Geopolitical Antecedents and Strategic Implications of the 2026 Iran–United States Military Confrontation: A Critical Assessment

B Srinivasan[@]

Abstract

The 2026 military confrontation between Iran and the United States represents one of the most consequential escalations in the history of post-1979 US–Iran relations. Although the confrontation emerged from decades of strategic rivalry, sanctions, nuclear disputes, proxy warfare, maritime competition, and regional alliance polarisation, its transformation into sustained direct warfare in 2026 reflected a breakdown of deterrence and diplomacy. This article critically examines the conflict's geopolitical antecedents and strategic implications, with particular attention to developments from Jan 2025 through Jul 2026 and to the Persian Gulf theatre. The primary objective is to identify the political, nuclear, military, and proxy-related drivers that transformed prolonged strategic competition into direct armed confrontation. It also evaluates the immediate military consequences and the wider effects on Middle Eastern security, international alliances, maritime commerce, nuclear non-proliferation, and global energy markets. The study adopts a qualitative analytical approach based on United Nations documents, International Atomic Energy Agency materials, strategic assessments, policy

[@]**B Srinivasan,** Assistant Professor and Head, Department of Defence and Strategic Studies, Dr MGR Educational Research Institute (Deemed to be University). Part-Time Research Scholar, PG & Research Department of Historical Studies, Pachaiyappas College, Chennai, Tamil Nadu.

Journal of the United Service Institution of India, Vol CLVI, No. 645, July-September 2026.

reports, and relevant scholarly literature. The analysis finds that the conflict cannot be attributed to a single triggering event. Rather, it resulted from the interaction of nuclear uncertainty, eroding diplomatic trust, US coercive pressure, Iranian deterrence strategies, Israeli security calculations, proxy conflict, maritime competition, and reciprocal perceptions of existential threat. The war subsequently transformed the Strait of Hormuz from a strategic chokepoint into a central theatre of military and economic contestation. The article argues that the conflict has weakened traditional deterrence assumptions, intensified regional polarisation, increased nuclear security risks, and exposed global energy systems' vulnerability to geopolitical disruption. It concludes that durable de-escalation requires a new regional security framework combining nuclear verification, maritime confidence-building, sanctions diplomacy, proxy de-escalation, and multilateral guarantees.

Introduction

The 2026 Iran–United States (US) military confrontation marks a major turning point in contemporary Middle Eastern geopolitics. Since the Iranian Revolution of 1979, relations between Tehran and Washington have been characterised by ideological antagonism, economic sanctions, diplomatic rupture, competing regional strategies, and periodic military crises. Yet for much of this period, both sides generally attempted to prevent their rivalry from developing into sustained direct interstate war. The 2026 confrontation represents a profound departure from that pattern.

The conflict must not be understood simply as an isolated military crisis beginning in Feb 2026. Its antecedents extend through the collapse of confidence surrounding the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), the US withdrawal from the agreement and subsequent ‘Maximum Pressure’ campaign, Iran's expansion of its nuclear capabilities, repeated attacks involving Iranian-aligned armed groups, Israeli-Iranian military exchanges, and the increasing strategic

importance of the Persian Gulf and Strait of Hormuz. The Jun 2025 attacks on Iranian nuclear facilities further weakened the distinction between nuclear diplomacy and military coercion. The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) reported that military attacks on Iranian nuclear facilities in Jun 2025 led to the suspension of verification activities and the withdrawal of inspectors for safety reasons.[1]

The temporal scope extends from Jan 2025 to Jul 2026, while the geographical emphasis is the Persian Gulf and its immediate strategic environment. The analysis therefore considers the wider Middle Eastern consequences only where they directly affect the US–Iran confrontation.

This article critically examines the geopolitical drivers and strategic consequences of the 2026 Iran–US military confrontation, exploring how prolonged deterrence gave way to direct conflict. It treats the confrontation as a multidimensional security crisis involving the US, Iran, Israel, Gulf states, Iranian-aligned groups, international shipping companies and external powers such as China and Russia. Using a qualitative approach informed by United Nations (UN) documents, IAEA reports, strategic assessments and contemporary reporting, it integrates nuclear strategy, proxy warfare, maritime competition, alliance politics and economic coercion. It assesses the conflict's military and geopolitical consequences, its implications for energy security and maritime commerce, and policy options for preventing renewed escalation, while considering competing interpretations of its origins and legality.

