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Abstract

These days, Trump’s actions have topped regional and world news. His new contracts for the sale of military weapons have created a wave of concern over the growing number of weapons in the world. The Trump administration has been drawing attention since coming in with repeated claims of direct entry into the military. By first proposing a safe zone in Syria, he sought to justify direct US presence in the West Asian region, which made modifications to his plan with Russian and Iranian opposition. Given Washington’s growing difficulty in entering the Syrian military, Trump has chosen a new option for the US body in the region, in which Trump has ordered the use of American drones to bomb various areas of Yemen under the pretext of combating Yemen. Al-Qaeda has given up. The main research question is what is the strategic importance of Yemen in Trump’s foreign and security policy? The findings of the study show that Trump, with goals such as tearing loops of resistance, removing Iran from regional equations and preventing the spread of Shi’ite waves to Saudi Arabia, took a tough and forceful approach to the developments in Yemen. He is reluctant to boycott American power in the region by engaging in showmanship and, with a business-minded and profit-driven view of Yemen, is pouring Western weapons stockpiles with Arab reactionary dollars into the region. The research method is descriptive-analytical based on aggressive realism.
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1. Introduction
The Middle East and North Africa have been subject to severe shocks and shocks from the 2011 Arab revolutions since 2011, with Yemeni developments particularly important. Yemen, which some analysts call Afghanistan the Arab world and others called the Arab world Vietnam because of Abdel Nasser's defeat in the 1960s, is going through a crisis of identity. And it has a structure. Social instability has caused civil wars. The Middle East region is now experiencing multi-faceted conflicts due to the interference of numerous internal and external factors. Inland and inland wars and overseas wars have engulfed the region. This trend in the near future will bring more social, political and economic problems to the Middle East, as well as widening the gap and reproducing wider and more complex violence and war. The complex political and security situation has destabilized the country and the political crisis in the country has had a negative impact on major economic sectors and the livelihood of the people. It is worth noting that if the US is present in Yemen, the arena for Iran will be tougher and easier for Saudi Arabia. Saudi Arabia’s military invasion of Yemen in 2015 marks its third year as US policies are expected to turn into a widespread war in the region. With the election of Donald Trump as US policy-maker, Washington seems to be stepping up its role in the region. In particular, the importance of Yemen’s strategic islands and the Babalmandab Strait overlooking the Red Sea, as well as Yemen’s access to oil and gas resources in the north and south, have made the country particularly important to the US President and business interests. Thus, the US foreign policy apparatus is seeking to develop maneuvers in Yemen. In this regard, increasing insecurity in Yemen and Babalmandab and expanding al-Qaeda’s activities could pave the way for Washington’s direct involvement in supporting Saudi military strikes. Trump’s recent trip to Saudi Arabia, America’s key ally in the region, can also be traced to the intensification of crisis centers in West Asia. On the one hand, Saudi-US relations under Obama were not for the past, and despite military agreements between the two, the US did not stand in the way of the most important external crisis in Saudi Arabia, Yemen, and most of the role of intelligence coordinator and on the other hand, the Arabs are now seeking to encourage the new US government to intervene further in the region, and recent positions by US officials indicate this. As a result, it is hard to say that Trump is trying to get along with his Arab allies once again and to provide them with more space to sell weapons. The $ 100 billion US arms deal to Saudi Arabia could be one of the biggest arms sales deals not only in the Middle East, but in the entire world as it is unprecedented; it will certainly launch a new round of arms competition in the Middle East that Its enormous benefits will go to American arms companies and will affect Trump’s election promises to create jobs for Americans. The deal, along with Donald Trump’s first foreign trip to Saudi Arabia, is a priority for the Trump administration over commercial and economic issues. Anti-Iranian remarks by Saudi King and Donald Trump at official meetings in Saudi Arabia reiterate longstanding US government policies in the Middle East in opposition to the Islamic Republic of Iran and in favor of Riyadh; Saudi Arabia’s defense capability could rise to more than $ 300 billion, mainly aimed at boosting Saudi Arabia’s
defense capacity against Iran’s regional power, which in turn covers regional issues, especially the Yemeni crisis, and makes the prospect of resolving this very unlikely. The blazing fire of the Yemeni war will continue to ignite Appetite will add to the ruins and martyrs of this tragedy of the 21st century every day. The main research question is what is the strategic importance of Yemen in Trump’s foreign and security policy? The research findings show that Trump has taken a tough and forceful approach to developments in Yemen with goals such as tearing loops of resistance, removing Iran from regional equations and preventing the spread of Shiite waves to Saudi Arabia. He is reluctant to boycott American power in the region by engaging in showmanship and, with a business-minded and profit-driven view of Yemen, is pouring Western weapons stockpiles with Arab reactionary dollars into the region. The present study will be developed using a descriptive-analytical approach and based on the theory of aggressive realism. Library and Internet resources have been used to conduct the research.

