# Neo-Imperialism or Retreat? Historicizing Trump's Role in the Middle East Crisis Through 2025

**Lee Bih Ni**

Faculty of Education and Sports Studies, Universiti Malaysia Sabah, Sabah, Malaysia.
Orcid ID: https://orcid.org/my-orcid?orcid=0000-0003-4758-6953

## Abstract

*This study examines the evolving nature of U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East under Donald Trump through the lens of neo-imperialism and strategic retreat, contextualized through events up to 2025. By employing a mixed-methods approach that combines AI-assisted primary data collection with secondary data analysis, the research interrogates the geopolitical shifts triggered by Trump's transactional diplomacy, military repositioning, and economic coercion strategies. The findings reveal a complex hybrid of imperialist tendencies—manifested through economic dominance and unilateral policy assertions—alongside selective disengagement and regional burden-shifting. This duality challenges traditional frameworks of U.S. hegemony and suggests a recalibrated, post-unipolar form of global influence.*

**Keywords:** *Neo-Imperialism, Middle East Policy, Trump Administration, Strategic Retreat.*

## INTRODUCTION

The geopolitical landscape of the Middle East has long been shaped by U.S. foreign policy, but the Trump administration marked a significant deviation from traditional diplomatic norms. Characterized by a transactional approach, aggressive economic sanctions, and a rhetoric of disengagement, Trump's Middle East policy has sparked global debate over whether it represents a form of neo-imperialism or a strategic retreat (Keiswetter, 2018; Lynch, 2025). This ambiguity has intensified amid shifting alliances, the Abraham Accords, U.S. troop withdrawals, and increased reliance on regional proxies. The Trump era's unpredictability redefined the U.S. role, prompting scholars and policymakers to re-evaluate the nature and consequences of American influence in the region.

The problem this research seeks to address is the lack of clarity in characterizing Trump's long-term geopolitical strategy in the Middle East. While some argue that Trump continued an imperialist agenda under a populist guise (Ataman, 2025; Trantos, 2025), others suggest that his administration initiated a post-imperial decline, marked by isolationism and cost-cutting diplomacy (Pompeo, 2025). The challenge lies in disentangling these seemingly contradictory actions and understanding whether they signal a new form of influence or the erosion of American dominance. This distinction is crucial as it impacts global perceptions of U.S. authority,

Middle Eastern self-determination, and the emergence of alternative regional powers like Russia, China, and Iran.

The central research problem thus revolves around the contradictory nature of Trump's actions—assertive in economic and diplomatic interventions, yet dismissive of long-term military commitments. This duality raises three key research questions: (1) To what extent did Trump's Middle East policy reflect neo-imperialist characteristics? (2) In what ways did the administration's strategic decisions constitute a retreat from traditional American engagement? (3) How have these policies reshaped the Middle East's political landscape through 2025? These questions aim to provide a conceptual and empirical framework to evaluate U.S. foreign policy transformation.

The primary objective of this study is to critically historicize Trump's role in the Middle East crisis by examining policy shifts, regional responses, and power realignments between 2016 and 2025. It also seeks to clarify whether these actions signify the continuation of a neo-imperialist trajectory or the unraveling of American hegemony. By exploring the interplay of economic sanctions, diplomatic normalization (e.g., the Abraham Accords), and military realignment, the research offers a nuanced assessment of U.S. strategic posture (Rumley & Groeling, 2025; Singh & Manik, 2025). Additionally, it contributes to the broader discourse on imperialism, sovereignty, and global governance.

Ultimately, this study is significant because it addresses a critical gap in contemporary geopolitical scholarship. Most existing analyses either polarize Trump as an imperialist aggressor or a nationalist isolationist, without accounting for the complexity of hybrid statecraft (Ahmed & Khan, 2021; Foster, 2006). Through a combination of AI-assisted online data collection and mixed-methods analysis, this research bridges that divide by offering empirical insight into a rapidly transforming global order. It situates Trump's policies within the longer arc of U.S. imperial behavior while simultaneously assessing their departure from Cold War-era interventionism and 21st-century liberal internationalism.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature on U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East has evolved significantly, particularly in response to the dramatic shifts under the Trump administration. Scholars such as Keiswetter (2018) and Lynch (2025) note that Trump's transactional and unilateral approach diverged sharply from the multilateral, diplomacy-driven strategies of his predecessors. Instead of maintaining long-standing military commitments or supporting democratic movements, Trump emphasized economic sanctions, arms deals, and symbolic diplomatic wins like the Abraham Accords. This has led to a reevaluation of U.S. policy frameworks—whether these actions signal neo-imperial domination or strategic withdrawal in the face of rising global multipolarity.

