

Arabian Gulf Journal of Humanities and Social Studies

ISSN: 3080-4086

Vol 6 - Issue 17 || Issued Date: 20-08-2026



Arabian Gulf Journal
Humanities and Social Studies

The Consequences of the Military Conflict with Iran in 2026 in the Light of Combat Doctrines and Technological Transformations: A Forward-Looking Geopolitical and Economic Study

مآلات الصراع العسكري مع إيران عام 2026 في ضوء العقائد القتالية والتحويلات التقنية: دراسة جيوسياسية واقتصادية مستشرقة

Dr. Azzam Amro

د. عزام عمرو

AL-istiqlal University, Faculty of Administrative and Informatics, Department of International Relations and Diplomacy, Jericho- Palestine

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.64355/agjhss61734>

AGJHSS || This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution ([CC BY-NC-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/))

Clarivate | ProQuest

Ulrichsweb™

Crossref doi

ISSN
INTERNATIONAL
STANDARD
SERIAL
NUMBER
INTERNATIONAL CENTRE



Google Scholar

معرفية
e-Marefa



شبكة المعلومات العربية
Arab Educational Information Network

AskZad



Scilit

INTERNATIONAL
Scientific Indexing

CC creative commons

Abstract:

The study aimed to deconstruct the structure of military doctrines and the balances of mutual technological deterrence in the Middle East at the onset of 2026. It adopted a qualitative methodology, utilizing the descriptive-analytical approach, geopolitical systems analysis, and the comparative method to demonstrate the transition of engagement rules from shadow wars to open confrontation. The study reached a set of key findings, most notably: the inability of (American-Israeli) air superiority and artificial intelligence to achieve a comprehensive strategic resolution against the Iranian decentralized "Mosaic Defense" doctrine; the success of the regional "Unity of the Arenas" strategy in inducing "technical saturation" of the adversaries' air defense systems; and the emergence of the energy weapon alongside the disruption of vital straits as a coercive geopolitical and economic constraint that enforced pacification to protect international interests, backed by structural support from the new Russian-Chinese polarization. The study concluded that physical geography (mountainous fortifications) and digital independence (national cyber infrastructure) still govern the efficacy of military technology, thereby ending the practical viability of unipolarity and driving toward the formation of a multipolar regional system governed by the balance of terror and political realism.

Keywords: Technological Deterrence; Unity of the Arenas; Geopolitics of Energy; Multipolarity; Strait of Hormuz.

المخلص:

هدفت الدراسة إلى تفكيك بنية العقائد العسكرية وموازن الردع التكنولوجي المتبادل في منطقة الشرق الأوسط مطلع عام 2026، واستشراف مآلات الصراع الجيوسياسي والاقتصادي في ضوء التحولات التقنية المعاصرة. واعتمدت الدراسة على المنهج الوصفي التحليلي، وتحليل النظم الجيوسياسية، والمنهج المقارن لبيان تحول قواعد الاشتباك من حروب الظل إلى طور المواجهة المفتوحة.

وتوصلت الدراسة إلى مجموعة من النتائج؛ أبرزها: عجز التفوق الجوي والذكاء الاصطناعي (الأمريكي-الإسرائيلي) عن تحقيق الحسم الإستراتيجي أمام عقيدة الدفاع الفسيفسائي اللامركزي الإيراني الحصين جغرافياً، ونجاح إستراتيجية "وحدة الساحات" في تحقيق "الإشباع التقني" للمنظومات الدفاعية للخصوم عبر جبهات متعددة غير متناظرة. أن سلاح الطاقة والتحكم الجيوسياسي بالمضائق الحيوية (كمضيق هرمز) قد فرض تداعيات هيكلية على الاقتصاد العالمي وسلاسل التوريد، مما أثمر عن كبح جماح التصعيد والقبول بتهدئة قسرية عبر وساطة خشنة قادتها باكستان كقناة خلفية حيوية، مدعومة بتموضع بنوي وتوازن دفاعي وقوته القوى الصاعدة (روسيا والصين).

وخلصت الدراسة إلى أن الجغرافيا الطبيعية والاستقلال الرقمي السيرياني لا يزالان يحكمان فاعلية التكنولوجيا العسكرية، مما أنهى عملياً حقبة الأحادية القطبية لصالح نظام إقليمي متعدد الأقطاب؛ محكوم بواقعية توازن الرعب، مع بقاء الساحة اللبنانية كمتغير حرج وثغرة أمنية قادرة على إعادة هندسة الصراع مالم تشملها الترتيبات الأمنية الكلية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الردع التكنولوجي؛ وحدة الساحات؛ جيوبوليتيك الطاقة؛ التعددية القطبية؛ مضيق هرمز.

1. Introduction

The Middle East represents the most influential geopolitical space For reshaping the balances of the international System, where the US-Israeli conflict with the Islamic Republic of Iran has transitioned from a strategy of proxy confrontation to a phase of direct existential confrontation. The accelerated strategic shift witnessed in 2025- ranging from the qualitative development in

Iranian uranium enrichment to Tehran's possession of hypersonic missiles capable of penetrating the most sophisticated defense systems- has prompted decision-makers in Washington and Tel Aviv to revise the doctrine of "containment" and replace it with the a doctrine of military decisiveness through preemptive strikes.

This study provides a new vision of the mechanisms governing the complex intersection of ideological and military-technical dimensions, demonstrating how the war on Iran goes beyond the boundaries of local military operations aimed at aborting the nuclear program turning, into a comprehensive confrontation aimed at undermining the pillars of Iranian influence in the region- striking the Iranian axis and its network within the "unity of the arenas" framework that stretches from the shores of the Mediterranean to the Bab al-Mandab Strait (Arab Center for Research and Policy Studies, 2026, p. 2). Many recent studies and strategic reports have demonstrated that any confrontation in this era will be completely different from the wars of the past two decades—driven primarily by its reliance on artificial intelligence to manage drone swarms and cyber warfare that may cause the paralysis of infrastructure before the first bullet is fired (Gasper & Raman, 2024).

Moreover, Iran's difficult geography, characterized by the Zagros mountain range and deep underground fortifications—including the Natanz and Fordow facilities-poses unprecedented logistical and military challenges to U.S. and Israeli forces. The "Midnight Hammer" strategy advanced by Tel Aviv's military circles relies on absolute air superiority, Yet clashes with the reality of Iran's "mosaic defense," which relies on dispersing the adversary's capabilities across several front (Cordesman, 2019).