2. Method
The research methodology of this paper is analytical-descriptive and uses library resources.

3. Theoretical Framework: Offensive Realism
Aggressive Realism following other international intellectual tendencies, its foundations are based on realistic doctrines and assumptions. The followers of this school, while recognizing in the context of realism the states as the main actors in the international relations scene, believe that it is these great powers that shape international politics. And in influencing the international system, the data of the great powers are crucial. Aggressive realists argue that anarchy forces states to maximize their relative power or influence. Governments strive to maximize their security by maximizing their power and influence. From the perspective of aggressive realists, international anarchy is of great importance. Therefore, governments’ efforts to gain security may conflict with others, and as gaining state power means losing the power of another state, the inevitable consequence of such a game is conflict. Governments must make the maintenance or improvement of their position of power the main goal of their foreign policy to ensure their survival, and since power in the final analysis implies the ability to wage war, so governments always insist on establishing military organizations. In this way, the aggressive realists describe the great powers in a way that is incessantly seeking power. They believe that the international system forces large powers to increase their relative power because they can thereby enhance their security. In other words, the issue of “survival” warrants aggressive behavior. The offensive performance of the great powers is not only due to their hegemonic motive, but they have to seek more power to increase their chances of survival. John Merschheimer emphasizes that great powers are rational actors. They are aware of their external environment and choose the appropriate strategic behavior for their survival. In particular, they look at the priorities of other states and how they affect the behavior of other states, and how the behavior of other states affects their strategy for survival. In addition, governments pay attention not only to the short-term and immediate
consequences but also to the long-term consequences of their actions. Farid Zakrieki, one of the most important aggressive realism theorists, has argued that history shows that governments are turning to great armies as they become increasingly wealthy. They engage in issues outside their borders, seeking to increase their international influence (Zakaria, 1998, p. 3). Offensive realists believe that relative abilities largely shape the intentions of governments. As a state becomes stronger, it seeks to increase its influence and maximize its control over the international environment. Governments, therefore, will pursue aggressive strategies aimed at maximizing their power and influence in cases where their main decision makers think that the country’s relative strength has increased. Thus, as the power of a state increases, it turns to more aggressive and expansionist foreign policies (Taliaferro, 1999, p. 1).

Offensive realism comes from an understanding of foreign policy to understand international politics and regards the achievement of absolute security as the most important demand of the great powers that can only be achieved through power and the attainment of hegemony. These powers are the main actors of the international system and, in an anarchic environment, seek to maintain their survival and enhance their power, so they seek to outshine other actors in planning and planning their foreign policy. In fact, the United States is one of the influential countries in the international system that supports the ruling leaders in Yemen’s development and strives to maintain and consolidate the power of the ruling minority. It is important to note that the United States and its regional allies, within the framework of the theory of offensive realism, regard the political developments in Yemen as a threat to their security and interests and seek to increase their power by actively intervening in politics. Rivals are preventing their losses and are trying to maximize their power and role in the region by maximizing their power and directing Yemeni political developments in their favor to the hegemonic position in the Middle East. To achieve, existing research utilizing these theoretical implications examines Yemen’s role in Trump’s foreign and security policy and Washington’s behavior toward developments in the country.

4. The Strategic Importance of Yemen in Regional and International Equations

Yemen is an Arab country in southwest Asia and in the south of the Arabian Peninsula, in the Middle East, and its capital, Sanaa. The geographical location of this country is of particular importance to regional and trans-regional actors. Over 99% of Yemenis are Muslims. Although there are no official figures on the percentage of Shites and Sunnis in the country, it can be said that about 35 percent of the population is Shiite and 65 percent Sunni. Yemen has wide maritime borders in the Red Sea and the Gulf of Aden. Its strategic location has given particular importance to the aristocracy of the Horn of Africa and the possibility of controlling the movement of the region as well as the east coast of Africa through the southern and western seaboard of Yemen and the island of Sucatra. In addition, the aristocracy of the country over the Babalmandeb Strait has given it extra importance. In fact, a large percentage of the traffic on the Suez Canal passes through Babalmandab. So as important as the Suez Canal is, Babalmand is also important. Also, most of the exports passing through the Persian Gulf through the Suez Canal and the Third Pipeline pass through the Babalmandab Strait. Because it is the
Suez Canal that controls the strategic link between the Indian Ocean and the Red Sea. Babalmandab is an important strategic bottleneck for international maritime trade and shipping and energy transfer. Its importance is as important as the Suez Canal for maritime shipping and maritime trade between Africa, Asia and Europe. They are deeply concerned about the victory of Ansarullah and the Houthis because Yemeni control by the Houthis cuts the Zionist regime’s access to the Indian Ocean via the Red Sea and impedes the easy access of the Zionist submarines to the Persian Gulf for the threat of Iran. Can. This has made Yemen’s control one of the highlights of Netanyahu’s March 3, 2015, meeting with the US Congress. But on the other hand, Saudi Arabia, as a US regional ally, is deeply afraid of Yemen becoming an Iranian ally, fearing that these events will spur the entire Arabian Peninsula against the Saudi family. The US concerns that detaining Iran, China and Russia from gaining strategic ground in Yemen (Nazemroaya, 2015, pp. 1-5).

