The Evolution of Economic Ties and Energy Cooperation: Saudi Arabia and the United States (Post-2014)

Rashid Khan[1], Prof. Mahendra Kumar[2]
[1]*Research Scholar, Dr. Bhimrao Ambedkar University, Agra*
[2]*Professor Department of Political Scienc Bhadawar Vidya Mandir (PG) College, Bah Agra Dr. Bhimrao Ambedkar University, Agra*

***Abstract* - The bilateral relationship between Saudi Arabia and the United States has undergone a profound and multidimensional transformation since 2014, driven by shifting global oil markets, the emergence of United States shale energy, geopolitical realignments across the Middle East, and the Kingdom's ambitious Vision 2030 reform agenda. This paper examines the structural evolution of economic ties and energy cooperation between the two countries during the post-2014 period, with particular attention to the 2014 oil price collapse, the renegotiation of the petrodollar framework, investment flows, arms trade, and the diplomatic strains that have tested but ultimately preserved the strategic partnership. Drawing on a range of primary and secondary sources, the paper argues that while the United States shale revolution has fundamentally altered the energy interdependence that once defined the relationship, both nations have adapted their engagement through diversified economic channels, multilateral energy governance, and renewed strategic realignments that reflect the realities of twenty-first century geopolitics. The paper concludes that although the relationship faces unprecedented structural pressures, it retains a durable foundation built on mutual economic interests, regional security concerns, and institutional inertia that neither country has yet sought to dismantle.**

Keywords: Saudi Arabia, United States, energy cooperation, petrodollar, Vision 2030, OPEC+, shale revolution, bilateral trade, geopolitics, oil market.

I. INTRODUCTION

The strategic partnership between Saudi Arabia and the United States is one of the most consequential bilateral relationships in contemporary international affairs. Rooted in the historic 1945 meeting between President Franklin D. Roosevelt and King Abdulaziz Ibn Saud aboard the USS Quincy, the relationship was built on a foundational compact: Saudi Arabia would guarantee reliable oil supplies to the United States and price those exports in US dollars, while the United States would provide military protection and political support to the Saudi monarchy (Bronson, 2006). For nearly seven decades, this arrangement functioned as the cornerstone of regional order, anchoring the broader architecture of American power in the Middle East and financing the rapid modernisation of the Saudi state.

However, since 2014, this longstanding arrangement has been subjected to intense structural pressures that have compelled both governments to recalibrate their expectations and strategies. The shale oil and gas revolution in the United States transformed the country from a net importer of petroleum to the world's largest producer by 2018, fundamentally altering the energy dependence that had historically compelled Washington to prioritise Saudi preferences (Yergin, 2020). Simultaneously, the dramatic collapse of global oil prices in the second half of 2014 exposed the fiscal vulnerabilities of the Saudi state, triggering a major reform effort under the leadership of Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman and a comprehensive economic diversification programme known as Vision 2030 (Al-Rasheed, 2021). These developments, compounded by a series of diplomatic crises including the murder of journalist Jamal Khashoggi in 2018, the Yemen conflict, and diverging assessments of Iran's regional ambitions, have introduced unprecedented uncertainty into a relationship that was once considered unshakeable.

This paper examines the evolution of economic ties and energy cooperation between Saudi Arabia and the United States in the post-2014 period. It proceeds in several stages. First, it provides a historical and structural overview of the relationship up to the 2014 turning point. Second, it analyses the impact of the shale revolution and the 2014 oil price shock on bilateral energy dynamics. Third, it examines the transformation of economic engagement through trade, investment, and arms sales. Fourth, it traces the geopolitical strains that have affected the relationship, including the Khashoggi affair and diverging positions on Iran and Yemen. Finally, it assesses the prospects for the relationship in light of the global energy transition and Saudi Vision 2030.

