

The Impact of President of 'USA' Donald Trump's Policies on the Middle East: An Analytical Study

Sarbast Abdullah Mohammed

Republic of Iraq Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research Kirkuk University- College of Law and Political Science Department of Law and politics Science

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.91100021>

Received: 07 November 2025; Accepted: 14 November 2025; Published: 27 November 2025

ABSTRACT

This analysis focuses on the direct outcomes that President Donald Trump's diplomatic action has had on the Middle East's Politics, trade and security. Specifically, what has the United States' withdrawal from the Iran nuclear agreement, relocation of the US Embassy to Jerusalem, and the signing of the Abraham Accords done to the configuration of global alliances, the deepening and proliferation of rivalries, and the re-architecting of the mechanisms of peace? With the intention of providing a coherent account of the dilemmas and accumulations of the Trump presidency, this study utilizes qualitative analysis on documents, field studies of the region, specialized documents, and iterated regional commentary. The study's central argument is that the responses from national leaders, which are overt and covert, support and oppose, illustrate, yet again, that American choices are crucial, among other things, to the geopolitics of the Middle East.

Keywords: Trump, Middle East, U.S. Foreign Policy, Iran Nuclear Deal, Abraham Accords, Jerusalem Recognition, Geopolitics, Regional Security, U.S.-Middle East Relations, Peace Process.

Background of the study

The Middle East has always piqued the attention of global powers due to the region's abundant oil and natural gas reserves, strategic location, and the multifaceted ethnic, religious, and political dynamics of the surrounding vicinity. The region has been under the influence of the United States for several decades and this can be traced back to the need for the US to maintain constant energy supply, support allied states, curb terrorism, and maintain, to the best of its ability, a level of stability in the region (Blanchard 2020). This policy, in the real world, has oscillated from the use of diplomatic negotiations and sanctions, to deploying the US military, establishing peace, and then sponsoring conflicts, insurgences, and jihadist activities that appear.

From 2017 to 2021, Donald Trump resided in the White House, and carried with him a demeanor and attitude that updated the post 1945 era etiquette and attitude about diplomacy with partners. His lens, unlike in the past, was transactional and shallow, often reframing alliances as simple contracts, and receding from relations deemed expensive (Wright 2021). In the name of America-First, Trump and his team renegotiated complex treaties, suddenly stopped military financing, and thought about politics in term of direct Rogers and the United States' posture as well as the political behavior of the Middle Eastern nations towards each other and the USA.

One of the most prominent achievements in the history of foreign politics and relations Under Trump was, in May 2018, the withdrawal from the (JCPOA) that as a 2015 agreement between the United States, Iran and other strong countries that gave Iran the permission to restock the nuclear arms, with ample economic sanctions and sanctions relief (Katzman, 2020).

The administrations rationale for withdrawal-replacing the accord with a so-called maximum-pressure strategy-was to counter Iran's influence across the Middle East and to curb its backing for militia networks and groups labeled terrorist by Washington. Yet the reimposition of sweeping embargoes ratcheted up U.S.-Iranian

hostilities, raised the prospect of open conflict, and unsettled nearby states already caught in sectarian turmoil (Blanchard, 2020). Moreover, the exit alienated key European partners who still backed the JCPOA, exposing deep cracks in the Western alliance that had once coordinated closely on Iranian nuclear conduct.

Evidence of the growing resentment between the United States and the Palestinians, especially over flagrant American support for Israel, surfaced once again in December 2017 when President Donald Trump formally declared Jerusalem to be Israel's capital and ordered the relocation of the Washington embassy from Tel Aviv to that city, a move carried out in May 2018. Nearly all scholarly examinations of the Israeli-Palestinian crisis agree that the holy city contains the most sensitive religious monuments for Jews, Muslims, and Christians and that unresolved questions about its status have long ranked among the chief stumbling blocks in peace talks (Bella, 2023; Hasso, 2020; Tamari, 2022). By treating the question as settled, the Trump administration shattered decades of American diplomatic restraint, invited stern denunciations from Palestinian leaders and from governments across the Arab and Muslim worlds, and intensified the already erosive cycle of distrust and violence that characterizes the conflict (Azar, 2019; Khen, 2020). Notably, shift that many observers believed would be hard to reverse and that redefined expectations for future administrations the policy also signaled a sharper alignment of U.S. diplomatic resources with the aims of the Israeli Right, a (Berti, 2018; Khalidi, 2021).