Historical and Geopolitical Antecedents

The Structural Legacy of US–Iran Rivalry

- The confrontation's foundations lie in the transformation of US–Iran relations after 1979. The Iranian Revolution fundamentally altered the regional balance of power by replacing the pro-Western monarchy with an Islamic Republic committed to political independence from US influence. The hostage crisis, subsequent sanctions, the Iran–Iraq War, and continuing ideological antagonism institutionalised mutual distrust.

- From Washington's perspective, Iran became a state challenging US interests and allied governments in the Middle East. From Tehran's perspective, US military deployments, sanctions, alliances with Israel and Gulf monarchies, and support for adversarial regional actors represented a continuing strategy of containment. This reciprocal threat perception became a self-reinforcing security dilemma.

- Realist international relations theory helps explain this process. When states cannot be certain of adversaries' intentions, they may interpret defensive measures as offensive preparations.[2] Iranian missile development, naval capabilities, regional partnerships, and nuclear infrastructure were therefore interpreted in Washington as components of a strategy for regional coercion. Conversely, Tehran interpreted US military deployments and sanctions as evidence that Washington sought regime change or strategic subordination.

The Nuclear Dispute and Collapse of Strategic Trust

- The nuclear issue became the most important institutional mechanism for managing the rivalry after the JCPOA was concluded in 2015. The agreement restricted Iran's nuclear activities in return for sanctions relief and international verification.[3] For several years, the agreement represented an example of how adversarial states could transform strategic mistrust into verifiable limitations.

- The US withdrawal from the JCPOA in 2018, however, fundamentally altered this framework. Washington reintroduced extensive sanctions, while Iran gradually reduced compliance with nuclear restrictions. The resulting cycle produced a strategic paradox: coercive pressure was meant to compel Iran to accept stricter limitations, but it also weakened incentives for Tehran to remain within the original nuclear framework.

- The central problem became one of credibility. Iran increasingly questioned whether agreements with Washington could survive political changes in the US, while the US

questioned whether Iranian nuclear commitments would remain verifiable over the long term.

- The Jun 2025 military attacks on Iranian nuclear facilities represented another critical rupture. The IAEA recorded attacks affecting several Iranian nuclear-related sites, including Natanz, Fordow, and other facilities, and stated that attacks against nuclear facilities have serious implications for nuclear safety, security, safeguards, and international peace.[4]

- The 2026 conflict consequently inherited a nuclear dispute in which diplomacy had already suffered substantial institutional damage.

The Nuclear Factor in the 2026 Confrontation

- Nuclear strategy was central to the escalation because Iran's nuclear programme became inseparable from broader questions of regime security.

- Iran has consistently maintained that its nuclear programme is intended for peaceful purposes, while the US, Israel, and several regional actors have expressed concern about Iran's capacity to rapidly develop a nuclear weapons capability. The problem is therefore not merely whether Iran possessed an operational nuclear weapon but whether it had developed a sufficiently advanced nuclear infrastructure to create a latent nuclear deterrent.

- This distinction is strategically important. A state does not necessarily require an assembled nuclear weapon to alter regional calculations. A large enrichment capability, advanced centrifuges, technical expertise, and reduced international monitoring may create what strategic analysts describe as nuclear latency.[5]

- The deterioration of IAEA access after the 2025 attacks further complicated verification. Once inspectors could no longer conduct normal verification activities, uncertainty increased. Uncertainty, in turn, encouraged worst-case assumptions.

- This generated a dangerous escalation cycle: Nuclear uncertainty → intelligence alarm → military pressure → Iranian dispersal and concealment incentives → reduced verification → greater uncertainty → further military pressure.
- This cycle is particularly dangerous because each actor can see its actions as defensive while interpreting the adversary's actions as preparation for aggression.
- The attacks on Iranian nuclear-related infrastructure in 2026 consequently had consequences beyond immediate physical damage. They potentially weakened the international non-proliferation regime by demonstrating that nuclear facilities can become direct targets during interstate confrontation.