II. HISTORICAL FOUNDATIONS AND THE PRE-2014 FRAMEWORK

To understand the post-2014 evolution, it is essential to situate the Saudi-American relationship within its historical context. The 1945 agreement established a precedent of mutual strategic dependence that survived through dramatic shifts in global politics, including the Cold War, the 1973 Arab oil embargo, the Iranian Revolution, and the Gulf Wars of 1991 and 2003 (Bronson, 2006). Central to this arrangement was the petrodollar system formalised in the early 1970s following President Nixon's abandonment of the Bretton Woods gold standard. Saudi Arabia agreed to denominate all oil sales in US dollars, thereby sustaining global demand for American currency and reinforcing the financial architecture underpinning American hegemony (Spiro, 1999). In exchange, Washington provided the Saudi monarchy with a security umbrella, military hardware, and political legitimacy that enabled the Al Saud family to withstand internal and external challenges to its rule.

Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, Saudi Arabia remained the world's largest oil exporter and the swing producer within OPEC whose decisions could determine global oil prices (Stevens, 2012). American dependence on Saudi oil imports was not merely quantitative but structural: the Kingdom's willingness to maintain spare production capacity and moderate prices within acceptable ranges was considered indispensable to global economic stability. This gave Saudi Arabia enormous leverage in Washington and ensured that American policymakers were deeply attentive to Saudi concerns on a wide range of issues, from arms transfers to the Palestinian question (Yergin, 1991). By the early 2000s, bilateral trade in goods and services exceeded $50 billion annually, and hundreds of thousands of Saudi students had been educated in American universities, creating deep human capital linkages between the two societies (US Census Bureau, 2014).

The first decade of the twenty-first century saw the relationship tested by the September 11 attacks of 2001, in which fifteen of the nineteen hijackers were Saudi nationals, and by the subsequent American invasion of Iraq, which Saudi officials viewed with deep alarm as a destabilising action that would empower Iran (Riedel, 2011). Despite these frictions, the structural foundations of the relationship remained intact. High oil prices between 2003 and 2014, driven by Chinese demand and limited non-OPEC supply growth, enriched the Saudi treasury and allowed Riyadh to maintain its position as one of the world's most important purchasers of American military equipment and Treasury bonds (IMF, 2013). This period of relative stability, however, obscured growing tensions that would emerge with full force after 2014.

III. THE SHALE REVOLUTION AND THE 2014 OIL PRICE COLLAPSE

The single most transformative development affecting the Saudi-American energy relationship in the post-2014 period was the dramatic rise of unconventional oil and gas production in the United States, commonly referred to as the shale revolution. Beginning in earnest around 2008 with breakthroughs in hydraulic fracturing technology and horizontal drilling techniques, American shale production grew from approximately 0.5 million barrels per day to over 7 million barrels per day by 2014, fundamentally altering global supply dynamics (EIA, 2020). By 2018, the United States had surpassed Saudi Arabia and Russia to become the world's largest petroleum producer, a development that would have seemed almost unimaginable just a decade earlier (IEA, 2019). This transformation had profound implications for the energy relationship between Washington and Riyadh.

The first direct consequence was the dramatic fall in global oil prices that began in mid-2014. After trading above $100 per barrel for much of the preceding three years, Brent crude fell to below $50 per barrel by January 2015 (World Bank, 2015). The causes of this collapse were multiple and interacting: the surge in American shale production had added significant volumes to global supply, while demand growth in China and other emerging markets was slowing faster than anticipated. In November 2014, OPEC, under strong Saudi leadership, made the consequential decision not to cut production in order to defend market prices, a departure from its traditional role as swing producer. This decision, widely interpreted as a deliberate strategy to drive high-cost American shale producers out of the market, reflected Saudi confidence in its low production costs and ample foreign exchange reserves (Stevens, 2016).