This strait is so important to the US that it has been placed on the list of seven strategic centers of the world's oil vessels. Serious estimates indicate that 3.8 million barrels of crude oil and petrochemical products refined in 2013 have been exported to Europe, America and Asia, increasing by 2.9 million barrels per day compared to 2009 shows. The Babalmandab Strait is about 18 miles wide and restricts the transportation of oil tankers to two two-mile traffic channels. The inbound and outbound routes are arranged through these two-mile canals. Closing the Bob-El Mandeb Strait could deprive the Persian Gulf of oil tankers of the Suez Canal and the Third Pipeline and divert them to the southern Cape of Africa and increase the time and cost of exporting oil; Europe and Africa can no longer follow the most direct route of export of goods and oil to Asian markets via the Suez Canal and Babalmand Strait (Ryan, 2015, p. 5).

![Figure 1. Yemen’s Strategic Importance and Sea Routes](image-url)
Yemen has a high position and is the most fertile peninsula. By controlling the Bab al-Mandeb Strait, it can control the Red Sea and, using the strategic island of Brim, can close this important strait, as it has the tallest island in the region. It can control maritime activities in the Gulf of Aden and the Red Sea. It is one of the strategic strategic points of the East and West, and due to its geographical location and important ports and islands, it has historically been the focus of colonialism and has filled the pages of its history with various events. It is strategically important because South Yemen is located in the northwest and northeast part of the Bab al-Mandeb Strait between the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean and is the closest waterway between East and West. The main concern of White House policymakers is its proximity to Saudi Arabia and the potential of Yemen to influence its northern neighbor as the US strategic ally in the region. Another point is the importance of the Bab al-Mandeb Strait in maritime trade, and in particular energy, which, given the strong bases of al-Qaeda in the Yemeni region, the instability of the government or the rise of hard-line groups could undermine this strategic path, causing irreparable damage to the world economy and in particular. The West will take over. Regional rivalry with the Islamic Republic of Iran, as well as the security of the Zionist regime, are other issues that have raised the importance of Yemen in the regional equations of US officials. Accordingly, US officials are well aware that losing Yemen to them would mean the insecurity of Saudi Arabia, the Gulf, oil and, in a word, the loss of the West Asian strategic region. On the other hand, Yemen’s proximity to the Horn of Africa crisis has heightened US concerns about the region. Thus, from the American perspective, Yemen is important for regional security, not only because of its neighborhood with Saudi Arabia, but also because of the contagion of the bankrupt Somalia to Yemen. An important issue for US officials is that strengthening Ansarollah’s power over the past three years under popular support is a major threat to the Zionist regime. Should this resistance group continue its current trend in the near future, it could threaten the security of Israeli offshore activities in the Red Sea and Babalmandab. In particular, Yemen’s western ports are in areas controlled by Ansarollah and could overshadow the situation in the Babalmandab Strait. The US emphasis on Ansarollah missiles is in fact from the perspective that it has been understood that Ansarollah missile power can also pose a threat to the interests of the United States and its allies in the world’s most important energy channel. This has led to Yemen’s dominance of world powers, regional powers and domination regimes such as the Zionist regime. This strategic position has forced the West, especially the United States, to intervene in Yemen’s political developments to maintain its grip on oil flow and the global economy. The US tried to build air and even naval bases in Yemen under the pretext of fighting al-Qaeda. Having a base in such a region allows the West to fully dominate the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf. Given the geopolitical position of the Arab monarchies, they enjoy stable and sustained support from foreign powers, which the Yemeni nation is no exception to and is currently facing many popular uprisings and protests.
5. Trump’s Foreign Policy in the Middle East: Principles and Goals

Donald Trump is from the American Republican Party and belongs to the Christian Right. With an ideological, yet power-centered attitude, this trend calls for the return of America to the era of past authority and American exceptionalism among the American variables that are most influential in US policy-making are traditional socio-religious trends that support an authoritarian and aggressive foreign policy with a conservative attitude to social issues. The kind of religious discourse that dominates these movements suggests an ideological foreign policy for the United States that can be considered a good manifestation of the Bush Doctrine in 2000 (Cherkaoui, 2016, p. 5).