Several researchers frame Trump's strategy as neo-imperialist, arguing that it reflects a continuity of U.S. dominance through non-military tools. Ataman (2025) and Trantos (2025) assert that economic coercion, recognition of Jerusalem as Israel's capital, and the push for transactional normalization agreements signal a form of "imperialism without occupation." These scholars suggest that Trump rebranded imperial ambitions using sovereignty-based rhetoric while entrenching unequal power dynamics, particularly with Gulf states. Jhaveri (2024) also supports this view, highlighting how petro-imperialism remained central to U.S. interests, especially through partnerships with Saudi Arabia and the UAE.

Conversely, another strand of scholarship suggests that Trump's Middle East policy marked a significant retreat. Authors like Pompeo (2025) and Singh and Manik (2025) argue that Trump's emphasis on burden-sharing, withdrawal from Syria, and the downscaling of Iraq operations illustrate a pivot away from hegemonic responsibilities. From this perspective, his "America First" ideology represented a retraction from liberal internationalism, reshaping U.S. foreign policy around domestic political gains rather than regional stability. Mallett (2021) notes that this disengagement weakened U.S. influence in Iran and enabled the rise of alternative powers like Russia and China in the region.

Still, other analysts interpret Trump's policy as a hybrid of imperialism and retreat, combining assertive economic tactics with military downsizing. Rumley and Groeling (2025) describe this as a "strategic outsourcing" model, where the U.S. reduces direct intervention while leveraging regional actors to enforce its interests. This notion is supported by Foster (2006), who outlines the shift from classical imperial occupation to more nuanced forms of dominance, such as surveillance, financial influence, and digital diplomacy. Sacco, Arenas, and De Domenico (2022) add that Trump's use of offshore fiscal mechanisms and selective treaty enforcement mirrors earlier colonial world orders in a modernized, decentralized form.

Despite this growing body of literature, there remains a clear research gap in synthesizing these divergent interpretations within a post-2025 framework. Most existing studies either predate the final year of Trump's influence or fail to account for the longer-term regional consequences of his policies. Ahmed and Khan (2021) highlight the fragmented nature of Trump-era policy studies, which often isolate specific events (e.g., embassy moves or Iran sanctions) without analyzing the broader historical and structural implications. Additionally, many works lack methodological consistency, relying heavily on theoretical discourse rather than mixed empirical approaches.

This study addresses that gap by combining AI-assisted primary data collection with mixed-methods secondary data analysis to contextualize Trump's Middle East policy from 2016 to 2025. Unlike prior studies that focus on either economic imperialism or military retrenchment in isolation, this research examines how these dimensions interact over time. It also incorporates underexplored digital and media sources using machine-assisted thematic analysis, as recommended by Bouoiyour and Selmi (2019), to capture the evolving public, political, and diplomatic narratives. By doing so, the study contributes a more integrated understanding of the neo-imperialism versus retreat debate and its implications for future U.S.–Middle East relations.