From an economic point of view, this study is of paramount importance in light of the "geopolitics of energy," as Iran exerts effective control over the Strait of Hormuz—the global bottleneck- where any threat to maritime navigation threatens to plunge the global economy into a dark tunnel of recession and inflation, with estimates suggesting that the price of a barrel of oil will surge by 160% to 200% within the first week of the outbreak of an all-out confrontation (Dandan, 2014).

While Israel relies on the an expanded iteration of the "Dahiya Doctrine" to paralyze Iran's regional allies and non-state actors, Iran adopts a cost-imposition strategy, which is designed to render the strategic price for Israel and the United States politically and economically unsustainable (Middle East News, 2026). Consequently, this study transcends the mere monitoring of tactical ground movements to anticipate the outcome of the conflict in light of the emergence of a multipolar international order featuring China and Russia, both of which are unlikely to remain passive regarding the potential destabilization of a strategic ally in a geostrategically vital region.

A deep understanding of the ongoing 2026 military confrontation necessitates a historical reconstruction of the geopolitical landscape which has been consistently shaped by decades of silent and open conflict between Iran and the U.S.–Israeli alliance. An examination of the roots of this clash reveals that it was neither spontaneous nor the product of a transient crisis, but rather represents the culmination of the structural transformations that began with the breakdown of the "Periphery Doctrine" in which the Shah's regime served as a cornerstone of Western security, and Iran's transition since 1979 to a radical revolutionary identity that placed it in existential contradiction with American and Israeli interests in the region. This ideological transformation transcended political rhetoric, manifesting practically in the construction of a cross-border strategic depth through which Tehran succeeded in cultivating a network of non-state actors armed with missile and technical capabilities, thereby shifting the conflict from the traditional confrontation

square between regular armies to a complex hybrid war that integrates regional geography into a singular theater of interconnected interests and threats (Barksdale, 2026).

Over the past decade, Israel has tried to contain this expansion through a series of localized intelligence-driven surgical strikes aimed at undermining the capabilities of Iran and its allies without descending into total warfare. However, the geopolitical realities in 2025 have demonstrated the diminishing returns of this strategy, as Iran achieved a "technological leap" by localizing the manufacture of unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) and hypersonic missiles. While fortifying its nuclear program in facilities within the Zagros mountain ranges—rendering limited kinetic options inadequate for establishing decisive deterrence (Swissinfo, 2022). In this sense, this strategic impasse in conventional military paradigms has prompted Israeli decision-makers, supported by a shift in U.S. combat doctrine, to consider comprehensive military surgery" as the definitive mechanism to contest regional hegemony and restore the regional balance of power.

On the structural level, this escalation cannot be isolated from major shifts in the US military doctrine; Washington finds itself compelled to re-project its strategic weight back to the Middle East in 2026, precisely while attempting a strategic pivot to counter the Chinese threat in the Indo-Pacific. Furthermore, Iran's capacity to disrupt maritime navigation in the vital Strait of Hormuz implies that allowing Tehran to reach the brink of nuclear capability would inevitably signal the end of the American era in the Persian Gulf and to reach the brink of nuclear capability necessarily means the end of the American era in the Persian Gulf And precipitate a structural fracture in the Washington-led international order. Consequently, this analysis leads directly to the conclusion that direct military confrontation has become, from the perspective of Pentagon realists, an unavoidable imperative to safeguard American hegemony and global leadership before a decisive shift occurs (Walker, 2026).

Statement of Problem

The problem of the study articulates the "strategic horizon closure" that gripped the Middle East in early 2026, following the escalation of geopolitical tension to the precipice of a full-scale regional conflict. This central problem manifests as a "strategic certainty dilemma" regarding the parameters of a potential military confrontation" between the United States-Israel alliance and the Iranian-led regional axis. In this context, the attacking powers face inherent structural constraints in neutralizing Iran's nuclear infrastructure and asymmetric conventional deterrents, alongside the catastrophic repercussions of an all-out war capable of destabilizing global energy security and reordering the international alliances matrix.

Based on these dynamics, evaluating the strategic trajectories of the conflict necessitates addressing the following primary research question; What are the potential scenarios for a comprehensive military confrontation with Iran in light of the 2026, geopolitical realities, and what are their strategic implications at the regional and international levels?

This primary question generates the following sub-questions:

1. What are the geostrategic incentives that compelled Washington and Tel Aviv to transition from a containment paradigm toward a strategy of direct military confrontation with Iran in 2026?
2. How do Iran's asymmetric mosaic defense strategy and the "Unity of Arenas" doctrine function to undermine the effectiveness of its adversaries technological and aerial supremacy?

3. What are the Limits of the anticipated strategic interventions of major powers, namely Russia and China, should the region slide into a protracted war of attrition?
4. What are the geopolitical and economic repercussions of a potential closure of the vital maritime chokepoints of the Strait of Hormuz And Bab al-mandab On global supply chains?

Importance of the Study

Scientific Significance: To provide a contemporary analytical model of fifth-generation warfare (5GW) by integrating neoclassical realist theory with cyber-security paradigms and military artificial intelligence (AI), thereby conceptualizing the “Unity of Arenas” as a transnational strategic doctrine

Applied Importance: Providing decision-makers with an objective assessment of the conflict trajectories while exposing vulnerabilities within mutual deterrence framework- consequently facilitating strategic cost-benefit analyses prior to fateful decision-making that could fundamentally reorder the regional architecture.

Justifications for the study

- The rapidly narrowing window between the maturation of Iran’s nuclear program and credible military intervention thresholds in early 2026.
- Literature Scarcity: The lack of comprehensive academic studies that synthesize emerging military technologies-such as UAVs and hypersonic missiles-with geopolitical dimensions like energy security within a unified analytical framework.
- Multipolar Shifts: The evolving involvement of extra-regional powers, specifically Russia And China, as strategic allies or diplomatic brokers, which necessitates updating traditional structural-realist interpretive framework.

Objectives of the Study

1. Deconstructing the military power architectures of the conflicting actors and analyzing the parameters of mutual technological deterrence framework.
2. Mapping potential military confrontation scenarios, specifically focusing on surgical strikes, all-out regional warfare, and maritime wars of attrition.
3. Forecasting the trajectory of the regional balance of power in the post direct confrontation phase.
4. Providing the academic community with a rigorous analytical framework to comprehend the structural complexities of the Iranian operational theater and its geostrategic periphery.

Hypotheses

This study tests three primary hypotheses;

- a) The U.S-Israeli aerial and technological supremacy is capable of neutralizing static, hardened targets, but remains structurally incapable of achieving a decisive strategic resolution without devolving into a ground campaign or a protracted war of attrition.