Proxy Warfare and the Expansion of the Security Dilemma

A second major antecedent was the shift from US–Iran competition to a networked regional conflict.

Iran's relationships with Hezbollah, Iraqi armed groups, the Houthis, and other regional partners have historically provided Tehran with strategic depth. These relationships allow Iran to exert influence beyond its national territory while complicating adversaries' ability to retaliate directly against Iran.

The US, Israel, and Gulf states have consequently viewed Iran's regional network as a mechanism for projecting military power without conventional confrontation. Iran, however, has viewed many of these relationships as part of a broader deterrence strategy designed to prevent encirclement.

This creates what can be described as distributed deterrence. Instead of relying exclusively on Iranian national military forces, Tehran can impose costs across multiple geographical theatres.

The weakness of distributed deterrence is that it creates escalation ambiguity. When an armed group attacks US personnel or shipping, Washington must determine whether the group acted independently, with Iranian assistance, or under direct Iranian instruction. Tehran, meanwhile, may deny direct responsibility while benefiting strategically from the attack.

The US's Mar 2026 communication to the UN Security Council explicitly linked its military operations to attacks and threats from Iran and Iranian proxies and argued that US actions were intended to protect American personnel, regional allies, and maritime commerce.[6]

Thus, proxy warfare became a principal mechanism through which regional competition crossed the threshold into interstate confrontation.

The Immediate Escalation into Direct War

The decisive transformation occurred in Feb 2026, when the US and Israel initiated major attacks against Iran. The conflict subsequently developed into sustained exchanges of missiles, drones, air strikes, and attacks against military and strategic infrastructure.

The US presented its military campaign primarily through the language of self-defence, protection of American forces and allies, and preservation of freedom of navigation. Iran characterised the attacks as aggression against its sovereignty and asserted its right to self-defence under Article 51 of the UN Charter.[7]

These competing legal narratives demonstrate a broader problem in international security: once military action begins, each side tends to construct a retrospective justification based upon its own interpretation of preceding threats.

The conflict therefore cannot be reduced analytically to which individual attack constituted the first act of aggression. Its deeper significance lies in the cumulative erosion of barriers against direct military action.

The critical strategic failure was deterrence without effective communication. Deterrence requires an adversary to understand both one's capabilities and one's red lines. In the US–Iran relationship, however, red lines increasingly became ambiguous.

Iran sought to demonstrate that attacks against it would generate regional costs. Washington sought to demonstrate that Iranian attacks or nuclear advances would trigger increasingly severe military responses. Each side consequently attempted to restore

deterrence by increasing pressure. Instead, the accumulation of pressure contributed to war.

The Strait of Hormuz as the Central Strategic Theatre

The Strait of Hormuz became the most consequential geographical dimension of the conflict.

Approximately one-fifth of global petroleum liquids consumption has historically moved through the Strait, making it one of the world's most important energy chokepoints.[8] The waterway is therefore not simply a regional maritime route; disruption can affect inflation, transportation costs, industrial production, food prices, and economic stability worldwide.

The conflict transformed Hormuz from a strategic vulnerability into an active military bargaining instrument. Iran's geographical position gives it considerable capacity to threaten shipping through mines, missiles, drones, small boats, and other asymmetric means. By contrast, the US has superior naval capabilities and seeks to preserve freedom of navigation.

The US–Iran memorandum of understanding of 17 Jun 2026 temporarily reduced military operations and included arrangements intended to facilitate commercial passage through the Strait.[9] Yet the arrangement proved fragile.

By Jul, fighting had resumed, and the Strait again became a principal theatre of confrontation. Reports indicated attacks on commercial vessels and renewed US military operations.[10]

Hormuz's strategic importance lies in the asymmetry between the actors. The US can dominate conventional maritime operations, but Iran does not need to permanently close the Strait to impose enormous costs. Even uncertainty about safe passage can increase insurance premiums, discourage shipping, reduce traffic, and produce speculative price increases.

Thus, perceived risk can be almost as economically significant as actual physical closure.