In contrast to the confrontational policies that marked much of his term, the Trump administration also negotiated a cluster of diplomatic pacts known as the Abraham Accords. The agreements "set the diplomacy and trade relations" between Israel and the UAE, Bahrain, and Morocco and Sudan and Israel, respectively, as well as developed trade and diplomatic relations between Morocco and Israel (Sharp, 2020). These agreements were signed in 2020. This change in geopolitics concerned the trade and economic relations that were ever normalized without addressing the Palestinian problem. This view had always been that relations did not maintain. The participants, driven by an amalgam of fears regarding the spread of Iran and the economic benefits of collaboration, were able to realize the trade relations. There are many, which say the agreements are a "practical reordering of the relations" that are able to change the geopolitical as well as the framework of the whole Middle East (Wright, 2021).

Contrarily, some critics believe that the accords also had initiatives that were more destructive, and less stabilizing for the future. To the detriment of the Palestinians, White House escalated rhetoric toward Iran and, in parallel, galvanizing proxy battles in Syria, Yemen, and Iraq, all while sidelining the thorny issue of Palestine, which were marring some of the Arab citizens and citizens of the Berti, 2018. Also there's Deep South. How Trump's advanced behavior of linking arms with progress, Mrs. Along with the policies, Davis's arms. Auctioned diplomats arms rented a vast and endure body. Symbolically includes the agreements cast for the United Splendid of the held. Different, any administration, Trump the under would be such extravagant. New, Given the patterns emerged like complicated and of timed in divide, region, there is need to move closely examine the policies and rest policies Trump of the Middle East and the postpartum disorder.

Only by identifying both short-term and long-lasting consequences can scholars, policy makers, and the states directly involved assess the health of new alliances, the direction of violent confrontations, and the realistic chances for durable peace and security. This inquiry therefore concentrates on the outlines, objectives, and operating logic of the Trump White House agenda, establishing a baseline for future comparative research on American diplomacy.

INTRODUCTION

Policy makers and analysts have treated the Middle East as a single points-list of threats, since failure or success in that arena will invariably ripple outward to Europe, Asia, and energy markets worldwide. American strategy thus attempted, often simultaneously, to neutralise transnational terrorism, undergird partners such as Israel and Saudi Arabia, guarantee uninterrupted oil shipments, and nurse diplomatic openings in Arabia, Palestine and the Gulf. Though these goals sound constant, presidents have re-ranked their importance and restyled their instruments, changing in consequence the balance of power, public trust, and civil order within the region itself (Gause, 2019).

The Middle East was previously dealt with in a manner that was highly different and distinct from the way in which it was dealt with during the reign of Donald Trump. Unlike the previous President, Trump was completely devoid of diplomatic skills and preferred very cautious speech over rhapsodic rhetoric. He gave pronouncements that made Trump's shifts in policy, like the pulling out of the Iran nuclear deal, the transfer of the U.S. embassy to Jerusalem, and the normalization of relations with Israel and friendly Arab states, masterly feats of the political relation epoch. (Hokayem, 2020)

Let us now examine the staggering impacts of the JCPOA. The deal was headed towards peace, but Trump's restlessness burned with a passion that made the plan easier to forget. The JCPOA was tailored to restrict Iran's nuclear armament program, and meticulously placed biteable pieces of diplomatic and socio-political strings. The plan all at once made the relations of Iran and the West much more tenuous and riled many. Viewed from a different angle, and relative to the rest of the globe, the arrangement in question aimed to shape entire economies, and policies. (Bendavid, 2020)

One of the foremost controversial decisions made during the Trump years was moving the U.S. embassy to Israel and, alongside it, recognizing Jerusalem as the capital of the nation. Moving the embassy represented a sharp rupture of prior U.S. policies which angered multitude of Palestinians as well as foreign countries, and even jeopardized the already stagnant diplomatic status quo (Khalil, 2019). By taking such unprecedented steps, the Trump presidency exacerbated the already existing Bayeux divisions and made the prospect of a two-state solution even more elusive.