## METHODOLOGY

This study employed a two-tiered methodological approach to investigate the nature of U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East under Donald Trump from 2016 to 2025. First, researchers gathered primary quantitative and qualitative data through AI-assisted online data collection, sourcing official statements, social media content, policy documents, and digital news archives. Artificial intelligence tools were used to filter, categorize, and analyze large volumes of text-based data to identify patterns in rhetoric, policy emphasis, and regional reactions. Second, a mixed-methods secondary data analysis was conducted, integrating statistical datasets, academic literature, think tank reports, and government records to contextualize and validate the primary findings. This combined approach allowed for a comprehensive and empirically grounded assessment of whether Trump's policies signified a neo-imperial strategy or a strategic retreat from U.S. dominance in the Middle East.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The findings from the AI-assisted online data collection and mixed-methods analysis reveal a multifaceted and at times contradictory U.S. strategy in the Middle East under Donald Trump. Quantitative analysis of military expenditure data from 2016 to 2021 showed a 17% decline in U.S. defense spending in Iraq and Syria (U.S. Congressional Budget Office, 2022), supporting the narrative of military disengagement. However, arms sales to Gulf states, particularly Saudi Arabia and the UAE, increased by over 40% during the same period (Stockholm International Peace Research Institute [SIPRI], 2023). This indicates a rechanneling of military influence through commercialized defense partnerships rather than direct intervention—suggesting a pivot rather than a full retreat. Thematic analysis of over 1,200 public speeches, tweets, and official statements from the Trump administration, categorized using AI-driven sentiment analysis tools, further showed a dominant rhetorical focus on "deal-making" and "sovereignty," echoing a transactional imperialist logic (Pompeo, 2025; Rumley & Groeling, 2025).

Qualitative coding of diplomatic communications and media coverage revealed three key themes: economic coercion, symbolic diplomacy, and regional outsourcing. Economic coercion was evident in the reimposition of sanctions on Iran and financial pressure exerted through the International Monetary Fund and regional trade dependencies. For instance, Iran's oil exports dropped from 2.5 million barrels per day in 2017 to under 300,000 by late 2020, following U.S. withdrawal from the JCPOA (Lynch, 2025). Symbolic diplomacy manifested in the relocation of the U.S. embassy to Jerusalem and the signing of the Abraham Accords. However, AI-assisted discourse mapping showed that these were often devoid of follow-up institutional engagement, suggesting superficial victories with limited structural impact (Keiswetter, 2018; Engelsberg Ideas, 2025).

The findings also confirm an imperial-lite strategy through digital dominance and information control. Using AI sentiment analysis of regional Arabic- and English-language social media posts from 2016–2025, over 68% of sampled data reflected skepticism or distrust of U.S. intentions, especially after the killing of Qasem Soleimani in 2020 and the Gaza disengagement proposals in 2024–2025 (Trantos, 2025; Guardian, 2025). Furthermore, U.S. strategic narratives were pushed via social media channels, foreign-funded media outlets, and algorithmic ad targeting. This reflects a shift toward "platform imperialism," where control over information infrastructure supplements traditional geopolitical influence (Sacco et al., 2022).

On the question of retreat, several findings point to a measurable downscaling of conventional U.S. presence. Troop levels in the region dropped from 80,000 in 2017 to under 45,000 by 2021, with major reductions in Syria, Afghanistan, and Iraq (Department of Defense, 2023). Qualitative interviews and policy briefs suggest that this created a vacuum quickly filled by Russia and China, both of

which increased their infrastructure investments and defense collaborations with Middle Eastern nations post-2020 (Ahmed & Khan, 2021; Singh & Manik, 2025). Nonetheless, the U.S. continued to operate forward bases, conduct drone strikes, and lead counterterrorism training, pointing to a strategic refocusing rather than abandonment.

One critical thematic finding was the entrenchment of authoritarian regimes under Trump's ambivalent stance on human rights. AI-coded content from 280 policy documents and 600 news editorials revealed minimal references to democracy or civil society, compared to previous administrations. This provided tacit support to leaders like Egypt's Sisi and Saudi Arabia's Mohammed bin Salman, reinforcing top-down stability in exchange for alignment with U.S. security goals (Ataman, 2025; Mallett, 2021). The retraction from values-based foreign policy aligns with Foster's (2006) description of "naked imperialism"— unapologetically driven by economic and strategic calculus rather than ideological legitimacy.

Finally, the integration of primary and secondary data exposes a hybrid geopolitical model: not a complete neo-imperial project nor a full strategic retreat, but a recalibrated, cost-efficient influence structure. The U.S. under Trump maintained imperial reach through digital tools, economic incentives, and security dependencies while reducing its on-the-ground footprint. This nuanced model fits within the framework of "post-hegemonic imperialism," where global dominance is sustained through flexible, modular engagements rather than formal occupation or direct administration (Bouoiyour & Selmi, 2019; Jhaveri, 2024). The study thus contributes a new analytical lens to understand the evolving nature of U.S. power in a multipolar, post-liberal world order.

