



[Israel's Efforts to Push U.S. President Trump to Adopt Its Maximalist Approach Towards Iran](#)

With the threat of a potential military attack against Iran looming, analysts have sought to draw attention to the factors behind President Trump's shifting goals and demands towards Iran in the time since the U.S. bombing campaign against several Iranian nuclear facilities back in June of 2025. For many, it is clear that the Israeli government has been actively and aggressively pushing the Trump administration to adopt a confrontational maximalist approach in an attempt to steer the U.S. away from possible diplomatic solutions and instead towards dangerous military actions aimed at complete disarmament, zero compromise, and regime change. This has led observers to lament that doing so and the serious threat of a military confrontation with Iran is something which detrimentally risks entangling the United States into a protracted and wide-scale conflict that could destabilize the Middle East and endanger the lives of American troops in the region. As such, experts are advocating for diplomacy as the sole means of averting yet another potential regional crisis – one which would undoubtedly be harmful to the United States' best interests.

The shifting Trump approach has become apparent, with recent reports highlighting Israel's efforts to push the United States to demand what has been labeled as the "three no's" policy regarding Iran. These consist of the maximalist demands that Iran agree to have no nuclear program, no ballistic missile program, and no support for regional proxy groups – things that Israeli officials have long desired in an effort to stoke conflict with Iran given Tehran's rejection of these as infringements on its sovereignty. In fact, Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu was deemed to have discussed the "three no's" policy with his American counterparts this week, specifically in meetings with U.S. Special Envoy Steve Witkoff whereby Netanyahu relayed the demands to American negotiators ahead of the plan for renewed U.S. nuclear talks with Iran. These have been referred to as "poison pill" demands which Israel has pressured Washington to adopt given that they are designed to make any diplomatic agreement with Iran impossible, thereby prompting a military confrontation. The Trump adoption of the stance related to the destruction of Iran's ballistic missile program in particular has been shown to be an Israeli demand, with Israeli state broadcasters themselves shedding light on how military officials view this as a core component of their military strategy. Those seeking to instigate conflict with Iran have also tried to put forward the argument that the Iranian government is in a vulnerable position and should be attacked. However, as impartial experts have pointed out, this idea that the government is close to being toppled has been voiced many times before and

has been used by hawkish figures as a tool to try to promote their desire for a direct military confrontation that is certain to have disastrous ramifications.

One can also see the changed Trump approach by looking back at what unfolded during the U.S. bombing campaign in June of 2025. When this was carried out against Iranian nuclear facilities last year, President Trump insisted that the attacks inflicted major damage which obliterated Iran's nuclear program – despite this being contradicted by independent U.S. intelligence reports concluding that the damage caused was instead superficial. The Trump administration's anger at the assessment which countered its narrative even prompted the firing of the then head of the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA), Lt. Gen. Jeffrey Kruse, whose agency had remarked that the U.S. attacks had set back Iran's nuclear program by "only a few months." Following this, the Trump administration was understandably criticized, with the dismissal being characterized as a dangerous attempt to politicize and undermine the impartial U.S. intelligence community. Furthermore, this and what has transpired since raises questions as to why Trump would still be seeking to target Iran over its nuclear program if his insistence on its obliteration is to be believed, unless of course – as observers have alluded to – there is a clear "moving of the goalposts" that advocates of another attack are manipulating to try to justify the purported need for this.

Concerns regarding the Trump administration's adoption of Israel's maximalist demands towards Iran elicits unease as to the troubling manner in which U.S. actions and policies are being increasingly shaped by outside priorities that are ultimately detrimental to the best interests of the United States. Military escalations with Iran would likely entangle the United States in a wide-scale conflict and harm U.S. alliances. This is why regional U.S. allies like Turkey, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Oman, and others have been seeking to prevent escalation due to fears of the destabilization that would stem from an expansive and protracted conflict. As such, the increased U.S. military presence in the region has many on edge, with several countries refusing to allow the use of their airspace or bases to carry out attacks against Iran. The United States' European allies oppose any form of direct military confrontation as well – which could create diplomatic rifts if the U.S. decides to strike Iran. Additionally, external military intervention from the United States is more likely to prompt internal repression inside Iran rather than weaken the government. Beyond these considerations, war results in widespread loss of life, civilian displacement, the destruction of infrastructure, and economic hardship – all of which precipitate long-term instability. Thus, observers are emphasizing the importance of diplomatic engagement in order to instead deescalate tensions and prevent a potentially widespread and catastrophic regional war.