On a different and parallel diplomatic front, the administration also orchestrated the so-called Abraham Accords, enabling Israel to establish formal diplomatic relations with the United Arab Emirates and later on with Bahrain and other countries. These agreements were regarded as a diplomatic revolution particularly because they traded recognition for cooperation in defense, especially around Iran, as well as in trade, tourism, and technology (Jones, 2020).

These contrasting policies are the reason why it is important to investigate Trump's policies in the Middle East. To understand today's tensions and tomorrow's opportunities, the focus shifts to the next pages. These pages analyze how these decisions reordered alliances, recalibrated military dynamics, and stalled or ignited new dialogue around peace to provide a comprehensive summary of the last U.S. administration's regional agenda.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The subject of U.S. Middle East policy under president Trump has garnered quite a polarized reception of praise and criticism. This split in the reception has diverged deeply, and the intricacies of the strategies the Trump administration implemented has dictated the routes the various scholars, operating within international law and security studies and other domains of diplomacy and international relations, have taken.

The most well-known fragmentation Trump caused, the withdrawal from the 2015 Iran nuclear deal, is a subject most analysts point to as a benchmark. Mohseni and Kalout believe that the downfall of the agreement, with its multiplicity of signatures, the synthesis achieved during the Iran nuclear negotiations, and set into motion a re-calculation of critical nuclear activities within Tehran. These activities were classified as dangerous in the region. This line of reasoning sees the United States as a militarization catalyst, rather than a stabilizing force. Cedric, Fitzpatrick, goes as far as to say that the politically motivated withdrawal from the deal bipartite Iran and the U.S. disregarded the fact that a lot of the framework the disengaged annex was still supportive of the JCPOA. This action was characterized as a blow to Transatlantic Unity.

In contrast, some analysts have purported that the maximum pressure strategy toward Iran by President Trump was strategically prudent. Goldberg (2020) for instance argues that the imposition of broad sanctions on Iran was able to, in turn, restrict Tehran's finances and thereby restrict Iran's proxies in Iraq, Syria, and Lebanon. From this perspective, this policy is less a failure of diplomacy and more an intentional strategy to limit Iranian expansion in the short to medium term.

One of the latest points of debate in the studies of international affairs is the Abraham Accords which established formal relations with several Arab states. Indyk (2021) views the accords as the pragmatic crowning achievement of diplomacy that changed the Arab-Israeli conversation, if only for a moment, by pushing the Palestinian issue to the periphery. He argues that a shared worry about Iranian influence coupled with possible economic synergies was the reason the signers agreed to put pen to paper. Critics, in contrast, maintain that the agreements were little more than a series of smiling photographs. From their perspective, the accords consolidated authoritarian rule and silenced the political rights of the Palestinian people. Thus, even if the accords received ample attention in the Western press, the critics argue that their impact, to say nothing of the transformative impact, on the region's democratic disposition and achieving peace was minimal and in many ways absent.

The American government's decision to proclaim Jerusalem the capital of Israel in 2017 has received critical analysis from a specific branch of scholarship. Such criticism, in the case of Bisharat (2018), claims that the announcement diplomatically and lawfully overshoot and, in many instances, replaced nuance and refinement. Bisharat (2018) characterizes the proclamation as a monumental break from the far-reaching standards of international relations, claiming that such an action violated several tenets of the United Nations along with numerous established norms and principles, all the while wreaking chaos in the Arab world. In her opinion, Washington marred her claim of independent impartiality, thus, losing the claim to a mediator and might as well be gone from the table because of her unilateral assignment of a legally disputed territory. Countering her argument, Dershowitz (2019) claims that the proclamation did not attempt to cover any theoretical gap, and, rather, was an acknowledgment of a pre-existing status. He offers a realist explanation of her diplomatic statement as a mere adjustment of policy to the realities, while she frames it as a spin on transcendental norms.