- b) The Iranian strategic response relies on the principle of operational decentralization, operationalizing interconnected regional theaters to overwhelm and disorient the defensive depth of its adversaries.
- c) The weaponization of energy security and the escalating economic costs of warfare will serve as the primary structural determinants in constraining the conflict and establishing its temporal limits.

Literature and Previous Studies

1. A study by Katman (2021), intitled: "The islamic Republic of Iran's Cyber Security Strategy: Challenges in an Era of Cyber Uncertainty", examines the development of the Iranian security doctrine in the digital space. The researcher highlights the paradigm shift in Iran's strategic vision following the stuxnet attacks. However, despite its foundational contription, katman overlooks a pivotal dimension: the operational integration of cyber capabilities with modern hypersonic missile systems to inflict instantaneous strategic blindness upon an advancing adversary.
2. A study by Bahgat (2019), entitled: " Iran's Ballistic-Missile and Space Program: An Assessment analyzes Iran's missile doctrine and the enhanced precision-strike capabilities of its ballistic missiles and unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) as a primary mechanism of strategic deterrence. Bahgat posits this asymmetric arsenal as Tehran pragmatic alternative to coventional airpower.
3. A study by Fayeze(2024), entitled: " The Confrontation Between Iran and Israel: From Shadow Battles to the open," monitors the shifting rules of engagement between Tel Aviv And Tehran The author chronicles the transition of the conflict from proxy-driven "shadow wars" toward direct and overt military confrontations.
4. A study by the international Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS, 2026), entitled: The Military Balance 2026, assesses the accelerating technological arms race and the expanding role of missiles and UAVs within regional defense doctrines. The report details the quantitative and qualitative maturation of Iranian capabilities and their subsequent impact on the deterrence equilibrium with Israel, particularly following the geopolitical shifts of 2024 and 2025 and the emergence of novel direct confrontation paradigm.
5. A study by Cordsman (2019), entitled: "The Iranian Missile Threat" and published by the Center for Startegic and International Studies (CSIS), evaluates the tactical capabilities of Iran's ballistic and cruise missiles as an instrument for comprehensive regional deterrence.

Commentary on Previous Studies and the Research Gap:

The primary value- added of this study lies in its systematic attempt to brigde the exiting literature gap. Specifically, the core research gap manifests in the pronounced scarcity of acadimic scholarship that structurally synthesizes the "accelerating technological paradigm shift-encompassing missile dynamics, unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), and cyber security -with the concurrent 're-conceptualization of the political doctrine governing Iranian deterrence' in the post-direct confrontation era (2025-2026).

While conventional literature has predominantly analyzed either isolated technical parameters or broad geopolitical shifts in fragmentation, this study distinguishes itself by offering a

comprehensive, integrated framework. It elucidates how the fluidity of contemporary power dynamics, combined with the systemic vulnerabilities of conventional defense architectures observed in recent escalations, have driven Tehran to pivot from its long-standing doctrine of “historical caution” toward a strategy of “declared existential deterrence”. This crucial strategic variable remains theoretically unexamined and empirically unmapped within current academic literature, particularly in light of the volatile 2026 geopolitical realities and the entirely novel technical and hybrid rules of engagement now governing the Middle East theater.

Methodology

To comprehensively address the overlapping technological and dimensions of the phenomenon under investigation, this study adopts a multi-methodological research design, operationalized through the following methodological approaches:

- The Descriptive-Analytical Method: Utilized to systematically track and analyze the empirical reality of Iranian while deconstructing the underlying architecture of Tehran’s security and political deterrence doctrines. This is achieved by securitizing strategic defense reports and official political discourses spanning up to early 2026.
- Geopolitical Systems Analysis: Deployed to comprehend the systemic interactions between core state actors—namely Iran, Israel and the USA— and the border regional conflict environment. It examines how the integration of disruptive, advanced technologies has fundamentally altered the strategic inputs of power and the operational outputs of deterrence within the Middle East theater.
- The comparative Method: Employed to contrast the pre-2024 proxy-driven “shadow warfare” era with the subsequent “open confrontation” paradigm of 2025-2026. This approach evaluates how the underlying rules of engagement transitioned from frameworks of asymmetric, indirect deterrence to modes of direct and overt military confrontation.

Tools

To execute the aforementioned methodological framework, the study utilizes the following specialized data-collection and analytical tools:

- Qualitative Content Analysis: Applied to official state documents, strategic reports issued by prominent international think tanks (such as the IISS), and peer-reviewed policy papers to extract precise indicators demonstrating structural shifts in military and strategic doctrines.
- Digital Desk Research: Utilizing global defense databases—such as the Military Balance 2026 databases—to obtain precise, high-fidelity empirical data on military expenditures and technological balances.
- Scenario Analysis: Employed as a strategic forecasting tool to extrapolate the future trajectories of the regional conflict under the emerging paradigm of “mutual technological deterrence”.

Scope of the Study

- Thematics Scope: The study focuses primarily on the nexus between military-technological advancements and the underlying philosophy of political deterrence within Iranian strategic calculus toward Israel.

- Temporal Scope: The historical and operational parameters of this study span from the structural geopolitical shifts of 2024 through the first quarter of 2026, thereby ensuring that the empirical findings remain contemporary with the most recent evolutions in the regional rules of engagement.

2. Military Architecture and Combat Doctrines

The Section establishes an analytical framework to deconstruct the structural nature of the contemporary military confrontation. It evaluates the doctrinal divergence between the U.S-Israel alliance- which prioritizes digital asymmetry and preemptive counter-force strikes- and the Iranian paradigm, which leverage asymmetric deterrence and the choke-point architecture maritime waterways. This dynamic effectively induces a state of mutual techno-geographic deterrence

2.1. the U.S- Israeli Military Doctrine (Qualitative Edge and Digital Surgical Strike)

The joint military strategy of the U.S- Israeli alliance against Iran is predicated on a “zero-risk” operational doctrine, operationalized via absolute aerial supremacy-or “air sovereignty”-and direct preemptive counter-force operations. Consequently, contemporary strategic calculus no longer gauges military efficacy by the destructive volume of a kinetic arsenal, but has shifted toward what defense analysts conceptualize as “precision lethality”- a paradigm that synthesizes dense firepower with real-time intelligence telemetry (Schanzer et al., 2024).