On the one hand, the Christian Right Movement stresses the need for the spread of “American values” in the world, and on the other hand, considers “military leverage” as an appropriate means of advancing foreign policy. Taken together, the supporters of this social conservative movement can be seen as the backbone of the massively aggressive strategy, especially under Republican presidents such as George W. Bush. In this context, Donald Trump also seeks to revitalize American authoritarianism and strengthen its social and economic power in various arenas by chanting “Rebuild America’s Greatness” (Cherkaoui, 2016, p. 4). Although Trump disagreed with many Republican leaders during his election campaign and the Republicans themselves disagreed with his nomination (Mohammadi, 1395, p. 2), he remained loyal after the election. He revealed himself to his party. At the top of the list of countries affected by Trump’s presidency is the Middle East. An area that is in the advanced stages of collapse. Syria, Iraq, Yemen and Libya are grappling with a mix of civil and proxy wars. The Iranian nuclear deal at best only manages one aspect of Iran’s power for a limited time only. ISIL may also lose its regional dimension. But like other groups, for years, the terrorist threat will be considered. The plight of millions of refugees will not only be a humanitarian disaster but also an economic and strategic burden for countries in the region and Europe. It is difficult to understand and predict the current US foreign policy of Donald Trump in the Middle East. Trump, on the other hand, has a general mandate for the Middle East, believing that “this region is a great swamp that the United States should stay away from”. On the other hand, US interests such as Israeli security and US oil have prevented the US from abandoning the Middle East in all its presidents; in other words, the US foreign policy decision-making process and the long-standing interests of this power in the region. The Southwest Asian region, dubbed Hartland, has created a framework for policymaking and implementation in the Middle East that can hardly be predicted by serious change.

Donald Trump’s victory in the 2016 US presidential election was unexpected and extremely surprising. With no track record of state or government work, Trump took the helm of the world’s greatest power. Trump does not value American political structures, nor does he value accepted principles of American foreign policy. Trump is not a consultant with the political, intelligence, and intellectual structures in the United States, and he is extremely anti-structured and self-centered. In this respect, at least the 45th President of the United States is an exceptional person in the White House. This has made the main lines of US foreign policy extremely vague (McAdams, 2016). Zalmay Khalilzad writes in a note
published by The National Inquirer that US presidential candidates since 1992 have all agreed that post-war structure of states should be agreed upon, despite differences of opinion. The United States will be preserved and the American leadership will respond selectively to global crises and maintain peace among the great powers, but Trump has challenged many of these principles and other assumptions of US foreign policy. Khalilzad attributes these differences to the emergence of a new doctrine called the Trump doctrine.

According to many experts, the Trump cabinet is America’s fastest-growing cabinet, at least for the past two decades, where the most bellicose and extremist Republicans have come together. They are extremely ideological towards the Obama administration. The majority is with the generals, and most of them have a military background in the field of mentality. During his campaign, Trump emphasized the need for the United States to reduce the cost of securing its allies in the world as much as it could to boost the US domestic economy and meet the economic demands of the American people through savings. Trump believes that the White House should no longer be the umbrella of the Middle East’s Arab defense and that Arab countries must pay for it themselves, so Trump and his supporters have been looking to sell weapons in Western Asia. For Trump, security is a commodity that America manufactures and provides to others, without paying the price. Trump believes the United States is giving “free rides” to many countries where there are no direct benefits. He has promised that he will soon eliminate ISIL and Islamic terrorism. The former president wanted the United States to be powerful enough to shape world affairs and relations while ready to counter traditional military threats by balancing regional power to prevent them from acting against the vital interests of the United States and its allies. But it seems that the powerful American Trump wants to get rid of terrorism and sell it to others in a frightening and volatile environment (Kahi & Brands, 2017).

Since Donald Trump’s arrival in the White House, many changes have been made in American politics. The Trump administration has crossed the boundaries set by the Obama administration, raising questions about new US policy in the region. The beginning of these developments was a 9 percent increase in US military spending, equivalent to $48 billion. US intelligence spending rose seven percent. The United States has put more arms sales to Saudi Arabia and other Gulf states as it boosts its military and intelligence capabilities and increases its military budget. The United States is currently facing a crisis, and Trump is trying to move the crisis out of the environment. The West Asian region has attracted the attention of the US President, and West Asia’s security is an important means of outgrowing US military and industrial complexes and companies. Statistics from Gulf and US arms purchases from the US and the West reveal this very well. Unlike Obama, who has incorporated most of the petroleum demands into his administration’s policies, Trump is trying to represent the petroleum and weapons industries, or at least balance oil and arms cartels. While the US financial and economic crisis that led to Trump’s victory has made it important to transfer money and money to the US, Trump chose to make his first foreign trip to Saudi Arabia and sign a billion-dollar arms deal with Saudi Arabia.
Overview of Turkey’s foreign policy, the type of military and security partnership with Arab Gulf regimes, ignoring humanitarian crises in Yemen and Palestine, and emphasizing Israel’s security and oil export flows could be among the most important issues in the Middle East. At the regional and military level, the Zionist regime and the Saudis will encourage the Trump administration to take a tougher stance on Iran and even encourage it to attack Iran. Missile tests, weapons transfers to Yemen and Syria, and limited military clashes in the Persian Gulf are areas for Trump’s sharpening military actions against Iran. The US has intensified its hostile stance on Iran, but in recent years, especially after the Iran-West deal on the nuclear issue, the former US-Saudi relationship has not been warmly welcomed, even in times of mutual criticism that the decline in Saudi power in the area. Thus, with the United States tightening its stance on Iran during the Trump era, it is likely that the Saudi-US relationship will be less cold. By the time Trump enters the White House, however, signals have been given to Saudi Arabia to increase ties and cooperation, and Al-Saud has repeatedly stressed his readiness to increase cooperation with the new US government (http://donya-e-eqtesad.com); The current US administration has also called for Obama’s policies toward Iran to be tolerant and to seek greater confrontation with Iran, and has repeatedly stated numerous positions against the Comprehensive Plan of Action. In other words, creating tensions between Iran and the Arab countries is a solid step toward stabilizing American hegemony in the region. Because Iran fears on the one hand as the driving force behind the arms race and on the other hand it facilitates Arab dependence on a superior power over Iran, as Trump spoke of during his recent trip to the Arab alliance against Iran.