The 2019 withdrawal of United States troops from the northern Syrian area of operations has since become a hallmark of inflection on America's orientation towards the Levant. Phillips (2020) describes the move as a withdrawal from the Syrian Democratic Forces, the Kurdish warriors who were the forefront soldiers during the anti-ISIS ground campaign. He argues that the sudden vacuum left within the area encouraged and enabled the Turkish incursion which irreversibly fragmented the geographical patchwork and limited the American control over the post-war order. Such episodes have since been characterized as a diverging and disengaged pattern within the Trump administration's strategic focus for the region. This has been described as a nearly concentrated evasion of the intended outcomes. Other scholars from a libertarian perspective, led by Badow (2020), argue that the withdrawal of troops was in fact delayed and not premature. He suggests that the footprint of Washington remained devoid of any rational formation of a national interest and argues that the responsibility for securing the area rests on the region's local political actions.

Trump's economic and arms deals with Gulf countries, particularly Saudi Arabia, have elicited positive and negative comments along both strategic and ethical lines. Kamrava (2020) argues that the President's willingness to overlook the human rights records of countries after the gruesome assassination of Jamal Khashoggi to maximize weapon sales showed the moral bankruptcy of box diplomacy. Arguably, this critique points to an erosion of ethical consideration in the American foreign policy approach to describing the actions of the State Department in terms of profit as 'realistic' 'a profit before stability or justice.' Gause (2020) mentions on the other hand, that the realist defenders of the deals maintain that the pacts fortified American dominance and curbed Iranian belligerence because of the support provided to American partners in the region. With this in mind, the research on Trump's approach to the Middle East seems to be easily sliced in these two. Supporters relish in the reconfiguration of the alliances, the new economic profits and the strategic gains. On the other hand, detractors point to the increasing self-imposed diplomatic isolation, the Trump administration's deterring record on human rights, and the adverse impact on peace construction. This schism is the result of the continuing tension regarding whether the foreign policy of a nation is ethical or merely self-serving, while at the same time illustrates the enduring complications pertaining to American actions in the Middle East.

METHODOLOGY

This investigation uses highly qualitative interpretative methodologies to explore the ways in which Donald Trump's strategies objectives reconfigured the political dynamics of the Middle East. This analysis focuses on

the organized collection of a large set of documents which include Trump presidential speeches that remain unpublished, classified briefing documents and inter-agency memos, materials generated by think tanks, peer-reviewed publications and press commentary pertaining to the period of and immediately after the Trump presidency. The authors of the study worked to construct a narrative that weaves together the official language of the White House and the commentaries from outside analysts. In this regard, the file is a compilation of documents that originate from government sources and analyses from non-partisan analysts on the area. The work focuses on documents containing the statements of strategic actions that include the American withdrawal from the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, the recognizing Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, and the architecting of the Abraham Accords. In order to eliminate bias, the research team purposefully selected works created by American governmental bodies, bureaus of the Middle Eastern states, and international governmental organizations.

Upon collection of the pertinent files, testimonies, and recordings of the interviews the research team integrated the approach of close reading with content coding in order to analyze profound significance. The bifurcated process for completing the task needed first, to examine recurrently with a specific purpose every single document and try to detect implicit claims, and second, to systematically mark of a tagging of defining terms, policy milestones, and interpretive choices to track their relations throughout the scope of the entire period. In doing so, the researchers were able to identify the patterns of repetition and hidden biases, but also the previously unexposed relationships between earlier, contemporaneous, and later events of the Trump administration. The fine detailed close examination and analysis shed light on the sophisticated hidden intents of the policymakers, the actual outcomes that this deliberation brought about on various audiences, and the distinct responses that the policymakers, regional elites, and citizens of the area formulated.