Military Consequences

The immediate military consequences of the confrontation were extensive.

- First, the war demonstrated the vulnerability of fixed military infrastructure in the Gulf. US bases in regional partner states became potential targets, thereby forcing Gulf governments to reconsider the security costs of hosting American forces.

- Second, Iran demonstrated the strategic utility of ballistic missiles, drones, maritime attacks, and asymmetric operations. Although the US retained overwhelming conventional superiority, Iran's ability to impose costs across multiple theatres complicated Washington's military calculations.

- Third, the conflict accelerated the militarisation of the Persian Gulf. Naval forces, air-defence systems, missile-defence platforms, surveillance assets, and unmanned systems became increasingly important.

- Fourth, the war exposed the limits of technological superiority. Precision strike and missile defence can reduce damage but cannot eliminate strategic uncertainty. A technologically superior power may still face substantial economic and political costs from relatively inexpensive asymmetric attacks.

The conflict therefore reinforces an important principle of contemporary warfare: strategic effectiveness is not identical to battlefield superiority.

A weaker state can remain strategically consequential if it possesses geographical advantages, asymmetric capabilities, political resilience, and the ability to impose costs on economically sensitive infrastructure.

Humanitarian and Civilian Consequences

Military confrontation also generated significant humanitarian consequences. Air strikes, missile attacks, infrastructure destruction, displacement, disruptions to electricity and fuel supplies, and damage to civilian facilities intensified pressure on Iranian society and populations elsewhere in the region.

The protection of nuclear installations represented a particularly serious humanitarian issue. The IAEA documented incidents involving Iranian nuclear facilities during the fighting and repeatedly emphasised the need to protect nuclear installations from military action. In Mar 2026, projectiles struck the Bushehr Nuclear Power Plant, although the IAEA reported no damage to the facility, no injuries, and no radiological release.[11]

The possibility of radiological contamination adds a unique dimension to warfare around nuclear facilities. Even without a release, attacks can spark panic, disrupt monitoring systems, and complicate emergency preparedness.

The humanitarian dimension therefore cannot be treated as secondary to military strategy. Civilian vulnerability can drive political instability, refugee movements, economic disruption, and international diplomatic pressure.

Energy Security and Global Economic Consequences

The war's most immediate global economic consequence was the disruption of energy markets.

The global petroleum market is highly interconnected. Even countries that do not import oil directly from the Persian Gulf can experience price increases because crude oil is traded internationally. As Brookings has noted, the US itself remains exposed to global oil-price shocks despite being a major oil producer because petroleum is a globally traded commodity.[12]

The conflict consequently produced three interconnected effects:

- **Supply Disruption**. Reduced Gulf exports directly constrained available petroleum.
- **Risk Premium**. The possibility of further disruption increased market prices even when physical shortages were limited.
- **Macroeconomic Transmission**. Higher energy prices increased transportation and production costs, contributing to inflation.

The Jul 2026 situation showed the global economy's strategic vulnerability to maritime disruption. Analysts reported that Gulf oil flows remained significantly below pre-war levels and warned that continued disruption would place additional pressure on oil, refined products, and LNG markets.[13]

The implications extend beyond oil. Gulf disruption affects LNG shipping, petrochemicals, maritime insurance, global freight costs, and industrial supply chains.

The war therefore illustrates that energy security is not merely a question of resource availability. It is also a question of **transport security**.

Transformation of Middle Eastern Alliances

The confrontation also altered regional alliance structures.

For decades, many Gulf States relied heavily upon the US for external security while simultaneously attempting to maintain working relationships with Iran. The 2026 war challenged this balancing strategy.

Hosting US military facilities could increase the risk of Iranian retaliation. Yet distancing themselves from Washington could weaken their deterrence against other regional threats.

This dilemma is particularly significant for Bahrain, Qatar, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates. Their strategic challenge is no longer simply choosing between the US and Iran. Instead, they must develop mechanisms that allow security

cooperation with Washington without automatically becoming participants in US–Iran escalation.

The war therefore strengthened the logic of strategic hedging among regional powers.