This heavy reliance on aerial supremacy seeks to project unilateral political will by systematically paralyzing the adversary’s technological infrastructure, thereby neutralizing its regional deterrence architecture prior to the initiation of any ground maneuver. The operational plans crystallized in early 2026 rely fundamentally on integrating algorithmic AI into the automated targeting cycle (Targeting AI). Within this framework, machine learning algorithms are deployed to exploit technical and electronic vulnerabilities within Iran’s air defense network-specifically the Bavar-373 and Khordad missile systems-thereby identifying transient temporal windows for missile and projectile penetration bypassing effective radar interception (Pinfold,2026). And the operational spearhead of this doctrine comprises low-observable “stealth” platforms, primarily the F-35 lightning II and the next-generation B-21 Raider. These platforms are explicitly engineered to penetrate highly contested anti-access/area-denial (A2/AD) environments to execute surgical kinetic strike against strategic centers of gravity, including hardened nuclear facilities, command, control, communications, computers, and intelligence (C4I) nodes, and mobile ballistic missile launch infrastructure(Eshel, 2026).

2.2. Iran’s Asymmetric Mosaic Defense and Missile Deterrence Strategy

In contrast to this Western digital asymmetry, strategic analysis demonstrates that Tehran has actively countered by formulating a highly resilient, asymmetric operational doctrine known as the “Mosaic Defense” (Dafaa-e Moza’ee). This doctrine is structurally designed to leverage Iran’s rugged, complex topography by partitioning the territory into autonomous, decentralized combat zones capable of sustained, independent operations even under conditions of total command-and-control (C2) isolation from central leadership (Raman, 2026). A study by the center for a New American Security (Sand, 2026) highlights that Iran has structurally replaced traditional “static defense” paradigms with “defense-in-geopolitical-depth”, positioning its extensive ballistic and cruise missile inventory as an asymmetric surrogate for conventional power.

Cosequently, the Mosiac Defense operates as a strategic instrument to wage prolonged wars of attrition, designed to neutralize rapid, decisive offensive operations and fracture adversary coalitions by demonstrating the failure of surgical military interventions within complex geographic terrains (Sharma, 2026). This posture has been significantly bolstered by the deployment of the Fattah-2 hypersonic glide vehicle (HGV). Capable of terminal maneuvering at speeds exceeding Mach 15, these systems render forward-deployed U.S. assets in the Persian Gulf and strategic centers within the Israel depth highly vulnerable, effectively bypassing the interception envelopes of conventional Patriot and Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) batteries. Furthermore, as Kamil (2025) observes in an Al-jazeera Center for studies analysis on unmanned aerial systems, Tehran has cultivated an “aerial shadow army” -comprising highly coordinated unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) swarms designed to execute dense saturation attacks to deplete and overwhelm adversary air defense fire units(Kamil, 2025).

Synthesizing these operational parameters, the primary objective of this doctrine is the systematic exhaustion of adversary integrated air and missile defense (LAMD) system. By orchestrating synchronized salvos of low-cost liotering munitions alongside precision-guided ballistic missiles, Iran seeks to saturate radar tracking capacities to guarantee that a lethal percentage of kinetic payloads-including Multiple Independently Targetable Reentry Vehicles (MIRVs)-penetrate to high-value assets. Geopolitically, This operational posture is geared toward establishing a robust “balance of terror”. By holding critical regional energy infrastructure hostage to retaliatory strikes, Tehran ensures that the escalation costs for Washington and Tel Aviv exponentially outweigh any potential strategic dividends. This credible threat matrix provides Tehran with substantial leverage and coercive utility in diplomatic negotiations and geopolitical maneuvering(Kurlantzick & Richter, 2026).

2.3. Maritime Security and Choke-Point Geopolitics as Strategic leverage

Critical maritime waterways, most notably the Strait of Hormuz and the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait, constitute the third foundational pillar of Iran’s regional defense doctrine as of 2026. Within this framework, the weaponization of maritime geography and the control of strategic sea lines of communication (SLOCs) function as a mechanism of asymmetric deterrence, carrying strategic weight comparable to non-conventional capabilities (klawans, 2026). In the SIPRI Yearbook, Dan Smith (2025) underscores that the regional arms race has reached a critical inflection point, increasingly centered on the deployment of advanced coastal defense systems (CDS) designed to enforce or counter the forced closure of these straits. This trend reinforces the global consensus that contemporary geopolitical rivalries are increasingly manifested as hybrid “maritime-economic wars”(Smith, 2025).

Utilizing maritime choke points as coercive geopolitical leverage represents a structural shift in theater-level conflict strategic. International transit corridors are effectively redefined as defensive frontlines capable of neutralizing conventional military superiority by threatening the instantaneous paralysis of global commercial shipping. Geographically, the Strait of Hurmoz narrows to a mere 39 kilometers at its tightest point, while the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait spans only 32 kilometers, rending them highly exploitable military choke points that amplify asymmetric deterrence(Abdel-Ati, 2026).

In this context, Fusek (2025) argues that 2026 marks a paradigm shift in naval warfare, characterized by the widespread “automation of maritime threats” and the deployment of unmanned, autonomous systems (such as unmanned surface vessels ‘USVs’ and underwater

loitering munitions) along critical shipping lanes. This transition effectively transforms contested waters into “digital minefields”, rendering safe commercial passage entirely hostage to diplomatic concessions. Analytical forecasting models indicate that such localized maritime denial operations can trigger an estimated 400 % surge in maritime war-risk insurance premiums, compelling extra-regional great powers to consider direct military intervention to preserve the global flow of energy exports (Fussek, 2025).

Ultimately, an structural assessment of these competing military architectures reveals that Western technological and digital superiority is no longer a guaranteed decider of conflict outcomes. The synthesis of Iran’s “Mosaic Defense” paradigm, its layered ballistic and cruise missile threat rings, and its latent capability to interdict critical maritime corridors has established a highly costly deterrence equilibrium. This matrix effectively converts any potential direct military confrontation into a high-risk economic and political gamble with deeply unpredictable outcomes for all actors involved.

3. The Operational Theater and Military Engagement (2026)

This Section provides a comprehensive analytical deconstruction of the contemporary operational theater and the evolving equations of military engagement in 2026. It systematically examines the introductory cyber the regional electronic counter-force operations, tracks the strategic shift toward the regional “Unity of Arenas” doctrine, and evaluates the cascading effects of this escalation on global energy geopolitics and the structural realignments of global great powers. Ultimately, this chapter serves to empirically test the study’s core hypotheses within these fluid dynamics.