The less tangible qualitative methods are still crucial while analyzing the complexities of global politics. This is precisely the case when indicators relative to ‘winners’ and ‘losers’ and the reasons behind new power distributions are shrouded in obscurity by ‘quantitative’ methods. Counterpointing narratives from numerous timetables allowed the group to draw both short-lived crises and the more than profound structural change set in motion by following ‘Trump’ choices. This methodical weaving all together of descriptions seeks to, at the end, offer a rich and situated account of how, since the year 2016, his diplomacy has changed the Middle Eastern political framework.

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

This study illustrates that the Trump administration reframed the geostrategic and security matrices of the Middle East on diverging and even conflicting vectors. This evaluation comes with three principal ramifications, which are: First, there is an increasingly and overtly confrontational position with the Islamic Republic of Iran. Second, the Arab-Israeli normalization and formalized with the the the Abraham accords is witnessing a significant acceleration. Third, there is a significant re-evaluation among a group of regional partners on the predictability and depth of the operations of the United States.

Even more obvious is the steep turn in U.S.-Iran relations which followed the exit of Washington from the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA). Eisenstadt and Knights (2019) show that the renewed sanctions, even under the maximum- pressure strategy, were a burden on the economy but did not change the core policy of the Regime. Instead, breaching nuclear agreements and ceilings became more abundant and crossed borders through proxies in Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, and Yemen. This back-and-forth type of tension creates moments that are more explosive like the U.S. strike which killed General Qassem Soleimani in January of 2020 and the retaliatory missile salvos that Iran launched at the American outposts in Iraq.

New evidence suggested that the latest escalation has considerably diminished the heightened stability observed in the extra-continental Middle Eastern region. In the absence of diplomatic contact paired with the steady increase of military threats, the odds of a major, even dangerous, miscalculation progressing to open war certainly increased. This has been noted by Maloney (2020). This whole scenario, in turn, has driven a wedge between the U.S. and its European allies, which were U.S. aligned themselves and trying to sustain the JCPOA even under ceaseless American pressure, had drove down the odds of open war.

The same administration, however, in a glaring contradiction, indirectly facilitated Arab-Israeli rapprochement, which culminated in formal relations between Jerusalem and four Arab states with the Abraham Accords. Sponsored by the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Sudan, and Morocco and signed in late 2020, the accords were hailed in Washington as a watershed step toward regional peace. As noted by Almezaini and Rickli (2021), these were not if anything the outcomes of traditional peacemaking. Rather the agreements resulted from incongruent security apprehensions regarding Iran and a reciprocal wish to improve relations with Israel to the extent of trade and high technology.

Despite the fact that a number of countries in the region applauded the provisions of the Abraham accords, such agreements have, however, revealed a crucial transformation in the calculation of the Arab regimes. The condition that Israel must recognize the state of Palestine, which was an unwavering primary condition before any form of relations could be established was, especially in the recent past, precisely discarded. This change indicates that in the case of such countries the ideological zeal in support of Palestine has been weakened by the need to maintain domestic order and continuous economic growth.

However, as Daoudy (2021) points out, the accords also exacerbated the already fractured state of the Arab World. While the Gulf monarchs reveled in their achievement, other nations such as Jordan and Algeria were quick to condemn the accords on the basis that there was a diminishing regard for the rights of the Palestinians, and that a previously held Arab consensus was in decline. This fragmentation illustrates a newly developed paradigm whereby the age-old practice of symbolic collaboration in support of the Palestinians has been replaced with the primary objective of mutually beneficial security and trade agreements.

The Trump administration, according to some experts, severely diminished America's credibility and moral standing in the Middle East. His public diplomatic alignment with Israel along with deal oriented, zero-sum diplomacy made regional specialists doubtful about the capacity of Washington to be an impartial intermediary to regional conflicts. "As Khatib comments, To recognize Jerusalem as Israel's capital without a parallel plan to provide self-determination to the Palestinians was as an undoing of the image the US had constructed over the years" Khatib, 2020.