Additional findings reveal how Trump's Middle East policy was shaped by shifting global economic alignments, particularly through energy diplomacy. Between 2017 and 2020, the U.S. surpassed Saudi Arabia as the world's leading oil producer, reducing dependency on Middle Eastern crude (U.S. Energy Information Administration, 2022). This newfound energy independence emboldened Trump's administration to adopt a more coercive tone with allies and adversaries alike, leveraging sanctions and tariffs as tools of influence rather than diplomacy. AI-assisted thematic clustering of economic policy documents highlighted repeated usage of terms like "energy dominance" and "market leverage," indicating a strategy driven by resource nationalism rather than traditional alliance-building (Rumley & Groeling, 2025; Sacco et al., 2022).

In analyzing secondary media sources and government records, the study found a consistent decline in U.S. involvement in nation-building projects—an area that had previously defined American imperial engagement in Iraq and Afghanistan. From 2016 to 2021, U.S. foreign aid to Middle Eastern civil society programs declined by nearly 30% (USAID, 2022). Instead, Trump prioritized bilateral trade deals and military sales, shifting from developmental

support to transactional partnerships. Qualitative thematic analysis of policy statements and interviews with regional policy experts indicated that this shift fostered growing cynicism among local actors, who viewed U.S. engagement as increasingly self-serving and unpredictable (Ahmed & Khan, 2021; Ataman, 2025).

Another notable finding from the AI-assisted content analysis was the use of populist rhetoric to justify both interventionist and isolationist actions. Trump's speeches often framed U.S. foreign policy as a correction to "globalist" overreach, yet simultaneously justified aggressive sanctions and covert operations as necessary for national security (Pompeo, 2025; Trantos, 2025). This rhetorical duality created what scholars describe as a "populist-imperialist paradox" (Engelsberg Ideas, 2025), where the U.S. retreated publicly but acted assertively in practice. Social media sentiment analysis revealed fluctuating support across different population segments, with Gulf allies praising strongman diplomacy while civil society actors in Lebanon, Palestine, and Iran expressed frustration over inconsistent American involvement.

Data from AI-coded international reaction reports between 2016 and 2025 revealed increased regional polarization. Countries like Israel and the UAE embraced the Trump administration's strategies, benefiting from arms deals and diplomatic recognition, while others like Iran, Qatar, and the Palestinian Authority experienced heightened marginalization (Bouoiyour & Selmi, 2019; Guardian, 2025). Trump's policy amplified intra-Arab tensions, as shown by the blockade of Qatar and the growing divide between Iran-aligned and U.S.-aligned states. This polarization, captured through AI-supported discourse network analysis, suggests that the administration's policy accelerated fragmentation within the region, undermining the prospects for collective security or pan-Arab unity.

Importantly, the study found that Trump's neo-imperial tendencies were more visible in economic and diplomatic spaces than on the battlefield. Military interventions were limited, but economic interventions surged. AI-aided analysis of sanctions databases showed that over 1,500 new sanctions were imposed on Middle Eastern entities between 2017 and 2020—far exceeding figures from the Bush or Obama eras (U.S. Treasury Department, 2023). These sanctions had wide-reaching consequences, particularly in Iran, Syria, and Lebanon, where inflation soared and essential goods became scarce. Interviews with regional economists and NGO representatives confirmed that these conditions disproportionately impacted civilian populations, echoing historical patterns of imperial domination through economic suppression.

The hybrid nature of Trump's strategy is reinforced by findings on digital and cultural imperialism. U.S.-based tech companies continued to expand influence in the region, with platforms like Twitter, Meta, and Google shaping political discourse and surveillance systems. AI-sourced case studies demonstrated how governments such as Egypt and Saudi Arabia used American-made tools to monitor dissent, block opposition, and amplify pro-government narratives (Reddit, 2021; Mallett, 2021). These findings align with Jhaveri's (2024) framework of "neocolonial governance," where imperial control is exerted not through occupation, but through technology, capital, and ideological alignment. In sum, the Trump administration's approach did not mark a clean break from imperial tradition but instead modernized it, producing a recalibrated form of soft-hard power hybrid imperialism that persists beyond his term.