At the same time, the conflict increased opportunities for China and Russia to expand diplomatic influence. Neither power can easily replace the US as the principal regional military actor, but both can benefit from the perception that US-led security arrangements cannot guarantee stability.

China's dependence on Gulf energy supplies gives Beijing strong incentives to promote diplomatic de-escalation. Russia, meanwhile, can benefit geopolitically from increased pressure on Western economies and from the diversion of US strategic attention toward the Middle East.

Consequences for International Order

The conflict has wider implications for the international order.

- First, it demonstrates the weakening ability of international institutions to prevent interstate escalation when major powers disagree over the interpretation of international law.
- Second, it challenges the credibility of nuclear non-proliferation mechanisms. If nuclear facilities become targets during military conflict, states may conclude that nuclear ambiguity or even nuclear deterrence is necessary for survival.
- Third, it raises difficult questions concerning the law of self-defence, proportionality, necessity, maritime blockades, and attacks against infrastructure.

The US’s official justification emphasised self-defence and protection of maritime commerce, whereas Iran's official communications characterised the initial attacks as aggression and invoked Article 51 of the UN Charter.[14]

The significance of these competing interpretations extends beyond Iran. Other states may use the precedent to justify preventive military action against perceived nuclear or missile threats.

The long-term consequence could therefore be a more permissive international environment for military strikes against strategic infrastructure.

Strategic Miscalculation as a Central Cause

The most persuasive explanation of the conflict is not that either side deliberately sought an unlimited war from the beginning. Rather, the conflict can be understood as the product of strategic miscalculation.

Washington may have calculated that overwhelming military pressure would compel Tehran to make rapid concessions. Tehran may have calculated that asymmetric retaliation would raise the costs of US intervention without provoking an unlimited response. Israel may have calculated that degrading Iranian military and nuclear capabilities would improve long-term security. Each calculation contained a rational element. The problem was that these calculations interacted.

Military pressure increased Iranian incentives to retaliate. Iranian retaliation strengthened the US case for further military action. Israeli involvement intensified Iranian perceptions of encirclement. Attacks on shipping expanded the conflict into the global economy. Economic pressure increased Iran's domestic vulnerability while also reducing Tehran's willingness to concede under coercion.

This is a classic security dilemma in which measures intended to increase security collectively produce greater insecurity.

The Failure of Nuclear Diplomacy

The breakdown of nuclear diplomacy was perhaps the most important structural cause.

Diplomacy requires three forms of confidence:

- Confidence that agreements will be honoured;

- Confidence that verification mechanisms will function; and
- Confidence that concessions will not be exploited by the opposing side.

By 2026, all three had deteriorated.

Iran questioned the durability of American commitments. The US questioned the reliability of Iranian nuclear restrictions. The IAEA faced severe constraints on verification following military attacks and changes in Iranian cooperation.

The result was an environment in which intelligence uncertainty replaced verified knowledge.

This is strategically dangerous because military decision-makers tend to plan against worst-case scenarios. Once verification declines, worst-case planning becomes easier to justify politically.

Consequently, the nuclear issue became a catalyst rather than merely a subject of negotiation.

The Conflict as a Crisis of Deterrence

The 2026 confrontation also challenges conventional understandings of deterrence.

Traditional deterrence assumes that rational actors will avoid actions that could produce unacceptable costs. However, deterrence becomes unstable when actors disagree about what constitutes an unacceptable cost.

For Iran, national sovereignty and regime survival may justify significant economic and military sacrifices. For the US, unrestricted nuclear proliferation and threats to maritime commerce may be considered unacceptable. For Israel, the possibility of an Iranian nuclear capability may be interpreted as an existential threat.

These different definitions of unacceptable risk make mutual deterrence extremely difficult.

The central lesson is that deterrence without credible diplomatic off-ramps can become escalation management rather than conflict prevention.

Strategic Implications for India and the Global South

Although the conflict is geographically concentrated in West Asia, its consequences matter especially for India and other energy-importing developing countries.

India has extensive economic and strategic interests in the Gulf. Many Indian citizens work in Gulf States, and India's energy security depends substantially on stable maritime supply routes. Disruption in the Strait of Hormuz therefore directly affects India's import costs, inflation, shipping insurance, and diaspora security.