The market share strategy ultimately failed on its own terms. While many smaller American shale producers did face financial difficulties, the industry as a whole proved more resilient than Saudi officials had anticipated, demonstrating remarkable cost reductions through technological innovation and operational efficiencies (Yergin, 2020). Saudi Arabia, meanwhile, was suffering severe fiscal consequences. The Kingdom's break-even oil price, the level needed to balance the national budget, had risen to approximately $100 per barrel due to the massive social spending commitments undertaken in the wake of the Arab Spring uprisings of 2011 (IMF, 2016). The collapse in revenues created a significant budget deficit, forced the partial drawdown of sovereign wealth fund assets, and accelerated the urgency of economic reform under Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman (Al-Rasheed, 2021).

The strategic ramifications of the shale revolution extended beyond economics to reshape the geopolitical logic of the relationship. American policymakers, emboldened by domestic energy abundance, became less reliant on Middle Eastern oil imports and therefore less constrained by the need to maintain Saudi goodwill. The Obama administration's pursuit of the Iran nuclear deal, formally concluded as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) in 2015, was viewed in Riyadh as evidence of this reduced dependence and a dangerous accommodation of Iranian expansionism (Gause, 2014). Saudi officials expressed deep frustration that Washington was prioritising diplomatic engagement with Tehran over the security concerns of its traditional Gulf allies, a perception that introduced significant strain into the bilateral relationship during the final years of the Obama presidency.

IV. OPEC+ AND THE RECONFIGURATION OF ENERGY GOVERNANCE

The inadequacy of the 2014 market share strategy eventually compelled a fundamental reconfiguration of global oil governance arrangements. In December 2016, Saudi Arabia led OPEC to conclude the landmark Vienna Agreement with Russia and nine other non-OPEC producers, creating what became known as the OPEC+ framework. Under this arrangement, twenty-three major oil-producing nations agreed to coordinate production cuts to stabilise markets and restore prices to levels more fiscally sustainable for producer economies (Fattouh & Sen, 2018). The agreement represented a strategic recalibration by Riyadh, acknowledging that the market share strategy had not achieved its objectives and that cooperation with Russia was necessary to manage global supply in an era of abundant American shale production.

The OPEC+ arrangement had complex implications for the United States. On one hand, American shale producers benefited from the price stabilisation that OPEC+ production cuts facilitated, as higher prices enabled continued investment and production growth. On the other hand, the arrangement effectively represented a coordination mechanism among major oil producers that at times conflicted with American interests in low energy prices for consumers and competitiveness concerns for its manufacturing sector (Yergin, 2020). The Trump administration periodically pressured Saudi Arabia to increase production, most visibly via Twitter communications from President Trump, creating a novel and at times awkward dynamic in which an American president was publicly lobbying a foreign government over its internal production decisions (Blanchard & Felter, 2020).

The COVID-19 pandemic of 2020 produced the most dramatic test of the OPEC+ framework. In March 2020, negotiations between Saudi Arabia and Russia over production cuts collapsed in acrimonious circumstances, triggering a brief but intense price war that saw oil prices collapse to historic lows, with the WTI futures contract briefly trading in negative territory in April 2020 (IEA, 2020). The United States played an active mediating role in the subsequent negotiations, with President Trump personally lobbying both Saudi Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman and Russian President Vladimir Putin to conclude a new agreement, reflecting the continued American interest in oil market stability despite its domestic energy abundance (Blanchard & Felter, 2020). The eventual OPEC+ agreement of April 2020, which involved the largest production cuts in history, demonstrated the continuing centrality of Saudi Arabia to global energy governance and the ongoing American interest in that governance even in an era of energy self-sufficiency.

V. ECONOMIC DIVERSIFICATION, VISION 2030, AND THE TRANSFORMATION OF BILATERAL INVESTMENT

The low oil price environment after 2014 provided the catalyst for Saudi Arabia's most ambitious economic reform programme since the oil boom of the 1970s. Launched officially in April 2016 under the stewardship of Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman, Vision 2030 set out a comprehensive agenda to reduce Saudi dependence on oil revenues, diversify the economy into non-oil sectors, increase female labour force participation, develop the entertainment and tourism industries, and reform the public sector (Vision 2030, 2016). The programme represented a fundamental rethinking of the Saudi social contract, which had historically exchanged generous welfare benefits and public employment for political loyalty, and it had significant implications for the bilateral economic relationship with the United States.