Also, Trump's, in this case, readiness to embrace a number of authoritarian leaders on the first, multi-billion dollar arms deals to Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, which coincided with the worsening of the Yemen war and the Yemen civil rights, promotion, worse, of the latter stream of Khatib, the decision. Instead, the arms –Khatib stream is utterly impunitive and sustains the arms trade. That kind of attitude, fulfilled by the Jaw Jaw of democracies, the lack of dissent or critique. 2021 cape.

The withdrawal from the Middle East was marked by the decline of America's soft power. The withdrawal of American troops in northern Syria in 2019 was seen by many as a betrayal, as it left the Kurdish partners open to a Turkish attack. Cook (2020) claims that Washington's reputation in Syria was diminished and, in addition, it signaled to both allies and rivals that American commitments could be reversed on a whim.

The changes brought about further disorder in the area. While some countries moved to approach the restructuring of their political and thereafter commercial dealings swiftly, others found themselves exposed and vulnerable. Still exposed to the lethal Gulf blockade, Qatar came about with a more radical and assertive foreign policy in reaction to the new order. Syria remained obscure in the fog of war while Iraq, trapped under dual Iranian and American dominion, turned into the stage of choice for proxy warfare.

Phantom timelines fundamentally rupture the configuration whereby conflicts remain fundamentally absent yet the means to resolve the conflicts remain—multilateral, the U.S. brokered Road Maps, and the overwhelming consensus of the Arab League—less and less able to accomplish the goals set. The consequences from the Trump presidency, during this vacuum, could concretize a Middle East with more than one center of power, as the Russian, Chinese, and Turkish diplomatic activities gain additional traction and the American power, ever so slowly, continues to retreat.

DISCUSSION

In this regard, the analysis argues that the Trump administration foreign policy managed to change the Middle Eastern region's diplomacy, operational security practices, and the historically maintained strategic credibility of the U.S. The Abraham Accords, of course, created new diplomatic relations, but the region's order and balance of forces were more likely to be detached and recalibrated as a consequence of the unilateral withdrawal from the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action and the increased troop deployment to Syria. The subsequent inquiry then seeks to situate these phenomena within the then existing and new paradigms of international relations with special emphasis on the redistribution of resources, the processes of internal disintegration, and the change of the U.S. historiographic role over the region. American policy during the Trump administration took an exceptionally evident turn toward a realist approach in the Middle East, focusing on clearly defined national interests, unilateral agreements, and a noticeable reduction of participation in multilateral forums. Gvosdev and Marsh (2020) co-authored this approach as "transactional realism," arguing that every policy choice was made on the basis of short-term geopolitical gain or monetary profit, long-term ideological goals and systemic obligations falling to the bottom of the hierarchy. Such a mentality was evident in the eagerness to sell military equipment, the readiness to embrace authoritarian leaders, and the blatant disregard for the region's democratic decline.

The reset also transformed alliances in the region and began to erode the formerly unbroken Arab agreement around fundamental matters. The Abraham Accords, for instance, shifted the Arab-Israeli dialogue irreversibly by putting Iran in the middle and sidelining the Palestinian issue (Gordon & Kamel, 2021). Driven by that logic, the Israeli and Gulf states during that period considered the threat from Tehran more important than any pre-existing ideological divisions, demonstrating that deeply rooted concerns about security can overturn longstanding diplomatic relationships.

The Decline of Multilateralism and Institutional Trust

In the case of Trump and the Mid East, the damage was done by cutting the region's diplomacy to a few bilateral connections. The abrupt withdrawal from the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, even with the risk of allied governments opposing the move, had the remaining partners of the agreement shroud the assumption that a major U.S. presidential change would guarantee the endurance of any commitment offered by the U.S. Bajoghli (2019) maintains that in so doing, the order of the U.S. diplomatic engagement was affected and the spell of the institutional order, which is supposed to nurture in the long term, conflict-resolution mechanism, was also weakened.

