, that she shares strong ties to her family and our community, and that she will be accessible to comply with whatever requests or orders authorities might make.

This is not the profile of a person who is a danger to our community. This is the profile of a woman who has created a balloon store right there in Studio City. She uplifts my district and brings smiles to thousands in our district with her business.

A habeas corpus petition challenging her detention is currently pending before a judge, and her family is simply asking for a fair and timely decision.

I look forward to the day when Sharareh can be reunited with her family. I look forward to welcoming her back to the San Fernando Valley. She represents what makes American communities strong, and her continued detention is a travesty and antithetical to American values.

Sharareh, please stay strong. Your community thinks of you every day. I will not give up, and the San Fernando Valley will not give up until you come home.

NO NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION IN THE MIDDLE  
EAST

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, for 30 years, I have served on the Foreign Affairs Committee, where I currently serve as the chief Democrat on the Middle East and North Africa Subcommittee. I have spent 30 years fighting to make sure that Iran never has a nuclear weapon. I have given dozens of speeches on this floor on that very subject.

Yet, there is another subject that has not been addressed very much and may be almost as important. That is preventing Saudi Arabia from developing a nuclear weapon. MBS, the Crown Prince, the real head of government, has made it plain that he would like to have access to a nuclear weapon or at least the capacity to build one. He has said in the past that he wants the same deal as Iran got.

Well, I don't think he wants that deal now because Iran is not looking all that good. Yet, what he does want is a nuclear cooperation agreement with the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I have always felt that any nuclear cooperation agreements, particularly in the Middle East, should meet the highest level of safeguards so that, in an effort to allow for the creation of nuclear power, we don't see a clandestine effort to develop a nuclear weapon.

Mr. Speaker, I wrote and got passed in 2020 section 1264 of that year's National Defense Authorization Act, requiring that 90 days before even asking Congress to review a nuclear agreement, we get an extra 90 days before that to know that the President is anticipating sending us a nuclear cooperation agreement with inadequate safeguards, or at least not meeting the safeguards that are specified.

The President did send us that very notice on November 21 of last year. Now, get this: The notice was sent only to Republicans, only to the chair of the Foreign Affairs Committee, not to the ranking member.

All comity will break down in this House if notices to the House are notices to only one political party. Yet, alas, this subterfuge will probably lead to nothing because, in February, finally, months later, Democrats were notified. I am sure that it is probably another 60 days from now before the President sends us a proposed nuclear cooperation agreement with Saudi Arabia because, as I understand it, other things are happening in the Middle East.

Why is it so important and so reasonable that we have safeguards in any agreement? First of all, the safeguards that are called for are the same safeguards that the United Arab Emirates has already agreed to. These are safeguards fully consistent with the efficient and economic production of nuclear power. There is no reason for Saudi Arabia not to sign up for the same safeguards unless they want a clandestine nuclear weapons program.

Why should we be concerned about a Saudi nuclear program? First, we have no idea what that does for the Middle East, assuming that MBS is still running Saudi Arabia. I am old enough to remember a time when there was a powerful—the most powerful—Middle East monarch. It was 1978, and the most powerful Middle East monarch was the Shah of Iran, a good friend of the United States.

Every weapons system that the Shah had in 1978 was in the hands of the ayatollahs in 1979. There is no guarantee that, even if you have faith in MBS, the weapons systems developed by his government will be controlled by his government.

Saudi Arabia is not a democracy. Its government does not reflect an elected will of its people, and who knows who will be running Saudi Arabia in the next decade.