One of the most significant initiatives associated with Vision 2030 was the proposed partial privatisation of Saudi Aramco, the world's most profitable company and the crown jewel of the Saudi economy. The initial public offering of approximately 1.5% of Aramco's shares was completed on the Tadawul stock exchange in Riyadh in December 2019, valuing the company at approximately $1.7 trillion and raising $25.6 billion, making it the largest IPO in history at the time (Reuters, 2019). While Saudi officials had initially hoped to list a portion of shares on international exchanges including the New York Stock Exchange, concerns about American legal liability under the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act (JASTA) and the potential exposure of Aramco to discovery proceedings ultimately led to the decision to list exclusively on the domestic exchange (Al-Rasheed, 2021). This decision reflected the continuing legal and political complications that beset the bilateral relationship even as economic interdependence deepened.

The Public Investment Fund (PIF), Saudi Arabia's sovereign wealth fund, emerged as a major vehicle for implementing Vision 2030 and deepening economic ties with the United States. Under Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman's direction, the PIF was transformed from a relatively passive domestic investment vehicle into an activist global fund with ambitious targets to grow its assets under management to $2 trillion by 2030 (PIF, 2021). The fund made a series of high-profile investments in American technology and entertainment companies, including a $3.5 billion investment in Uber in 2016 and a $45 billion commitment to SoftBank's Vision Fund, which in turn invested in numerous Silicon Valley start-ups (Economist, 2019). These investments reflected a deliberate Saudi strategy to position the Kingdom as a participant in the knowledge economy of the future and to build relationships with the American technology sector that would survive any eventual decline in energy interdependence.

The bilateral economic relationship also continued to be shaped by substantial arms sales, which remained one of the most commercially significant and politically controversial dimensions of engagement. The Trump administration concluded what it described as a $110 billion arms deal with Saudi Arabia in May 2017 during President Trump's first foreign trip, which included substantial components to be delivered in subsequent years (Blanchard & Felter, 2020). American arms exports to Saudi Arabia during the post-2014 period covered a wide range of systems including combat aircraft, munitions, missile defence batteries, and naval equipment, supporting both Saudi defence modernisation objectives and American defence industry employment. Critics of this trade, including many members of the US Congress, argued that American weapons were being used in the Yemen conflict in ways that caused indiscriminate civilian casualties and potentially violated American law and international humanitarian law (Human Rights Watch, 2020).

VI. DIPLOMATIC STRAINS AND POLITICAL TURBULENCE

Beyond the structural economic and energy shifts, the post-2014 period has been characterised by a series of acute diplomatic crises that have tested the resilience of the bilateral relationship in unprecedented ways. The most serious of these was the murder of Saudi journalist and Washington Post columnist Jamal Khashoggi inside the Saudi consulate in Istanbul, Turkey on 2 October 2018. Khashoggi, a former Saudi government insider who had become an outspoken critic of Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman's consolidation of power, was killed by a team of Saudi intelligence operatives in what the CIA subsequently assessed with high confidence had been ordered by the Crown Prince himself (CIA, 2021). The killing produced a global wave of outrage and placed the Trump administration in an acutely uncomfortable position, given its close personal and strategic alignment with Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman.

The Trump administration's response to the Khashoggi killing prioritised the preservation of economic and strategic ties with Saudi Arabia over accountability for the murder, with President Trump explicitly citing billions of dollars in arms sales and investment as reasons not to impose penalties on the Crown Prince personally (Trump, 2018). This position generated significant bipartisan criticism in the United States Congress, which passed resolutions condemning the killing and, in the case of the Senate, explicitly invoking the War Powers Resolution to attempt to curtail American military support for the Yemen conflict (Congressional Record, 2019). The Biden administration, upon taking office in January 2021, released the CIA assessment implicating the Crown Prince and imposed sanctions on individuals directly involved in the operation, though it refrained from sanctioning Mohammed bin Salman himself, citing the practical necessity of engaging with the Kingdom's de facto ruler (White House, 2021).