During the Trump administration, foreign policy appeared to emerge as an opinion of the President, distancing itself from the previous considered governmental policy formulation. Over turned cooperation partners and adversaries grew abroad American in reaction. Iran, for example, became bold and confrontational. European governments, meanwhile, floundered in their attempts to preserve unilaterally American agreements on which they could no longer rely, (Kinninmont, 2020).

The covering and Washington military partners draw policy America down of has intersection has munched the skin the imposing structure in the the deep and ending and held to as abide counting on for three decades. Alter-man (2020) argues, with them. wanted willing politics from region, to share the to align with domestic priorities but "Step back" and master reframe the... rinse every U.S. ally and rival.

More recently drawn and relaxations of the such adjustments the American south to the kingdom and s poster take has embracing self-challenging foreign policy.

CONCLUSION

This paper outlines the foreign policy of President Donald Trump in the Middle East and assesses the impact of his unorthodox, and mostly, unilateral decisions, showing that they brought forward new geostrategic shifts. Trump's term is the first in which the United States moved away from the Usual Multilateralism of the past in exchange for a more transactional and interest-based approach.

The resultant foreign policy almost appeared to be fundamentally at odds with itself: on the one hand, the unilateral withdrawal from the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action set the United States and Iran on a mutually hostile path, but on the other, the Abraham Accords reshaped the alliances between the Arabs and Israel, with clear disregard for the Palestinians. Each shift in posture was reinforced by more extensive sanctions, aggressive coercive diplomacy, and a clear alignment with repressive governments, at times undermining American assertions of promoting democracy and human rights.

The Accords, despite awarding their signatories and the Trump administration with international honors and acclaim for ‘diplomatic brilliance’, undermined by their own fragility, highlighted the fickle nature of pan-Arab identity and the willingness of certain nations to trade long term diplomatic goals for bilateral military and trade relations. Other measures—the ‘diplomatic’ recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, faster than planned withdrawal of American troops from the northern part of Syria—considerably reduced the reputation of the United States, revealing the disorganized and erratic nature of the Trump administration's policy towards the Arabs.

Head of State and its elite have crafted and reinforced policy efforts to enhance US disengagement from supervising relations. This suits the agendas of the regions orthodox-realists and left opportunities for Moscow and Beijing to reinforce their ties and cooperation on these issues. The US now has to deal with gradual diminishment of its norm setting power along diminished confidence from allies and out of date schematics of diplomacy. All of these separately and in combination increase the difficulty of reestablishing the US corner stone position in the region.

In the appraisal section of the paper, the juxtaposition of the diplomatically advantageous era of trump on the one hand and on the other increasing strategic instability and disintegration, is almost as if any attempt of putting the United States under democracy to create planning in the region, its disintegration is increasing ever so efficiently. The Middle East today is perhaps the most intensely analyzed section of trump's presidency. This is the legacy for which adverse consequences of his presidency is most cruelly scrutinized. This precarious balance will continue to be the leading factor for the decision making of the regions rulers, and likewise, will have a direct impact on the US's decision making in the immediate and medium time ahead.

REFERENCES

1. Berti, B. (2018). US recognition of Jerusalem as Israel's capital: Implications for the Middle East peace process. *Middle East Policy*, 25(4), 102-115.
2. Blanchard, C. M. (2020). U.S. relations with the Middle East: Background and issues. Congressional Research Service.
3. Katzman, K. (2020). Iran sanctions. Congressional Research Service.
4. Sharp, J. M. (2020). The Abraham Accords and Middle East realignments. Congressional Research Service.
5. Wright, R. (2021). The Trump administration's foreign policy in the Middle East: Unilateralism and transactional diplomacy. *Foreign Affairs*, 100(2), 85-97.
6. Berman, I. (2021). The Abraham Accords: Changing Middle East geopolitics under Trump. *International Affairs Review*, 27(3), 45-62.
7. Gause, F. G. (2019). U.S. policy toward the Middle East: A shifting landscape. Brookings Institution Report.
8. Hokayem, E. (2020). Unilateralism and U.S. policy in the Middle East: The Trump years. *Middle East Journal*, 74(2), 160-177.
9. Jones, R. (2020). Normalization agreements and regional realignment: The Abraham Accords. *Journal of Middle Eastern Politics*, 15(1), 12-29.
10. Khalil, L. (2019). Jerusalem and U.S. foreign policy: Implications for peace in the Middle East. *Journal of Conflict Studies*, 36(4), 301-318.
11. Parsa, A. (2020). The collapse of the Iran nuclear deal and its consequences. *International Security Quarterly*, 44(1), 77-98.
12. Bandow, D. (2020). America can't police the Middle East. Cato Institute.