3.1. The Strategic Blindness Scenario (Cyber and Electromagnetic Warfare)

Prior to the deployment of any kinetic aerial assets, strategic defense literature in 2026 converges on the premise that the “first salvo” of contemporary conflict will be digital and non-kinetic. In a study published by Chatham House, Naya Prakash(2026) observes that the preparatory phase of operations is structurally dependent on a “digital blackout” strategy. This phase leverages highly sophisticated cyberattacks designed to paralyze the target state’s “nervous system”—specifically its industrial control systems (ICS) and supervisory control and data acquisition (SCADA) networks within critical infrastructure—thereby inducing structural chaos and severely obstructing national mobilization efforts (Prakash, 2026).

Advanced cyber warfare fundamentally elevates conflict beyond localized physical geography, emerging as a coercive political instrument designed to degrade institutional and societal trust while denying the adversary real-time situational awareness. In a landmark study published by the Hudson Institute, Clark & others (2021) analyze the dynamics of the invisible battlefield within the Electromagnetic Spectrum (EMS), demonstrating that electromagnetic spectrum superiority enables the execution of sophisticated signal spoofing operations. This capability is engineered to systematically disrupt and spoof air defense radars by projecting dense matrices of false “ghost” targets. Consequently, integrated air defense systems are coerced into depleting their high-value interceptor inventories against non-existent digital signatures, the theater for the subsequent wave of kinetic strike operations (Clark et al., 2021).

3.2. The “Unity of Arenas” Strategy and Regional Retaliation

Any potential military confrontation targeting Iran cannot be analyzed in isolation from its regional allies and partners. Strategic literature indicates that Iran’s defensive doctrine is fundamentally

predicated on a comprehensive, network-centric proxy framework formalized as the “Unity of Arenas” strategy (Jones, 2024). Under the operational parameters of 2026, this doctrine is designed to trigger synchronized, multi-directional kinetic actions: deploying offensive unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) cells from Iraq, Syria, Yemen, and Lebanon, while concurrently launching land-attack cruise missiles (LACMs) and anti-ship ballistic missiles (ASBMs) from Yemen to interdict vital shipping lanes and maritime choke points.

Geopolitically, the “Unity of Arenas” strategy demonstrates the systematic erosion of unilateral deterrence paradigms. Regional theater integration functions as a mutual security architecture that structurally coerces an offensive actor into dispersing its high-end technological and surveillance assets across several contested fronts simultaneously. This operational coordination induces “technological saturation”. Despite the exceptional interception efficiency of systems like the “Iron Dome”, highly synchronized, multi-axis salvos are engineered to rapidly deplete finite interceptor inventories and achieve kinetic penetration into the adversary’s strategic depth. This operational reality is validated by the Military Balance 2026 report by the International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS), which concludes that a multi-front missile war of attrition is capable of degrading the qualitative edge of conventional integrated air and missile defense (IAMD) systems, thereby imposing a new geopolitical status quo (IISS, 2026).

Within this escalatory matrix, the Lebanese front – specifically the highly volatile theater of Southern Lebanon – remains the most critical operational flashpoint. This geographic linkage renders temporary de-escalation frameworks highly fragile and susceptible to rapid collapse. The structural and operational interconnectedness of these military activities systematically precludes the possibility of isolating the Lebanese theater from any broader diplomatic resolutions aimed at terminating the regional conflict.

3.3. Energy Geopolitics and the Economic-Political Repercussions of War

The contemporary conflict theater of 2026 represents the most severe supply-side shock to energy markets in global trade history. According to the International Energy Agency (IEA) report released in March 2026, titled “Dire Straits” the total interdiction of tanker transit through the Strait of Hormuz disrupted global energy flows by approximately 20 million barrels per day (mb/d) of crude oil and refined petroleum products. The IEA analysis notes that Gulf oil producers were structurally compelled to shut in and complete suspension to roughly 10 mb/d due to rapid storage tank saturation and the complete suspension of export terminals. Price dynamics mirrored this supply shock; global benchmark Brent crude surged immediately, testing the 120 \$ per barrel threshold in the immediate aftermath of the February 28 airstrikes, before retracing to 92 \$ per barrel following the IEA’s historic March 11 emergency coordinated action to release 400 million barrels from member states’ Strategic Petroleum Reserves (SPR) to stabilize global markets (IEA, 2026).

This critical energy security crisis underscores that global macroeconomic stability remains the primary strategic vulnerability for Western great powers. Exponential energy price inflation serves as a potent domestic political trigger, forcing Western democratic capitals to moderate their geopolitical commitments and walk back from supporting maximalist military outcomes. Concurrently, maritime compliance data for 2026 demonstrates that regional militarized disputes are no longer confined to kinetic domains; they have expanded to catalyze high “enforcement volatility” across global maritime trade. An analysis by ORCA Crew (2026), leveraging proprietary Kepler data, reveals that 2025 and early 2026 experienced an unprecedented tightening of international sanctions regimes. These regulatory measures target not only physical cargo flows but

aggressively encompass underlying maritime asset ownership structures, protection and indemnity (P&I) insurance clubs, and broader maritime service providers (ORCA Crew, 2026).

Under this hyper-scrutinized compliance environment, coupled with the systemic vulnerabilities highlighted in the World Trade Organization's World Trade Report 2026, maritime corridors are highly susceptible to total logistical paralysis. This structural blockage is primarily driven by the refusal of global tier-one underwriting syndicates and reinsurance markets to extend war-risk coverage within contested operations zones. This insurance strike triggers a cascading breakdown across global supply chains-characterized by port congestion, container terminal gridlock, and severe crew mobilization crises. Ultimately, these dynamics subject energy-importing nations to severe domestic inflationary crises, transforming a localized military conflict into a transnational humanitarian and economic emergency. This systemic threat matrix inevitably compels direct military and diplomatic intervention by global powers to safeguard the structural integrity and continuity of the rules-based global trading system (WTO, 2026).

3.4. The Chinese-Russian Position

This cross-border expansion confirms that the current war of 2026 does not represent an isolated regional conflict, but rather a true test of the influence of rising powers in the face of American hegemony. And (Feigenbaum, 2026) indicates, in a report for the Carnegie Endowment, that Chinese policy toward this conflict stems from a pragmatic approach to protecting energy flows-on which Beijing relies for over 60% of its imports from the Gulf region-moving away from the traditional logic of "alliance commitments". According to the analysis, China may resort to deploying coercive economic diplomacy or providing direct intelligence support to prevent the collapse of the regional balance, effectively turning the confrontation into a proxy war between major powers. In this context, Sarkin and Sotoudehfar (2024) argue that the development of artificial intelligence technologies and the technological arms race in the Middle East have created a fertile environment for this type of complex technical intervention, where the integration of advanced technology raises the cost of military resolution and prevents specific international powers from unilaterally re-engineering regional security (Sarkin & Sotoudehfar, 2024).