The Yemen conflict represented another significant source of bilateral friction in the post-2014 period. The Saudi-led military intervention in Yemen, which began in March 2015 in response to the Houthi takeover of the Yemeni capital Sanaa, was conducted with substantial American support including intelligence sharing, aerial refuelling, and arms sales (Salisbury, 2020). However, the conflict produced a devastating humanitarian catastrophe, with tens of thousands of civilian deaths and the world's most severe humanitarian crisis according to United Nations assessments, leading to sustained congressional criticism of American complicity (UN OCHA, 2021). The Biden administration suspended certain offensive arms sales to Saudi Arabia shortly after taking office and ended American support for offensive operations, creating renewed tensions with Riyadh, though the administration subsequently sought to recalibrate the relationship in light of rising oil prices and Iranian nuclear activities (White House, 2022).

The divergence between Washington and Riyadh over Iran policy has been a persistent structural tension throughout the post-2014 period. Saudi Arabia views Iran as an existential threat and has consistently pushed for maximum American pressure on Tehran, including opposition to the JCPOA nuclear agreement of 2015, which Riyadh feared would legitimate Iranian regional ambitions and provide financial resources that would be directed toward Iranian proxy activities in Yemen, Iraq, Lebanon, and Syria (Gause, 2014). The Trump administration's withdrawal from the JCPOA in May 2018 and its adoption of a maximum pressure strategy against Iran broadly aligned with Saudi preferences, facilitating a period of close strategic convergence between the two governments. However, the Biden administration's efforts to revive the nuclear deal through the Vienna negotiations created renewed Saudi anxiety about American reliability as a security guarantor and the possibility of a broader American-Iranian accommodation that might come at Saudi expense (Al-Monitor, 2022).

VII. THE ENERGY TRANSITION AND LONG-TERM STRATEGIC RECALIBRATION

Perhaps the most profound long-term challenge to the Saudi-American energy relationship is the global transition away from fossil fuels driven by climate change concerns, technological advances in renewable energy, and shifting consumer preferences. The United States has taken increasingly ambitious climate commitments under the Biden administration, including a target of achieving net-zero carbon emissions by 2050 and a significant expansion of domestic renewable energy capacity under the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 (White House, 2022). These commitments, if fully implemented, would structurally reduce American demand for petroleum imports and diminish the strategic importance of Saudi oil supplies to the American economy over the long term.

Saudi Arabia has itself acknowledged the imperative of adapting to the energy transition, though its public posture has combined acceptance of long-term change with vigorous defence of the continued importance of oil in the near and medium term. Aramco's CEO Amin Nasser has repeatedly argued that premature underinvestment in oil production capacity will lead to severe price spikes and energy insecurity before renewable alternatives are available at scale, a position that aligns with Saudi economic interests but also reflects genuine technical assessments shared by many energy analysts (IEA, 2021). Saudi Arabia has invested in renewable energy projects domestically, including ambitious plans for solar generation that could displace domestically consumed oil for power generation, thereby freeing up more crude for export, and has presented Vision 2030 partly as a programme of adaptation to a world of lower long-term oil demand (Vision 2030, 2016).

The Biden administration's diplomatic engagement with Saudi Arabia took a dramatic turn in July 2022 when President Biden personally visited Riyadh and met with Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman, despite having previously pledged to make Saudi Arabia a pariah state over the Khashoggi killing. The visit, which included a controversial fist bump between Biden and the Crown Prince, reflected the administration's calculation that Saudi cooperation on oil production was essential to managing global energy prices in the context of Russia's invasion of Ukraine and the resulting supply disruptions (New York Times, 2022). Saudi Arabia's subsequent refusal to significantly increase production in the months following the visit, and the OPEC+ decision in October 2022 to cut production by two million barrels per day despite American lobbying against such a move, reinforced a sense in Washington that Riyadh was pursuing an increasingly independent foreign policy and was no longer willing to subordinate its economic interests to American political preferences (Financial Times, 2022).