Americans are using every means to strike the axis of resistance, increasing Israeli security and their allies in the sensitive Middle East. The crises of Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, and Yemen are also recent cases. The security of the Middle East is guaranteed by the Americans, especially after the 9/11 events, because they believe that the form of government in the Gulf states, which is not based on the principles of Western democracy, always destabilizes the world and increases terrorist attacks. Consequently, the pattern of democracy in these countries had to be implemented. The important point is that what is most visible from the process of the American policies of the Trump era in relation to the current developments in the West Asian region is the satisfaction of the Arab countries of the region. In fact, contrary to his electoral promises to prioritize US domestic issues, Trump is now seeking to show his goodwill to the Arab states in a profitable and businesslike manner in parallel to the implementation of a plan to increase US military presence in West Asia. Obtain these countries to buy more US military weapons.

Under these circumstances, it is natural that Trump, West African-based Takfiri and terrorism-focused warfare and security in the region, will benefit the US economy. In the process, we must wait for catastrophes and events such as a surprise strategic attack on al-Sha’irat in West Asia and equipping regional rioters. In effect, Trump has pursued the crazy man’s foreign policy strategy, making his foreign policy unpredictable in international equations and in the Middle East’s strategic region. And to confront the interests of the United States and its regional allies in the Middle East’s strategic region.
with a profound and profound challenge, and to consolidate the interests and goals of its regional and international competitors. Relationship It can be said that the flow of energy to the West, as well as the security of the Zionist regime, as the major goals and strategies of the United States in the region will pose a major threat and will add to the strategic strength and depth of the Islamic Resistance axis in the region. In fact, Trump has been seeking a long-term stabilization of America’s position in the region, seeking not only to expand military and economic hegemony in the Middle East, but also to bring about profound political change in the region’s political equations. In line with this, it has resorted to the usual US strategy of creating crisis and flaming crisis centers in West Asia. Finally, it can be said that predicting US foreign policy during the Trump era will be very complicated, especially around the West Asian region. He has expressed warlike views. Many analysts believe that the West Asian equation is the result of a zero sum between Shiite and Sunni powers, in which the US must align with its Sunni allies.

6. Trump and the Yemen Issue

Yemen has suffered a political shock since the Arab Spring of 2011. Its authoritarian leader, Ali Abdullah Saleh, was ousted by popular pressure, but his successor, Mansour Hadi, failed to win the support of his country. The Houthis seized power in September 2014, and in March the following year, President Hadi was forced into exile in Saudi Arabia. Since then, Yemen has been plagued by interference by various groups and countries in Yemen, so one of the bloodiest disputes in the Middle East that has received little attention due to other events in Syria and Iraq is Yemen’s crisis. In the nearly three-year war in Yemen, more than 10,000 have been killed, causing a massive humanitarian crisis. The US-led presidential election ended with Republican primary, and Donald Trump was recognized as the forty-fifth president of the United States, a pollster who had little hope of winning, and in return, his rival, Hillary. Clinton was nominated by the next US president. Trump replaces Barack Obama in the White House, who inherits a multitude of complex and unresolved regional cases, from the Palestinian case to the Iraq-Syria crisis and the Yemeni war, as well as the phenomenon of terrorism expressed in ISIS Is.

