Survival Is Not Victory: How Iran Is Trying to Outlast a Militarily Superior Coalition

By
Mohamed ELDoh

Published: November 3, 2026

The renewed early September exchange of attacks between Iran and the US, including US strikes on three Iranian tankers after missiles targeted American warships, has not changed the conflict's underlying equation. The US and Israel have inflicted extensive damage on Iran's leadership, air defenses, naval forces, and military infrastructure. Yet Tehran has prevented those operational successes from yielding a stable political settlement. Its regime remains intact, its coercive capabilities have not been eliminated, and the Strait of Hormuz remains severely disrupted.

Tehran has adopted a strategy designed to avoid a fast and decisive defeat. Iran's principal objective is no longer to restore a favorable conventional balance. It is to survive, extend the conflict, and increase its opponents' economic and political costs until Washington accepts a negotiated outcome less ambitious than the one military force was intended to initially deliver.

A Strategy of Political Denial

Iran's approach rests on a distinction between battlefield performance and political effect. The US and Israel can destroy missile batteries, strike naval facilities, and decapitate command structures. But unless those actions compel Tehran to accept their terms, military success remains politically incomplete.

Iran has therefore treated time as a strategic resource. Every month that the regime survives allows it to argue that the campaign failed to force capitulation. Prolongation allows Tehran to expose differences among the US, Israel, European governments, and the Gulf states. At the same time, Gulf states also have powerful reasons to prevent their territories and infrastructure from becoming permanent fronts in a US-Iran conflict.

Hormuz as Coercive Leverage

The Strait of Hormuz is the central instrument of this strategy. Before the conflict, approximately twenty million barrels of oil and petroleum products crossed the Strait each day. The International Energy Agency estimates that available bypass capacity amounts to only 3.5–5.5 million barrels per day. Iran therefore does not need to close Hormuz completely to influence international decision-making. It is necessary to maintain sufficient risk to deter shipowners, crews, and insurers. Iran does not possess uncontested control of the Strait. American forces have cleared mines, attacked coastal launch systems, and facilitated some commercial transits. Recent traffic illustrates the effect. For one late August week, only twenty-four vessels reportedly passed through Hormuz, compared with roughly 130 per day before the war. Tehran nevertheless retains a potent, still-relevant sea-denial capability through missiles, drones, mines, and the threat of unpredictable attacks.

This leverage, however, is self-eroding. Prolonged disruption damages Iran's own exports, antagonizes Gulf neighbors and imposes costs on China and other Asian customers whose

diplomatic neutrality Tehran crucially needs. It also encourages investment in bypass routes, greater international naval coordination, and more aggressive action against Iranian coastal capabilities.

Iran's Supporting Pillars Are Weakening

Iran's remaining missiles, drones, and mines still impose operational costs, but stockpile levels and replacement rates will become increasingly important. The question is whether it can sustain enough regime survivability while its economy, oil exports, production sites (including drones and missiles production), and distribution networks (including regional proxies) remain under pressure.

The regional proxy network has also performed below Tehran's original expectations. Hezbollah in Lebanon has suffered extensive attrition and lost much of its former strategic depth in Syria. Iraqi militias remain divided by local political calculations. The Houthis continue to threaten Red Sea shipping and Saudi-linked interests, but their autonomy means activity in Yemen cannot automatically be converted into coordinated Iranian escalation. The "axis of resistance" remains dangerous but degraded. It no longer functions as a reliable unified deterrent system unless the Houthis manage to disrupt Bab El Mandeb.

Economic endurance presents a deeper problem. Iran also retains experience in sanctions evasion, informal financial channels, and covert trade. China provides an important commercial and technological lifeline, while Russia and China offer varying degrees of diplomatic protection. Yet these relationships are designed to prevent Iran's total isolation, not to assume the costs of rebuilding its military or rescuing its economy. Sanctions evasion can postpone financial suffocation; it cannot reverse cumulative wartime destruction, lost exports, and declining currency confidence.

Three Paths Over the Next Three to Six Months

The first option is a managed but deteriorating stalemate. Iran will preserve enough missile and maritime capacity to keep Hormuz contested, while the US alternates between limited strikes, mine-clearing, sanctions, and enforcement of its blockade. Negotiations will periodically resume without resolving the nuclear issue, maritime access, and sanctions relief. Iran will remain capable of resistance but progressively less capable of setting the terms of the conflict.

A second, plausible option is a coerced interim bargain. Mounting economic damage, Gulf pressure and concerns about military readiness could lead Washington to accept a phased arrangement involving verified commercial passage through Hormuz, limits on Iranian maritime activity and partial sanctions relief. It would be an armistice managing the confrontation rather than resolving it.

Lastly, is an accelerated Iranian breakdown accompanied by wider escalation. Serious fractures within the security elite, an inability to finance the coercive apparatus or a rapid decline in missile-launch capacity could convince Tehran that time is no longer on its side. Rather than surrender, the regime might expand attacks against neighboring states, undersea cables, shipping, or American regional facilities to force immediate intervention by outside

powers. Iranian weakness could therefore make the conflict more dangerous before it makes Iran more conciliatory.

The indicators to watch are commercial traffic and insurance premiums in Hormuz, Iran's missile and drone launch rate, evidence of renewed minelaying, Chinese purchases and technological transfers, cohesion within the Revolutionary Guard, and whether Gulf governments move from advocating restraint to supporting sustained maritime enforcement.

Iran has demonstrated that a regional actor can temporarily deny a superpower an inexpensive political victory. But denial is not victory, and endurance is not recovery. Unless Tehran converts disruption into a negotiated settlement, the same strategy that preserved the regime during the conflict's first six months will surely consume the economic, diplomatic, and military foundations required to survive the next phase.

Dr. Mohamed ELDoh is a business development and consulting professional in the defence and security sector. Mohamed holds a Doctorate from Grenoble École de Management, France, an MBA from the EU Business School, Spain, and an Advanced Certificate in Counterterrorism Studies from the University of St Andrews, UK. He regularly authors articles addressing defence cooperation, counterterrorism, geopolitics, and emerging security threats in the Middle East and Africa. The views of the author are his own.