The episode illustrated the fundamental transformation in the balance of leverage within the bilateral relationship since 2014. Whereas American energy dependence had once given Saudi Arabia considerable ability to threaten supply disruptions as a form of political leverage, the shale revolution had largely eliminated that threat. At the same time, however, American energy self-sufficiency had not translated into complete indifference to Saudi production decisions, since the United States remained deeply integrated into a global oil market in which Saudi choices had significant macroeconomic consequences for American consumers and the broader global economy (Yergin, 2020). Both countries thus found themselves in a novel structural situation in which traditional forms of energy leverage had weakened but economic interdependence through other channels, including investment, arms sales, and financial linkages, had deepened significantly.

VIII. CONCLUSION

The evolution of economic ties and energy cooperation between Saudi Arabia and the United States since 2014 reflects a relationship in profound structural transition, yet one that has demonstrated considerable institutional resilience despite facing pressures that might have been expected to fracture it entirely. The shale revolution and the 2014 oil price collapse fundamentally altered the energy interdependence that had historically been the primary foundation of the bilateral relationship, reducing American import dependence and compelling Saudi Arabia to reconsider its economic model through Vision 2030. The 2016 OPEC+ framework represented a Saudi adaptation to the new energy landscape that incorporated Russia as a co-manager of global oil markets, introducing a triangular dynamic into what had previously been a predominantly bilateral governance arrangement.

The diplomatic crises of the post-2014 period, particularly the Khashoggi murder and the Yemen conflict, exposed the normative tensions embedded within a relationship that pairs an established liberal democracy with an absolute monarchy, and revealed the limits of purely strategic calculation as a foundation for stable bilateral ties in an era of social media scrutiny and activist legislatures. Both governments have navigated these tensions by compartmentalising their differences and continuing to pursue cooperation on issues of mutual interest, a pragmatic approach that reflects the depth of structural interdependence even as its specific character has evolved significantly from the original oil-for-security bargain of 1945.

Looking ahead, the primary challenge to the relationship is the global energy transition, which over the medium to long term threatens to erode the petroleum nexus that has anchored bilateral engagement for eight decades. Saudi Vision 2030's success in diversifying the economy will partly determine the Kingdom's ability to maintain its geopolitical influence as oil revenues potentially diminish, while American climate policy commitments will shape the trajectory of domestic energy demand and the importance Washington attaches to maintaining stable relations with major Gulf producers. What seems likely is that the relationship will continue to evolve away from its energy origins and toward a more complex engagement encompassing investment, technology, security, and diplomatic alignment on issues ranging from Middle Eastern stability to the management of great power competition with China and Russia. The durability of the relationship will ultimately depend on the ability of both governments to adapt their strategic frameworks to a fundamentally changed global context while managing the domestic political pressures that make frank accommodation difficult in both Washington and Riyadh (Bronson, 2006; Riedel, 2011; Al-Rasheed, 2021).

REFERENCES

[1] Al-Monitor. (2022). Saudi Arabia watches Iran nuclear talks with growing unease. Al-Monitor Analysis, March 2022.

[2] Al-Rasheed, M. (2021). Salman's Legacy: The Dilemmas of a New Era. Oxford University Press.

[3] Blanchard, C. M., & Felter, C. (2020). Saudi Arabia: Background and U.S. Relations. Congressional Research Service Report RL33533. Washington, DC: CRS.

[4] Bronson, R. (2006). Thicker than Oil: America's Uneasy Partnership with Saudi Arabia. Oxford University Press.

[5] CIA. (2021). Assessing the Saudi Government's Role in the Killing of Jamal Khashoggi. Office of the Director of National Intelligence, Declassified Assessment. Washington, DC.