The US has been fighting alongside the Saudis in Yemen since 2015 under the pretext of fighting al-Qaeda and ISIL. Although international protests over high civilian casualties in the Yemeni war, former US President Barack Obama suspended arms sales to Saudi Arabia in December 2016, but allegedly paid US $ 200 billion by Saudi authorities to the United States. The cost of Washington’s aid to Riyadh in the Yemeni war has prompted the issue of arms sales to Saudi Arabia to be re-debated by Trump’s business administration, and a group of US senators is proposing a bill to determine new conditions in US military aid to Riyadh. So with the start of Trump, the Yemen case seems to have entered a new phase. In his recent remarks, Trump has emphasized further strengthening cooperation on “fighting Islamist terrorism” and “establishing safe zones in Yemen”. As American writer and analyst Richard Walker points out, US forces are one of the most important political players in Yemen.
today. Americans are suppressing Shiite movements in the country under the pretext of fighting al-Qaeda and terrorists, fueling Muslim religious divisions and fomenting extremism among Yemeni al-Qaeda members. In any case, Yemen is a strategic country and the way for Americans and Americans to access Asia and the Middle East. In addition, it can assist the United States in helping its key allies in the region, such as Saudi Arabia and the Zionist regime, and against countries such as Iran and Iraq; Yemen is seen in the country to counter the power of the Shiites (Nazemroaya, 2015, p. 5).

The emergence of US President Donald Trump has created a wave of ambiguity and confusion in the international system, and has made the prospect of Washington’s relations with friends and foes pregnant with new events. Meanwhile, the Islamic Republic of Iran, which has increased its strategic capacity and become a regional power in the Middle East since the nuclear deal, has been exposed to inconsistent policies by Trump and his political-security team. Observers say that with the Arab-Israeli drive to expand Iran’s influence in the region, as well as sharp US security policies, Tehran will again become the main US agenda for pressure and containment. With its presence in the Persian Gulf and its peripheral countries, the United States will reduce Iran’s healthy regional competitiveness and development of Iran’s influence and, in turn, increase the influence of Iran’s rivals. The Americans certainly do not see the disruption of the balance of power in favor of Iran in the region and seek to eradicate the balance of power for themselves and their regional allies by eradicating the Houthi Shiites and currents close to Iran. They gain access to this strategic region of the world and limit Iran’s influence in the region.

The US and its regional allies claim on Iranian pretexts that Yemeni forces are present in Yemen. At the same time, Iran’s influence in Syria and Iraq is also expanding, and it has frightened Western and US governments. “We destroyed the Iraqi military force that had been in conflict with Iran for years and never won the war”, Trump said in the election campaign, “giving Iraqis the second largest oil reserves in the world”. Now the Iranians have gone to Yemen and Syria, they have taken Syria and Yemen, and if you look at the Yemeni borders, you see that they really want Saudi Arabia. They want Saudi Arabia, they want Iraq, Syria, Yemen, everything. “They want to become a monster and the stupid American leadership has given them the opportunity”. Currently constraining Iran by restricting Iran’s influence in the region and playing Iran’s role as a regional critical power are important targets for US and Saudi military presence in the region, particularly Yemen, Bahrain, Syria and Iraq (Chubin, 1994, p. 109) and their efforts to maintain the Yemeni political regime and prevent revolutionary and structural developments in the country.

According to the author of The Middle East Institute, James Matisse agrees with Senator John McCain that the most important problem (for the US) in the Middle East is “radical Islam”, a vague phrase synonymous with Iran, not ISIL or al-Qaeda; At the risk of Iran, (for the US) ISIL ranked second. Matisse criticizes the Obama administration not for its nuclear deal with Iran, but believes it is a strategic arms control agreement, but for failing to counter Iran’s expansion of influence in the region. While Matisse served in the Obama administration at the US Army Command Center, he focused most
of his efforts on preventing Iranian assistance to the Houthis. Matisse probably agrees with Saudi Arabia that the biggest problem in Yemen is Iranian influence, not the loss of political balance (Schmitz, 2017, p. 2). Some analysts even consider the Babalmandeb Strait to be an act of fortification for the traps and livestock around Iran as well as the scenario of the war with Iran and refer to it as NATO’s last step on the path to launching an invasion of Iran (Nazemroaya, 2015, pp. 2-3).

Anthony Cordesman writes about US policy in Yemen: “The growing ties between the Houthi Shiites in Yemen and Iran have posed another threat to the (illegitimate) interests of Saudi Arabia and the United States. This could potentially allow Iran to deploy its air and naval forces in Yemen and increase its strategic depth and greater freedom of action to strike US and Saudi interests and balance the region. Benefits. The threat still seems limited. But it is important to note that the land of Yemen and its islands play an important role in the security of another global bottleneck and waterway at the southern end of the Red Sea called Babalmandab or the Tear Gate” (Ryan, 2015, pp. 5-7). According to Egypt’s Awnat website, Donald Trump’s rise to power is unlikely that the coalition of Yemeni attacking nations, especially the Arab Gulf states, will give any concessions to Ansarollah’s popular group, because Trump is lampooning Saudi Arabia and the UAE. Green has indicated that it will continue to attack Yemen by ignoring civilians. Trump’s presence in the White House is an opportunity for coalition states to attack Yemen, especially Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, in an effort to achieve their goals in Yemen.