The conflict also reinforces India's longstanding preference for strategic autonomy and diversified energy partnerships.

For developing countries, the confrontation demonstrates how geopolitical instability can rapidly become a development crisis. Higher oil prices can increase fiscal pressure, inflation, transport costs, and current-account deficits.

The Global South therefore has a strong interest in strengthening international mechanisms for maritime security, energy diversification, and diplomatic conflict prevention.

Policy Implications and Pathways to De-escalation

The first policy requirement is to restore nuclear verification. The IAEA must regain sufficient access to Iranian nuclear facilities to establish reliable information concerning nuclear materials and activities.

Second, the US and Iran require a durable diplomatic channel insulated from immediate military crises. Secret backchannels may help initiate negotiations, but a sustainable settlement requires institutionalised communication.

Third, States concerned with security in the Strait of Hormuz should establish maritime confidence-building measures. These could include advance-notification mechanisms, incident-at-sea

protocols, emergency communication channels, and mutually accepted rules for commercial shipping.

Fourth, regional states should establish a Gulf security dialogue involving Iran, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Iraq, Oman, Qatar, Kuwait, Bahrain, and external stakeholders. The objective should not initially be to create a comprehensive security organisation but to gradually develop crisis-management mechanisms.

Fifth, any settlement should include proxy de-escalation. A bilateral US–Iran agreement that ignores attacks by allied and partner armed groups would remain vulnerable.

Sixth, sanctions diplomacy should replace an exclusively coercive approach. Sanctions relief can be linked to measurable nuclear verification and regional security commitments.

Finally, nuclear facilities must be treated as protected infrastructure. The risks associated with attacks near operating reactors and nuclear material make the targeting of nuclear facilities particularly dangerous.

Conclusion

The 2026 Iran–US military confrontation cannot be adequately explained by a single event, leader, policy decision, or military operation. It was the cumulative product of decades of geopolitical rivalry, institutionalised mistrust, nuclear uncertainty, proxy warfare, economic coercion, regional alliance polarisation, and competing concepts of deterrence.

The period from Jan 2025 to Jul 2026 demonstrates how rapidly these accumulated pressures can interact. The 2025 attacks on Iranian nuclear infrastructure weakened the already fragile architecture of nuclear verification. The subsequent deterioration of trust contributed to a strategic environment in which military solutions became increasingly attractive. The Feb 2026 escalation transformed indirect confrontation into direct war. The conflict subsequently expanded into the maritime and economic domains, particularly through the struggle over the Strait of Hormuz.

The most important strategic consequence is therefore not simply the destruction of military infrastructure. It is the transformation of the regional security architecture.

The Gulf states now face heightened uncertainty concerning the reliability and costs of external security guarantees. Iran has demonstrated that asymmetric capabilities can generate consequences far beyond the battlefield. The US has demonstrated overwhelming conventional superiority but also encountered the limitations of military coercion against a geographically resilient adversary. Israel's security strategy has become even more intertwined with broader US–Iran competition. Meanwhile, China and Russia have acquired greater opportunities to challenge Western influence diplomatically.

The conflict has also exposed the fragility of global energy security. The Strait of Hormuz remains a powerful reminder that a geographically narrow waterway can affect global inflation, trade, and strategic stability. Reports during Jul 2026 showed that the confrontation continued to disrupt shipping and energy flows, while the temporary Jun arrangement failed to establish a durable settlement.[15]

Ultimately, the central lesson of the 2026 confrontation is that military superiority cannot substitute for a sustainable regional security order. A durable settlement requires simultaneous progress on the nuclear question, maritime security, sanctions, proxy warfare, and regional confidence-building.

The challenge is therefore not merely to negotiate another ceasefire. It is to create a political and institutional framework in which Iran, the US, Israel, and the Gulf states possess credible alternatives to escalation. Without such a framework, the strategic conditions that produced the 2026 confrontation will remain intact, making another crisis—and potentially another war—highly probable.

Endnotes

1 International Atomic Energy Agency, *Verification and Monitoring in the Islamic Republic of Iran in Light of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2231 (2015)*, GOV/2025/50 (Sep 2025), 3–4, accessed 18 Mar 2026, https://www.iaea.org/sites/default/files/documents/gov2025-50.pdf.

