



[U.S. Allies Decline Trump's Request to Help Secure the Strait of Hormuz](#)

Across the board, major U.S. allies have declined President Trump's request to send warships to help secure the Strait of Hormuz. The refusal stems from a combination of strategic, legal, and political concerns aimed at avoiding further escalation of the ongoing conflict with Iran. A host of countries have been adamant and direct in their underscoring that they seek to play no part in the war – fearing that joining a Trump-led naval mission would draw them into the ongoing U.S.-Israeli conflict with Iran. As many European partners of the United States in particular have sought to highlight, The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is a defensive alliance and therefore also lacks the legal mandate to take part in an offensive war of choice in the Middle East. Additionally, key U.S. allies like Germany and Japan both have strict post-WWII legal frameworks that require legislative oversight through parliamentary authorization for military action operations.

On top of the fear that deploying naval forces to the Strait of Hormuz would be deemed an act of escalation that could trigger an even wider-scale conflict, U.S. partners and allies have relayed other important reasons for why they oppose involvement. Many have noted that they were not consulted by the United States or Israel before the current war was launched, and thus, there is an overwhelming sentiment that the conflict is not one of their choosing. There is also a clear absence of a legal mandate for broad participation in the war from any type of collaborative global entity such as the United Nations, European Union, or NATO. Furthermore, most American allies have voiced a preference for internationally-coordinated efforts and diplomatic solutions to the Strait of Hormuz crisis – rather than one which involves the use of military force. All of this has prompted countries like France, the United Kingdom, Germany, Spain, Italy, Japan, South Korea, Australia, and others to either formally reject the Trump request or remain noncommittal, reflecting a wide consensus of opposition towards the notion of getting involved in the war efforts.

Perhaps one of the main driving factors behind the widespread opposition is due to the belief that the Iran war is an offensive military operation. Stefan Kornelius, spokesperson for German Chancellor Friedrich Merz, told media outlets this week that “NATO is a defensive alliance, used to defend its territory.” Indeed, the purpose of NATO is to protect the states involved through collective defense, which is why there are specific rules members follow to protect the nature of this partnership. Many critics point out that the Trump administration has broken the UN

Charter and these established global mechanisms when they decided to launch an attack on Iran – as the strikes do not meet the criteria for self-defense and the administration did not seek the approval of NATO members before initiating the attacks. This has become a central point of frustration among U.S. allies. Germany and the United Kingdom in particular have voiced their contention that NATO countries should have no role in policing the Strait of Hormuz – especially given that those in the partnership were not consulted beforehand. At the domestic level, the Trump administration’s decision to act without congressional approval raises further questions about overreach and the lack of legality for the attacks. Prior to them being initiated, reports had suggested that a U.S.-Israeli attack would garner heavy retaliation from Iran that risked severe regional escalations – yet these concerns were not heeded. As a result, allies are understandably opposed to being asked to assist efforts in a conflict that they did not approve nor want to be involved in.

It is not surprising that leaders of U.S. allies are hesitant to involve their naval assets for an operation in the Strait of Hormuz. Committing to war efforts drain resources, put countless lives at risk, harm diplomatic relationships, and are ultimately destabilizing to any party involved. For these countries, entering a war without a clear exit strategy is not worth the cost. The economic consequences are already being felt globally through the rise in oil prices. Markets are fragile right now as well, which increases the likelihood of inflation and economic strain. Thus, for American allies and partners, deepening involvement in a conflict that has already had wide-ranging negative ramifications is both unappealing and dangerous. There is also weariness considering that Trump has initiated unpopular unilateral decisions in the past, including pulling out of the Paris Climate Accords and raising tariffs, actions which have already made U.S. allies question the reliability of the U.S. administration and its approach to various key issues. Choosing to launch a dangerous war over diplomatic engagement seems unwise and unnecessary to many, particularly when there appears to be no long-term strategy or endgame to this conflict.