According to a report by the New York Times, the United States carried out numerous aerial scandals this month in the pretext of fighting al-Qaeda in Yemen, more than any other attack in 2016. This means that Trump has strongly emphasized US involvement in Yemen to show his goodwill to Arab countries, especially Saudi Arabia, and to take any measures to support loyalists to Yemen’s presidency Mansour Hadi and his opposition to Ansarollah Yemen. It takes advantage. In fact, what is most evident is that the Trump administration’s cabinet is more of a war cabinet, meaning that militant individuals dominate the decisions and strategies of the government. This has automatically enhanced US military presence in West Asia (Schmitt, 2017, p. 3).

US President Donald Trump made his first foreign trip in May 2017 to the West Asian region of Saudi Arabia. Saudi Arabia was the first stop on the US President’s regional tour. The purpose of the trip was to discuss bilateral issues in bilateral relations, including the signing of multilateral trade and arms deals, including the joint US-Arab summit. Saudi Arabia seeks to align itself with new government after Trump takes power and with the goals of the new government in line with the slogans such as the fight against ISIL and terrorism and the fight against regional influence of the Islamic Republic of Iran. To show America’s work. It is clear that US policies are now being defined by Donald Trump’s presidency as per usual and at any cost to the national interest. This is so that even if the President’s personal trip to the Middle East is necessary, he will immediately launch new events in his united states while selling heavily arms and earning huge sums of money (about $ 2 billion) from both Saudi Arabia and Qatar. In Saudi Arabia, even leading to the displacement of the crown prince, Qatar faces
problems.

In terms of security and military issues, one of the key aspects of Trump’s trip was the discussion of military contracts with Saudi Arabia. The issue of arms sales to the country by the US is not new because it, along with other members of the GCC, have been subject to US security for years and have formed the backbone of the Saudi Armed Forces, but in recent years Saudi Arabia. It has sought to buy weapons from its rival, the US, China, such as Saudi Arabia’s acquisition of Chinese-made reconnaissance drones that it used during its military offensive against Yemen. The SIPRI report shows that the growth of arms purchases in the Middle East region has been unprecedented in the last five years since the Cold War. According to the report, Middle East countries’ weapons imports grew by 5% in the period from 1% to 2%, with Saudi Arabia and Qatar being the largest importers. According to the report, Saudi Arabia was the second-largest importer of military weapons in the world in the 5-6 period, showing a 5 percent increase over the five-year period preceding the 5-7 period. In the past year alone, Saudi Arabia has purchased $ 2.5 billion and $ 1 million in weapons and weapons, a 6 percent increase from the year before, due to attacks on Yemen and arming terrorists in Iraq and Syria. Of that amount, $ 5 million was spent on F-5 fighters and a variety of air-to-air, ground-to-surface and surface-to-air missiles.

There has also been a recent trend of Americans adopting dual policies on Qatar. Qatar, which along with Saudi Arabia was one of the main US allies in the face of regional developments, especially the Syrian situation, after Trump’s trip to Saudi Arabia under the pretext of supporting Hamas and the Taliban in the fight against terrorism and boycott of countries Arabs, including Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates and Bahrain (albeit with US green light). In this context, Iranian Foreign Minister Mohammad Javad Zarif called for pressure on Iran to block its further influence in Syria and Yemen, including messages and consequences of Donald Trump’s trip to Riyadh. The Saudis have spent a great deal of time and money trying to turn Trump’s focus on restraining Iran’s role in the region. To block this influence is exactly equal to increasing Saudi Arabia’s regional role and restoring it to US Middle East strategy. He added that the trip would play a more serious role for the United States in Yemen and Syria in favor of Riyadh, and if the Saudis could pursue a Western-Arab-Hebrew plan to contain Iran and put the disparate actors in the equation in a line of symmetry. It can be said that there will be grounds for pressure on Iran at the regional level. The presence of the United States in the countries of the Middle East during the years following September 9 under the presidency of Bush and Obama has led to what is nowadays called complex and critical. The Yemen crisis is a catastrophe for America. The Obama administration announced last year that it has a comprehensive peace plan to implement, rather than pulling it off. The plan failed as an initiative by the four US states, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates and the United Kingdom, and worst of all, the plan was rejected by Yemen’s incumbent President Mansour Hadi because of acceptance. It meant his dismissal. Donald Trump seems to have to think about how he can save the old US ally, Saudi Arabia, who is trapped in a bloody Yemen war. Trump’s America must find a solution to the Yemeni conflict and its rising human costs.
and the challenges posed by the Yemeni crisis to create lasting security and stability in the region. Yemen, like Syria, is one of the most intractable challenges facing the United States. The Saudi-led coalition has no chance of winning in Yemen. Al-Qaeda is also a growing challenge in Sunni areas.