The joint Chinese-Russian alignment reveals a strategy of exploiting regional crises to re-engineer the international system and bypass unilateral hegemony, by providing a political and technical safety net for allies that prevents Washington from monopolizing decisions on international war and peace. From the perspective of the Offensive-Defensive Balance theory, the Russian positioning acquires complex structural and technological dimension, and (Glaser & Kaufmann, 1998) argue that this balance is determined based on "the ratio of the cost of the forces the attacker requires to take territory to the cost of the forces the defender requires to defend it", (Within this equation, the role of Autonomous Weapons systems (AWS) and military artificial intelligence emerges as tools capable of altering the balance of defensive deterrence. And (Glaser & Kaufmann, 1998) argue that this balance is determined based on "the ratio of the cost of the forces the attacker requires to take territory to the cost of the forces the defender requires to defend it." Within this equation, the role of Autonomous Weapons Systems (AWS) and military artificial intelligence emerges as tools capable of altering the balance of defensive deterrence. And Bazoobandi (2026) explains that the growing reliance on and localization of these technologies-as seen in the transfer and development of drones and autonomous system- allows actors to establish complex defensive networks that bypass traditional arms control mechanism(Bazoobandi, 2026). This technological shift raises the attacker's cost of aerial and cyber operations relative to the defender's cost, directly contributing to

neutralizing the Western doctrine of “digital surgery” and turning the conflict into prolonged structural clash over the identity of a multipolar international system (Abdulghani et al., 2025).

By analyzing the complex strategic state of the conflict, it is evident that the effectiveness of escalation strategies and brinkmanship in establishing stable deterrence equations has eroded; analyses from the (Walsh School Of Foreign Service, 2026) indicate that the military operation known as (Epic Fury) has exceeded its defined objectives, initiating a state of strategic attrition for the participating international powers, which effectively ends previous “zero-problems” strategies and opens the door to protracted conflicts. And (Abrahams & Williams, 2026) confirm that this conflict has led to a sharp escalation in cyber threats targeting energy infrastructure, imposing a new security reality that makes remaining in gray zones an impossible option in the face of the cross-repercussions of this clash.

In the same context, (Popescu & Riley, 2026) believe that the state of “slow death” resulting from sluggish decision-making and institutional decay will undermine strategic security and leave countries more vulnerable to dependency on foreign powers in the fields of energy and technology, which necessitates building resilient security systems that transcend traditional concepts of hegemony to avoid collapse scenarios in the absence of genuine frameworks for serious dialogue among active powers (Cohen, 2026).

Testing the Study's Hypotheses

Based on the documentary and field examination of the operational theater data for 2026, and culminating in advanced analytical readings, the researcher presents the results of the proven hypotheses as follows;

The First Hypothesis:

The hypothesis points that (US/Israeli) aerial and technological superiority is incapable of achieving strategic decisiveness without slipping into a ground confrontation or a long-term war of attrition.

The operational data concerning the deployment of F-35 and B-21 fighters, alongside AI-driven radar systems, demonstrated remarkable success in striking and destroying “hard targets” and visible installations. However, on the ground, this superiority collided with the mechanism of “decentralised mosaic defence” and manoeuvring missile systems such as “Fattah-2”.

According to the researcher's assessment, this field collision led both parties into prolonged operational battles of attrition, in which aerial superiority failed to impose political terms of surrender on Tehran. Consequently, the validity of the first hypothesis has been proven.

The Second Hypothesis:

This hypothesis posits that the Iranian response would rely on “field decentralisation” and the activation of the principle of the “Unity of Regional Arenas” to disorient adversaries.

Monitoring the field data of the regional conflict theatre proved that the simultaneous and intensive influx of kamikaze drones and guided missiles-launched from theatres in “Yemen, Iraq, Syria, and Lebanon”-caused “technological saturation” and acute disruption to Israel's advanced defence systems, namely the “Iron Dome” and the “Patriot” system.

This tactic reveals the undermining of the effectiveness of “long arms” by shifting the battle to multiple, asymmetric fronts. These fronts depleted and exhausted interceptor missiles through the chasing of decoy targets. Thus, the study proved the validity of the second hypothesis.

The Third Hypothesis:

This hypothesis posits that the energy weapon and the exorbitant economic cost of war represent the decisive determinant in curbing the conflict and defining its timeframe.

According to statistical and documentary indicators extracted from the 2026 reports of the International Energy Agency (IEA) and the World Trade Organisation (WTO), the removal of 20 million barrels per day from the Strait of Hormuz-which sent Brent crude prices soaring to 120\$ alongside the resulting maritime logistical paralysis-exerted direct structural pressures on global stock markets and international supply chains.

This threat forced the major powers and their allies to curb military escalation and immediately accept Pakistani mediation to halt the deteriorating situation. Accordingly, the third hypothesis proved to be valid.

Discussion of Results

- The results revealed that (US-Israeli) aerial superiority faced a structural deficit in achieving comprehensive “strategic decisiveness” against hard targets and deep Iranian fortifications. This finding partially aligns with the study by (Bahgat, 2019), which highlighted the risks of defensive missile capabilities; however, our current study adds a deeper analytical dimension. It demonstrates that the utilisation of artificial intelligence (AI) for strike guidance and target identification-as outlined in the (IISS, 2026) report- failed to neutralise the spatial flexibility of Iran’s geographical terrain and its natural immunity. This proves that advanced military technology will remain incapable of ending the conflict without a costly ground confrontation, thereby achieving our study’s first objective: dismantling the balances of mutual technological deterrence.
- The findings demonstrated a radical shift in the 2026 Iranian doctrine. While the study by (Katman, 2021) highlighted cyber security as a less costly tool for hybrid deterrence, the outcomes of this study prove that Tehran’s transition to the phase of “declared existential deterrence” came as a result of integrating digital sovereignty with hypersonic missile capability (such as the Fattah-2 missile). This structural integration is what granted Tehran the ability to induce a state of “digital blackout” and organised strategic blindness for the adversary through electronic warfare channels and signal spoofing. This shifted the formulation of deterrence from the realm of indirect containment to a confirmed and exposed threat to the attacking adversary’s geopolitical depth.
- The outcomes of the operational theatre converged with the second hypothesis, proving that the Iranian response was strategically based on activating interconnected regional arenas. This result intersects with the study by (Fayez, 2024) regarding the transition of the confrontation from “shadow wars” into the open. However, the current study delves deeper into this perspective to prove that the “Unity of Arenas” strategy transcended the path of mere political support to be tactically realised through the phenomenon of “technological saturation”. The simultaneous and intensive launching of kamikaze drones and guided missiles from multiple fronts exhausted the the adversary’s stockpile of interceptor missiles and paralysed its capacity

for geographical focus. This forward-looking characterisation achieves the study's second objective, while proving that the Lebanese front remains the most critical and volatile field variable capable of shattering regional de-escalation equations.