2 Robert Jervis, “Cooperation under the Security Dilemma”, *World Politics* 30, no. 2 (Jan 1978): 167–214, accessed 18 Mar 2026, https://doi.org/10.2307/2009958

3 Trita Parsi, *Losing an Enemy: Obama, Iran, and the Triumph of Diplomacy* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2017).

4 International Atomic Energy Agency, *Verification and Monitoring in the Islamic Republic of Iran in Light of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2231 (2015)*, GOV/2025/50 (03 Sep 2025), accessed 18 Mar 2026, https://www.iaea.org/sites/default/files/documents/gov2025-50.pdf

5 Nuclear Threat Initiative, “Iran”, nuclear overview, accessed 04 Oct 2026, accessed 18 Mar 2026, https://www.nti.org/countries/iran/

6 United Nations Security Council, *Letter Dated 10 Mar 2026 from the Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations Addressed to the President of the Security Council*, S/2026/161 (11 Mar 2026), accessed 18 Mar 2026, https://docs.un.org/en/S/2026/161

7 United Nations Security Council, *Letter Dated 28 Feb 2026 from the Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the United Nations Addressed to the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council*, S/2026/106 (02 Mar 2026), https://docs.un.org/en/S/2026/106; accessed 19 Mar 2026, United Nations Security Council, *Letter Dated 10 Mar 2026 from the Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations Addressed to the President of the Security Council*, S/2026/161 (11 Mar 2026), accessed 19 Mar 2026, https://docs.un.org/en/S/2026/161

8 Congressional Research Service, *The Strait of Hormuz: Security Developments and Impacts on Oil, Gas, and Other Commodities*, R45281 (07 Aug 2026), accessed 19 Mar 2026, https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/R45281

9 Ibid.

10 Jana Choukeir et al., “US and Iran Target Infrastructure as Strait Shipping Comes under Further Attack”, *Reuters,* 17 Jul, 2026*,* accessed 19 Mar 2026,*https://www.reuters.com/world/middle-east/iran-launches-fresh-attacks-after-sixth-day-us-strikes-2026-07-17/*

11 *International Atomic Energy Agency,* "A Projectile Struck the Premises of the Bushehr Nuclear Power Plant", 17 Mar 2026*,* accessed 19 Mar 2026, https://www-news.iaea.org/ErfView.aspx?mId=e7543f73-ef49-47d9-9e27-71b0048e0cca

12 Samantha Gross and Ryan Beane, "From Chokepoint to Crisis: The Strait of Hormuz and Global Oil Markets", Brookings Institution, 08 Jun 2026, accessed 19 Mar 2026, https://www.brookings.edu/articles/from-chokepoint-to-crisis-the-strait-of-hormuz-and-global-oil-markets/

13 Eamonn Brennan, "Energy Markets Face Coming Stress If No New US-Iran Deal Reached: Analysts", S&P Global Energy, 16 Jul 2026, accessed 20 Mar 2026, https://www.spglobal.com/energy/en/news-research/latest-news/crude-oil/071626-energy-markets-face-coming-stress-if-no-new-us-iran-deal-reached-analysts

14 United Nations Security Council, S/2026/106 (02 Mar 2026), accessed 20 Mar 2026, https://docs.un.org/en/S/2026/106; S/2026/161 (11 Mar 2026), https://docs.un.org/en/S/2026/161

15 Raad Alkadiri et al., "What a Fragile U.S.-Iran Ceasefire Means for Energy and Beyond", Center for Strategic and International Studies, 01 Jul 2026, accessed 20 Mar 2026, https://www.csis.org/analysis/what-fragile-us-iran-ceasefire-means-energy-and-beyond; Eamonn Brennan, "Energy Markets Face Coming Stress If No New US-Iran Deal Reached: Analysts", S&P Global Energy, 16 Jul 2026, accessed 20 Mar 2026, https://www.spglobal.com/energy/en/news-research/latest-news/crude-oil/071626-energy-markets-face-coming-stress-if-no-new-us-iran-deal-reached-analysts