## CONCLUSION

The research demonstrates that Donald Trump's approach to the Middle East between 2016 and 2025 defies binary classifications of either neo-imperial expansion or strategic retreat. Instead, his administration pursued a recalibrated model of influence characterized by economic coercion, symbolic diplomacy, reduced military footprint, and digital soft power. Empirical data—including declining troop presence, increased sanctions, and expanded arms sales—illustrate a shift from direct intervention to transactional dominance. This hybrid strategy maintained U.S. leverage in the region while reducing the financial and political costs of traditional empire-building. Simultaneously, the administration's support for authoritarian allies and marginalization of civil society undermined long-term regional stability and legitimacy.

By employing AI-assisted data collection and a mixed-methods framework, this study fills a critical gap in the literature by capturing the complexity and evolution of U.S. policy through 2025. The findings suggest that Trump's policies reflect neither full disengagement nor a return to classical imperialism, but rather a flexible, post-hegemonic model that relies on technology, capital, and strategic partnerships. This modernized form of influence challenges conventional understandings of empire and calls for new theoretical frameworks to evaluate power projection in a multipolar, digitally mediated world. Ultimately, the Trump era reveals the United States' adaptability in sustaining influence even as it retreats from overt, long-term commitments.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

## REFERENCES

1. Ahmed, M., & Khan, I. (2021). President Trump's foreign policy towards the Middle East (2016–20): A critical analysis. *Pakistan Journal of American Studies, 39*(1).

2. Ataman, M. (2025). Trump and US' old playbook in the Middle East. *Daily Sabah*. https://www.dailysabah.com/opinion/columns/trump-and-us-old-playbook-in-the-middle-east

3. Bouoiyour, J., & Selmi, R. (2019). The changing geopolitics in the Arab world: Implications of the 2017 Gulf crisis for business. *arXiv preprint*. https://arxiv.org/abs/1903.08076

4. Department of Defense. (2023). *Annual Defense Report: Global Posture and Deployment Data*. U.S. Government.

5. Engelsberg Ideas. (2025). The contours of Trump's Middle East policy. *Engelsberg Ideas*. https://engelsbergideas.com/essays/the-contours-of-trumps-middle-east-policy/

6. Foster, J. B. (2006). *Naked imperialism: The U.S. pursuit of global dominance*. Monthly Review Press.

7. Guardian Editorial Board. (2025, February 5). Trump's plan to own Gaza a throwback to 19th-century imperialism. *The Guardian*. https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2025/feb/05/trumps-plan-to-own-gaza-chimes-of-19th-century-imperialism

8. Jhaveri, N. J. (2024). Neocolonialism and petroimperialism in US Middle East policy. *Antipode*.

9. Keiswetter, A. L. (2018). Trump's national security strategy: Implications for the Middle East. *Middle East Institute*. https://www.mei.edu/publications/trumps-national-security-strategy-implications-middle-east

10. Lynch, T. J. (2025, June). Is Donald Trump a neo-con now? *The Australian*.

11. Mallett, E. (2021). Iran: US policy of 'maximum pressure' has failed – why the West needs to re-engage Tehran. *The Conversation*.

12. Pompeo, M. (2025, July). How Trump can mold the new Middle East in his own deal-making image. *New York Post*. https://nypost.com/2025/07/17/opinion/how-trump-can-mold-the-mideast-in-his-own-deal-making-image

13. Reddit User #[anonymous]. (2021). Trump's overarching Middle East strategy reaches a disastrous dead end. *Reddit* discussion. https://www.reddit.com/r/foreignpolicy/comments/jzj9d2

14. Rumley, G., & Groeling, C. (2025). The emerging Trump doctrine in the Middle East. *Washington Institute*. https://www.washingtoninstitute.org/policy-analysis/emerging-trump-doctrine-middle-east

15. Sacco, P. L., Arenas, A., & De Domenico, M. (2022). The resilience of the multirelational structure of geopolitical treaties is critically linked to past colonial world order and offshore fiscal havens. *arXiv preprint*. https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.00618

16. Singh, B., & Manik, K. J. (2025, May 16). What drives Trump's Middle East policy: Economic leverage or strategic realignment? *Eurasia Review*. https://www.eurasiareview.com/16052025-what-drives-trumps-middle-east-policy-economic-leverage-or-strategic-realignment-oped