- The results confirm the validity of the argument that the “energy weapon” as a tool of decisiveness is far more potent than conventional firepower. This outcome aligns with the warnings issued by the (IEA, 2026) following the price spike of Brent crude- the “international benchmark”- and the halting for the flow of 20 million barrels per day through the Strait of Hormuz. The current study clarifies that the tactic of “geopolitical choking” transformed the military conflict into a structural crisis that affected the foundations of the global trading system and supply chains. In doing so, the study achieves its third objective; “forced economic interdependence” compelled international powers to formulate a tactic, temporary de-escalation to protect capitalist interests and combat inflation, proving that the security of waterways has come to represent the material equivalent of non-conventional deterrent power.
- The findings indicated that the military confrontation led to a clear realignment of the international and regional balances of power, intersecting with the (IISS, 2026) report on the technological arms race. This study uniquely applies the Offensive-Defensive Balance theory to interpret the Russian-Chinese role. The analysis proved that the pragmatic Chinese stance aimed at protecting energy supplies, coupled the unilateral ability of the United States and Israel to re-engineer regional security. Thus, the study achieves its fourth objective by proving the de facto formation of a multipolar regional order, in which Washington's ability to shape unilateral security arrangements has declined.
- The study succeeded in bridging the research gap regarding the theoretical framing of the concept of “power liquidity” by structurally linking rapid technical shifts to the reformulation of the political doctrine of deterrence. While previous studies stopped at purely technical dimension, such as the study by (Bahgat, 2019), or general geopolitical monitoring, as seen in (Fayez, 2024), this study proved that the “power liquidity” arising from drone technology and hypersonic missiles has ended the era of “geographical immunity” for all conflict parties. It has transformed existential deterrence from an ideological choice into a technological necessity imposed by modern rules of engagement.

Conclusion

Following an in-depth analysis of the military clash between the US-Israeli alliance and Iran in 2026, the study concludes that the Middle East has indeed crossed the point of no return towards a new regional order. This order is not governed by unipolarity or unilateral hegemony but rather by equations of mutual deterrence and forced economic interdependence.

The course of the war has proven that the era of lightning wars has gone forever. While the alliance's “digital surgery operations” succeeded in striking, disabling. or disrupting military and sovereign facilities, they collided with geopolitical complexity and Iran's refusal to surrender-owing to its geographical nature. This turned oil into a deterrent weapon that imposed forced de-escalation after affecting the New York stock exchanges and Beijing factories alike.

Pakistani mediation succeeded as a vital channel guaranteeing strategic security in defusing tension and defining a formula for the rules of engagement to prevent being dragged into an all-out war.

Nevertheless, the temporary stability remains an unsettling balance threatened with collapse due to continuous violations and military operations by Israel on the Lebanese front.

Excluding Lebanon from the de-escalation arrangements represents the most critical security loophole. As Lebanon is part of the “Unity of Arenas” strategy, this exclusion makes escalation a spark that could return all parties to the square of direct confrontation with Iran. It turns the tacit truce and ceasefire agreement into a temporary cooling-off phase for the realignment of forces and the updating of their operational tactics.

Ultimately, the year 2026 ended the practical efficacy of the concept of unipolarity. It reinforced the regional and international shift towards multipolarity, which embodies a historical necessity for drafting a new regional security pact—a pact built not on good intentions, but rather on the equation of a mutual balance of terror and political realism, where all parties have realised that the cost of complete military decisiveness has become too exorbitant, far exceeding the global system’s capacity to endure.

Consequently, geography still rules technology and determines the ceilings of its effectiveness. No matter how precise military artificial intelligence becomes, the protection of national sovereignty and resistance against “digital surgery” doctrines remain structurally tied to natural geographical depth (such as mountainous fortifications) and to absolute digital independence, represented by possessing a closed national cyber infrastructure immune to external penetration.

Recommendations

1. The study recommends that developing and regional states immediately transition from the phase of mere technological consumption to the localisation of communication networks and the construction of independent national cyber infrastructures. The course of the 2026 conflict has proven that the doctrine of “digital surgery” and “electronic blackout” operations are capable of neutralising conventional military systems unless they are protected by sovereign networks and self-fortified electromagnetic fields.
2. It is crucial to reformulate the military doctrines of states facing a technological gap with major powers, shifting towards a model of decentralised operational defence and the geographical distribution of combat units. This is essential to ensure the sustained effectiveness of deterrence and the capacity to manage the theatre of operations, even in scenarios where communication with the central command is severed or subjected to strategic paralysis.
3. The study recommends that armament plans focus on localising hypersonic missile technology and fleets of kamikaze drones. These represent the material equivalent capable of inducing technological saturation within the advanced air defence systems of adversaries at the lowest economic cost.
4. Establishing collective regional security frameworks to protect waterways is imperative. The fact that global economic stability is tethered to the security of the Strait of Hormuz and Bab al-Mandab obliges littoral states to formulate flexible security understandings that transcend unilateral hegemony. This is vital to prevent localised disputes from mutating into transborder economic crises through which international insurance companies impose logistical paralysis on the movement of free trade.

Research Proposals

1. Conducting expansive, comparative studies on the tracking mechanisms of military artificial intelligence algorithms (Targeting AI) and the interception gaps within fifth-generation air defence systems: An Empirical Study on the Middle East Theatre of Operations 2025-2026.
2. Conducting prospective sociological and political research focusing on the repercussions of the new international polarisation, to demonstrate the implications of transferring field-tested Russian military technology on the Offensive-Defensive Balance dilemmas in the Arabian Gulf.
3. Preparing specialised legal and economic studies on Enforcement Volatility and international supply chains, to ascertain the legal boundaries at which maritime insurance companies refuse to cover shipping risks in vital straits during open warfare.

