



Insights & Analysis

By Dr. Mohammed Ihsan
Senior Research Fellow at Yale University,
Former Minister for Human Rights,
Secretary-General of the Afro-Asian
Peoples' Solidarity Organization

Why Iran and Turkey Never Go to War: The Middle East's Most Enduring Strategic Equilibrium

In a region where alliances shift rapidly, proxy wars are commonplace, and military confrontations frequently redefine political realities, one relationship stands out for its remarkable stability. Iran and Turkey have spent decades competing across nearly every major geopolitical arena, yet they have consistently avoided direct military conflict. This restraint is not the product of friendship, [...]

In a region where alliances shift rapidly, proxy wars are commonplace, and military confrontations frequently redefine political realities, one relationship stands out for its remarkable stability. Iran and Turkey have spent decades competing across nearly every major geopolitical arena, yet they have consistently avoided direct military conflict. This restraint is not the product of friendship, ideological convergence, or diplomatic trust. Rather, it reflects one of the Middle East's most durable strategic equilibria, where both states recognize that competition serves their interests, while war would threaten the very foundations of their regional influence.

Many observers explain the absence of conflict through military deterrence or economic ties alone. While both factors matter, they fail to capture the deeper strategic logic that has shaped Iranian and Turkish behavior for generations. The relationship is best understood as a carefully managed rivalry in which both powers seek to expand influence without crossing the threshold into direct confrontation. Their competition is intense, but it is deliberately calibrated.

At the heart of this equilibrium lies a balance of power that neither side believes it can decisively overturn. Iran has invested heavily in asymmetric capabilities, including ballistic missiles, proxy networks, cyber operations, and unconventional warfare. These tools are designed not necessarily to win conventional wars but to raise the costs of any confrontation beyond an acceptable level. Turkey, meanwhile, possesses one of the region's most technologically advanced militaries, supported by modern air power, sophisticated drone systems, a large conventional force, and the strategic advantages that accompany its NATO membership. Each country possesses strengths that directly offset the other's advantages, making military victory uncertain and potentially catastrophic.

This mutual deterrence produces an important strategic reality. Neither Tehran nor Ankara believes that a direct war would leave it stronger than before. Even a limited conflict could evolve into a prolonged confrontation that drains military resources, weakens domestic economies, and creates opportunities for external powers to exploit the instability. The possibility of victory is outweighed by the certainty of significant losses.

Geography reinforces this strategic calculation. The mountainous frontier separating Iran and Turkey has historically acted as one of the most effective natural defensive barriers

in Eurasia. Large scale offensives across this terrain would require enormous logistical resources while exposing attacking forces to severe operational challenges. Modern military technology has transformed warfare in many respects, but geography continues to impose limits that cannot easily be overcome. The border is difficult to penetrate, difficult to supply, and even more difficult to hold. Geography therefore functions not merely as a physical obstacle but as a strategic deterrent in its own right.

History adds another layer of stability that is often overlooked. Unlike many contemporary rivalries in the Middle East, the territorial dispute between Iran and Turkey was effectively settled centuries ago. The frontier established after the Ottoman Safavid conflicts became one of the region's most enduring international borders. While both states have challenged each other's influence beyond their frontiers, neither has seriously questioned the legitimacy of the border itself. This historical settlement removed one of the principal causes of interstate war. Their rivalry shifted from competing over territory to competing over influence.

This distinction is critical because influence can be negotiated, shared, or contested indirectly. Territory generally cannot.

As a result, Iran and Turkey have become masters of indirect competition. Syria provides perhaps the clearest example. Tehran and Ankara have supported opposing factions, pursued conflicting political objectives, and frequently criticized one another's regional policies. Yet both governments have repeatedly demonstrated a willingness to negotiate when escalation threatened broader regional stability. Similar patterns have emerged in Iraq, the South Caucasus, and even Central Asia. Instead of confronting each other directly, they compete through diplomacy, intelligence operations, local partners, economic investments, and political leverage. Proxy competition has become a substitute for interstate war.

Economic considerations further strengthen this restraint. Despite sanctions, diplomatic disagreements, and regional crises, trade between Iran and Turkey has remained strategically valuable for both countries. Energy exports, cross border commerce, transportation corridors, and financial exchanges create mutual interests that neither government wishes to destroy. Turkey has repeatedly served as an important commercial outlet for Iran during periods of international isolation, while Iran continues to provide valuable energy resources for the Turkish economy. War would immediately disrupt these relationships, producing economic costs that neither leadership is prepared to absorb.

The broader international environment also discourages military confrontation. Turkey's membership in NATO does not automatically guarantee alliance intervention under every conceivable circumstance, but it fundamentally changes Iran's strategic calculations.

Any attack on Turkey would introduce uncertainty regarding the involvement of Western military powers, dramatically increasing the risks facing Tehran. Iranian policymakers have consistently demonstrated a preference for avoiding confrontations that could unite multiple adversaries against them. Strategic ambiguity alone serves as a powerful deterrent.

Perhaps the most underestimated factor, however, is that both governments ultimately share the same overriding priority: regime survival. Despite their ideological differences, neither leadership views the other as an existential threat requiring military elimination. Iran's leadership seeks to preserve its revolutionary state while expanding regional influence. Turkey pursues strategic autonomy, regional leadership, and economic connectivity across multiple regions. These ambitions frequently collide, but they do not require the destruction of the opposing state. Their objectives are competitive rather than existential.

This explains why crises between Tehran and Ankara rarely follow the escalation patterns seen elsewhere in the region. Political tensions rise, proxy competition intensifies, diplomatic rhetoric becomes increasingly hostile, and then both sides gradually return to negotiation. Neither government mistakes rivalry for a justification for total war.

The deeper lesson is that Iran and Turkey have quietly constructed an unwritten strategic bargain. They accept that they will compete across the Middle East, challenge each other's influence, and support opposing regional actors. Yet they also recognize that preserving the overall balance is ultimately more valuable than attempting to overturn it through force. This understanding has survived revolutions, coups, regional wars, shifting alliances, and dramatic changes in the international system.

In a Middle East often characterized by instability, the Iran Turkey relationship represents something remarkably uncommon: a rivalry governed by strategic restraint rather than emotional escalation. Their competition is real, persistent, and at times intense, but it remains bounded by a shared recognition that direct war would weaken both powers while strengthening everyone else. That, more than diplomacy or goodwill, explains why one of the region's oldest rivalries has also become one of its most stable.

Thank you