Many analysts believe that the main cause of concern for the United States and Saudi Arabia over Ansarullah’s coming to power in Yemen is the Yemeni movement’s takeover of the Strait of Babel aimed at transferring weapons to Gaza. In the same vein, the US, Britain and the Zionist regime also support Al Saud in the war against Yemen, and especially in their attempt to dominate Babalmand, because they do not want to see the Babalmand strategic strait as a strategic strait. Hormuz has an actor whose most important characteristics are behavioral and intellectual independence and opposition to Western domination and interference in the affairs of the Middle East. The United States and its regional allies are pursuing a number of scenarios for the future of its developments in Yemen to achieve its desired role model. Most of these scenarios are as follows:

| US scenarios and its regional allies in Yemen | 1. Plan to divide Yemen into two parts: North and South  
2. Preserve Yemen’s integrity by establishing a puppet state  
3. Preserve Yemen’s integrity while at the same time creating chaos and instability in Yemen |

Undoubtedly, because of Yemen’s strategic position and current presence as Houthis who oppose US, Saudi Arabian and allied policies in the region, Americans and Saudis will seek ways to end Yemen’s resistance. Although the Saudis and the Zionist regime have been trying to destroy this resilient Yemeni people for the past two years by bombing the Houthi occupied areas, fortunately the resistance in Yemen continues to be of great concern. Saudi Arabia, America and the fake Zionist regime. The US and the Saudis are in their interest in ending Trump’s trip to Saudi Arabia to end the Yemeni issue in order to put other regional issues on the agenda. And block the path of the Arab revolutions to the eastern borders of Saudi Arabia.

4. Discussion

Throughout the years of the Cold War, the United States sought to expand its influence in all parts of the world, including West Asia, by blocking competition with Russia. After the USSR collapsed and the US ended the Gulf War, Washington was able to consolidate its activity in West Asia more and more. Yemen is one of the regions in West Asia whose geopolitical importance has been assured by regional and international actors. The geographical location of Yemen in the south of the Saudi Arabian Peninsula has put the country in a special geopolitical position, dominating it as a strategic hub, guaranteeing the dominance of two major international waterways in the Babalmandab Strait and the Strait of Hormuz. It does. As such, the West, especially the United States, has been tempted to seek to dominate this geopolitical region. US military arms deal signed in Saudi Arabia during Trump’s May
2017 visit to Saudi Arabia, a US official said, with the goal of selling and strengthening the Saudi military’s ability to respond to regional threats. Have. It is said that the Saudi army is involved in the Yemeni war, and Riyadh strongly supports terrorist groups in Syria. However, Saudi Arabia has not yet succeeded in overthrowing Bashar al-Assad’s regime in Syria and rooting for the Houthis in Yemen, but the Syrian army and its allies are gaining new victories every day in the country’s internal battles. In Yemen, too, the Saudi army has faced many setbacks. Given that the White House’s policies on Syria and Yemen are in line with Riyadh, the sale of US military weapons to Saudi Arabia seems to be worthy of consideration in the wake of the war in Syria and Yemen. In fact, Washington wants to indirectly change the course of military developments in Syria and Yemen in favor of Saudi Arabia by selling these weapons to Riyadh.

However, if Trump seeks to make effective and positive changes in US foreign policy, he must end the war in Yemen. In doing so, the United States should press Saudi Arabia to end its support for Hadi and give up his goals of controlling the Yemeni government after the war. If Saudi Arabia fails to do so, the United States can and should cease all military operations in the military areas backed by Saudi Arabia. From this, Trump and Saudi Arabia’s King bin Abdulaziz talked about future strategies for the war in Yemen. In a statement after the call, the two leaders agreed on the importance of stepping up joint efforts to combat the spread of Islamic State militias; such as Trump, in a phone conversation with the UAE presidency, on supporting safe areas for Displaced refugees in the wake of the clashes emphasized, and Mohammad bin Zayed welcomed the plan. However, the idea of a ceasefire in Yemen did little to end the conflict and support Yemeni civilians, and it seems that things will get worse in the Trump era, especially as aid cuts in the Obama era. Has been. Following an executive order on January 27, 2017, Trump criticized Yemen and barred its citizens from entering US territory. In the current situation, Saudi Arabia and the United States are concerned about the spread of Islamic and democratic movements in Yemen and Bahrain, and fear the establishment of an independent state in the region, as they lose their influence and, in the face of regional power and influence. The Islamic Republic of Iran will be added. In fact, the current state of the US position on the Yemen war fluctuates depending on field developments, although it has provided the seeds for future destabilization by creating the seeds of sectarian and religious wars. Therefore, Yemen has a strategic place in the Trump Middle East equations. However, Ansarollah’s resistance and coalition with Ali Abdullah Saleh, along with the Yemeni people, prevented the implementation of Washington’s policies despite the initial planning.
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