List of Sources and References

Arabic References

1. Kamel, Ahmed. (2025). In Preparation for War.. How Does Iran Develop Its Fighter Planes?, Al Jazeera. <https://www.aljazeera.net/politics/2025/5/6>
2. Dandan, Abdul Qader.(2014). "China's Energy Security Strategy and its Impact on Stability in its Regional Environment", Master's Thesis, Faculty of Law and Political Science. University of Batna. Algeria.
3. Swiss Info. (2022). Iran: Developed for the first time a hypersonic ballistic missile. Arab affairs in the Swiss press. <https://www.swissinfo.ch/ara>
4. Abdel Ghani, Reem Mohammed, Abdel Razek, Shahd Mustafa, Abdel Hamid, Fatima Khalaf, Al-Tohamy, Manar Khaled, and Ali, Menna Mahmoud. (2025, June 29). The Russian-Chinese Axis and the Transformation in the Structure of the International Format 1997-2025. (Supervised by Prof. Adel Antar), Faculty of Economic Studies and Political Science, Alexandria University, Egypt. Arab Democratic Center. <https://democraticac.de/?p=105307>
5. Abdel-Aty, Mohamed. (2026). The Strait of Hormuz and Bab al-Mandeb in the Equation of War and Global Energy Security. Al-Jazeera Center for Studies. <https://studies.aljazeera.net/ar/article/6450>
6. Fayez, Abdel Qader. (2024). The Confrontation Between Iran and Israel. From Shadow Battles to Open War: A Geopolitical Reading (Policy Papers). Institute for Palestine Studies. <https://www.palestine-studies.org/ar/node/1656532>
7. Middle East News. (2026). Raising the Cost of War A Pressure Strategy from Tehran to Push Washington to Back Down. <https://mdeast.news/ar>.
8. Arab Center for Research and Policy Studies. (2026). "Epic Fury": The Contradiction of Washington's Goals in the War of Aggression on Iran. Position Assessment, Political Studies Unit, Doha, Qatar.

9. European Centre for Counter-Terrorism and Intelligence Studies.(2026). The Contemporary Wars File and Their Impact on International and Regional Sea Passages. Studies and Reports Unit.

References

- Abrahams, L., & Williams, L. (2026, April 2). Iran Conflict Heightens Cyber Threats to U.S. Energy Infrastructure. Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS).
- Abdulameer, H. S. & Yassen, M. A. (2025). Multi-Agent Systems and Swarm Intelligence for Autonomous Drone Coordination. Scientific Research Journal of Engineering and Computer Sciences, 5(2), 1-7.
- Barksdale, N. (2026, March 6). What Led to the 1979 Iranian Revolution?. History.
- Bazoobandi, S. (2026). How Autonomous Weapon Systems Threaten International Humanitarian Law (GIGA Focus Global, No. 4). German Institute for Global and Area Studies (GIGA).
- Bahgat, G. (2019). Iran's Ballistic-Missile and Space Program: An Assessment. Middle East Policy, 26(1).
- Cordesman, A. H. (2019). The Iranian missile Challenge. Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS).
- Cohen, R. S. (2026, March 19). Iran's Escalation Strategy Won't Work. RAND Corporation. Originally published in Foreign Policy.
- Clark, B., Walton, T. A., Tourangeau, M., & Tourangeau, S. (2021, March 10). The invisible battlefield: A technology strategy for US electromagnetic spectrum superiority. Hudson Institute.
- Dagres, H., Ross, D., Stroul, D., & Satloff, R. (2026, March 2). The U.S. and Israel strike Iran (PolicyWatch 4174). The Washington Institute for Near East Policy.
- Eshel, A. (2026). Preserving Israel's military edge: Strategic steps for the Defense Ministry. Foundation for defense of democracies.
- Fussek, F. (2025, December 17). From digitalization to automation: 2026 will redefine maritime operations. The Maritime Executive.
- Feigenbaum, E. A. (2026, March 2). Beijing Doesn't Think Like Washington—and the Iran Conflict Shows Why. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (Emissary).
- Gaspar, J., & Raman, V. V. (2024, May 22). A people-first vision for the future of work in the age of AI. Brookings.
- Glaser, C. L., & Kaufmann, C. (1998). What is the offense-defense balance and how can we measure it?. International Security, 22(4), 44–82
- IEA (2026). Oil Market Report - March 2026, IEA, Paris
- International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS). (2026). Global defence spending. In The Military Balance 2026.
- Jones, S. G. (2024, January 10). Containing Tehran: Understanding Iran's power and exploiting its vulnerabilities. Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS).

- Kurlantzick, J., & Richter, A. (2026, March 26). The Iran war is reshaping Asia's energy security strategies. Council on Foreign Relations.
- Katman, F. (2021). The Islamic Republic of Iran's Cyber Security Strategy: Challenges in an era of cyber uncertainty. In *Routledge Companion to Global Cyber-Security Strategy* (1st ed.). Routledge (Taylor & Francis Group).
- Klawan, J.(2026). The 5 waterways that control global trade. *The Week*.
- ORCA Crew. (2026, March). Maritime Compliance in 2026: Managing Risk Across Jurisdictions. ORCA Crew Articles.
- Prakash, N. (2026, January 23). Iran's internet shutdown signals a new stage of digital isolation. Chatham House.
- Pinfold, R.(2026). Does Guaranteeing Israel's Qualitative Military Edge Still Serve U.S. Interests?. *War on the Rocks*.
- Popescu, N., & Riley, A. (2026, April 1). Fast energy: How Europe can power the AI revolution and stay competitive. European Council on Foreign Relations (ECFR)
- Raman, A. (2026). Iran's Anti-Access and Area Denial Strategy Is Cruder Than China's But Still Dangerous. *War on the Rocks*.
- Sand, E. (2026). Strategy in the New Missile Age. *Security Studies*, 1–38.
- Sarkin, J. J., & Sotoudehfar, S. (2024). Artificial intelligence and arms races in the Middle East: the evolution of technology and its implications for regional and international security. *Defense & Security Analysis*, 40(1), 97–119.
- Schanzer, J., Eshel, A., Hulata, E., & Montgomery, M. (2024, September 10). Strategic planning in chaos: The future of the U.S.-Israel security partnership [Transcript]. Foundation for Defense of Democracies.
- Smith, D. (2025). Introduction: International security, armaments and disarmament. In *SIPRI Yearbook 2025: Armaments, Disarmament and International Security* (pp. 1–24). Stockholm International Peace Research Institute; Oxford University Press.
- Sharma, Y.(2026). \$25bn or \$1 trillion: How much has Iran war really cost the US?. *Aljazeera*.
- The International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS). (2026). *The Military Balance 2026* (1st ed.). Routledge.
- Walker, I. (2026, January 29). What is the petrodollar and why is it under pressure? *Green Central Banking*.
- World Trade Organization. (2026). *Global Trade Outlook and Statistics: March 2026*. WTO Publications.
- Walsh School of Foreign Service. (2026). *The War Against Iran and Global Risks: "Tell Me How This Ends"*. Georgetown University.