13. Bisharat, G. (2018). Jerusalem, Trump, and international law. *University of Pennsylvania Journal of International Law*, 39(3), 505–537.
14. Dershowitz, A. (2019). *The case for Israel*. Wiley.
15. Fitzpatrick, M. (2020). The JCPOA's decline and the future of nuclear diplomacy. *Survival*, 62(5), 7-24.
16. Gause, F. G. (2020). Arms sales and security in the Gulf: Strategic or commercial logic? *Middle East Policy*, 27(1), 23–38.
17. Goldberg, J. (2020). Trump's pressure on Iran: Did it work? *Foreign Policy*, 237(6), 12-18.
18. Indyk, M. (2021). *The Abraham Accords: Peace for arms*. Brookings Institution.
19. Kamrava, M. (2020). Authoritarian resilience and arms diplomacy in the Gulf. *Third World Quarterly*, 41(6), 956–973.
20. Mohseni, P., & Kalout, H. (2019). *Trump's Iran policy and regional escalation*. Harvard Kennedy School Belfer Center.
21. Phillips, D. L. (2020). *The betrayal of the Kurds in Syria*. Council on Foreign Relations.
22. Shlaim, A. (2021). The Abraham Accords: Deal of the century or mirage? *Middle East Journal*, 75(3), 289–305.
23. Almezaini, K., & Rickli, J.-M. (2021). The geopolitics of the Abraham Accords: Normalization and realignment in the Gulf. *International Affairs*, 97(3), 623–642.
24. Cook, S. A. (2020). *False dawn: Protest, democracy, and violence in the new Middle East*. Oxford University Press.
25. Daoudy, M. (2021). Regional Repercussions of the Abraham Accords: The Middle East's shifting alliances. *Middle East Policy*, 28(1), 35–48.
26. Eisenstadt, M., & Knights, M. (2019). *Beyond Maximum Pressure: Iran policy after the JCPOA*. Washington Institute for Near East Policy.
27. Gause, F. G. (2021). The end of the post-Gulf War order: Washington's retreat and the Middle East's new balance. Brookings Doha Center.
28. Lynch, M. (2020). *The new Arab order: Power and protest after the Arab Spring*. Columbia University Press.
29. Maloney, S. (2020). The U.S.-Iran crisis and the perils of escalation. *Foreign Affairs*, 99(2), 92–105.
30. Alterman, J. B. (2020). The US military and Middle East security after Trump. Center for Strategic and International Studies.
31. Bajoghli, N. (2019). Maximum pressure and minimum results: Iran and the failure of U.S. coercive diplomacy. *Middle East Report*, 291, 10–15.
32. Bazzi, M. (2021). *Middle East power competition after Trump*. The Century Foundation.
33. Gordon, P., & Kamel, L. (2021). *Normalisation without peace: The Abraham Accords in context*. European Council on Foreign Relations.
34. Gvosdev, N. K., & Marsh, C. (2020). Realist foreign policy after Trump. *Ethics & International Affairs*, 34(3), 307–317.
35. Khalidi, R. (2020). *The Hundred Years' War on Palestine*. Metropolitan Books.
36. Kinninmont, J. (2020). *Trust and withdrawal: U.S. regional credibility post-JCPOA*. Chatham House Briefing Paper.
37. Walt, S. M. (2021). America's foreign policy credibility gap. *Foreign Policy*, 244, 25–30.