

## The Case About Iran That President Trump Needs To Win

Within the GOP, the foreign policy debate has become more complicated, and it isn't simply a matter of isolationism. Given that the country has just come through record inflation and cost of living is still a problem, this outlook is raising the bar for how the electorate evaluates US involvement in foreign conflicts.

For some time, we have seen a recognition of the emboldening of America's adversaries like Iran, Russia and China, following the disastrous withdrawal from Afghanistan in 2021: *America's adversaries have been emboldened as a result of its standing in the world being weakened (55-19 believe-do not believe* in our April 2024 research for Winning the Issues).

At the same time, there is a concern that the US has become overstretched in foreign policy conflicts: *The US is overstretched with funding and providing military weapons assistance for international conflicts. We must focus on rebuilding our country* (June 2025). A majority of voters believe this (53-30 believe-do not believe), including 68% of Republicans (68-18) and 70% of Trump voters (70-18).

But even with the recognition of emboldened adversaries like Iran, the nation's fiscal challenges and the shadow of "endless wars" have caused Republican voters to rethink US involvement in international conflicts. They are not ruling it out, but there is a higher threshold for evaluating US investment. This is an issue area in which we see conflicting beliefs.

In a direct contrast about foreign policy threats (in April 2025), Republicans tend to be more worried about *America getting involved in endless and costly wars* (51%) than *the threat of emboldened adversaries* (42%). This is not an overwhelming preference, but the margin indicates that both issues are serious concerns that Republicans are weighing.

While both may be a concern, which of the following is a bigger concern to you?	Overall	GOP	Indep	Dem
America getting involved in endless and costly wars	45	51	43	42
The threat of emboldened adversaries like Iran, China, Russia, and North Korea	48	42	48	54

The White House recognizes the need to ensure that our current action in Iran is not seen as a prolonged war, [making the case](#) about the Iranian regime's reign of terror and attacks on Americans for over 40 years. They are emphasizing that the President is not getting entangled in an "endless war" but rather trying to end the Iranian nuclear threat once and for all which will make Americans safer.

The defining question about whether voters will support military action in Iran comes down to this: is this clearly in US security interests? If that case can be proven, the electorate's willingness to support this initiative will be much more solid. But if it is not clear, the domestic situation will become more difficult for the Trump administration to manage. For sustained support of military action in Iran, this is the case that the President must prove.

For more on thoughts on Iran, see David's latest Roll Call column: [Trump's big bet on Operation Epic Fury](#).

Have a good weekend.

*David & Myra*