[6] Congressional Record. (2019). S.J. Res. 7 — Yemen War Powers Resolution. 116th Congress, 1st Session. Washington, DC: US Government Publishing Office.

[7] Economist. (2019, June 6). The PIF's global ambitions: Saudi Arabia's sovereign wealth fund. The Economist.

[8] EIA. (2020). U.S. Field Production of Crude Oil. U.S. Energy Information Administration, Monthly Energy Review. Washington, DC: EIA.

[9] Fattouh, B., & Sen, A. (2018). The OPEC+ agreement: Governance, compliance and implications for oil markets. Oxford Institute for Energy Studies, OIES Paper WPM 78.

[10] Financial Times. (2022, October 6). OPEC+ cut puts Saudi Arabia on collision course with White House. Financial Times.

[11] Gause, F. G. III. (2014). Beyond sectarianism: The new Middle East cold war. Brookings Doha Center Analysis Paper No. 11. Brookings Institution.

[12] Human Rights Watch. (2020). Yemen: US Weapons Used in Unlawful Strikes. Human Rights Watch Report, New York.

[13] IEA. (2019). World Energy Outlook 2019. International Energy Agency. Paris: OECD/IEA.

[14] IEA. (2020). Global Energy Review 2020: The Impacts of the Covid-19 Crisis on Global Energy Demand and CO2 Emissions. Paris: IEA.

[15] IEA. (2021). World Energy Outlook 2021. International Energy Agency. Paris: OECD/IEA.

[16] IMF. (2013). Saudi Arabia: 2013 Article IV Consultation. IMF Country Report No. 13/229. Washington, DC: International Monetary Fund.

[17] IMF. (2016). Saudi Arabia: 2016 Article IV Consultation — Staff Concluding Statement. Washington, DC: International Monetary Fund.

[18] New York Times. (2022, July 15). Biden and Saudi Crown Prince meet, as U.S. prioritizes oil over human rights. The New York Times.

[19] PIF. (2021). Strategy 2021–2025. Public Investment Fund of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Riyadh: PIF.

[20] Reuters. (2019, December 11). Saudi Aramco IPO raises $25.6 billion, biggest in history. Reuters.

[21] Riedel, B. (2011). The Prince of Counterterrorism. Brookings Institution Press.

[22] Salisbury, P. (2020). Yemen: National chaos, local order. Chatham House Research Paper. London: Royal Institute of International Affairs.

[23] Spiro, D. E. (1999). The Hidden Hand of American Hegemony: Petrodollar Recycling and International Markets. Cornell University Press.

[24] Stevens, P. (2012). The 'Shale Gas Revolution': Developments and Changes. Chatham House Briefing Paper EERG BP 2012/04. London.

[25] Stevens, P. (2016). Saudi Aramco: The Jewel in the Crown. Chatham House Research Paper. London: Royal Institute of International Affairs.

[26] Trump, D. J. (2018, November 20). Statement from President Donald J. Trump on Standing with Saudi Arabia. White House Press Release. Washington, DC.

[27] UN OCHA. (2021). Yemen Humanitarian Response Plan 2021. United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. New York: OCHA.

[28] US Census Bureau. (2014). U.S. Trade in Goods with Saudi Arabia. Foreign Trade Statistics. Washington, DC: US Census Bureau.

[29] Vision 2030. (2016). Vision 2030: Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Riyadh.

[30] White House. (2021, February 26). Briefing on Accountability for the Murder of Jamal Khashoggi. White House Press Briefing, Washington, DC.

[31] White House. (2022). Inflation Reduction Act: Summary of Climate and Clean Energy Provisions. White House Fact Sheet. Washington, DC.

[32] World Bank. (2015). Commodity Markets Outlook: Oil Prices and the Global Economy. Washington, DC: World Bank Group.

[33] Yergin, D. (1991). The Prize: The Epic Quest for Oil, Money and Power. Simon & Schuster.

[34] Yergin, D. (2020). The New Map: Energy, Climate, and the Clash of Nations. Penguin Press.