



CENTER OF
ANALYSIS OF
INTERNATIONAL
RELATIONS

ANALYSIS

Ideological Self-Confinement and the Politicization of Predictions on Iran

Farid Shafiyev

📍 Mirza İbrahimov 8, Baku, AZ1005, Azerbaijan

📞 (+994 12) 596-82-39, (+994 12) 596-82-41

🌐 E-mail: www.aircenter.az, info@aircenter.az

MARCH 2026

Ideological Self-Confinement and the Politicization of Predictions on Iran

In recent years, predictions about a potential conflict involving the United States, Israel, and Iran have proliferated across major newspapers, think tanks, and independent commentary platforms. Despite the abundance of analysis, much of this predictive discourse lacks balance, nuance, and empirical grounding. Instead, it is deeply shaped by ideological bias and political polarization. I argue that contemporary forecasts about Iran are highly politicized and polarized due to what can be termed [*ideological self-confinement*](#) - a condition in which analysts interpret geopolitical developments through rigid ideological frameworks rather than objective evidence. As a result, predictions tend to fall into extreme and contradictory narratives, undermining the credibility of expertise and limiting the possibility of scientifically grounded analysis.

At the core of this issue lies the pervasive influence of bias. Analysts, journalists, and policymakers do not operate in a vacuum; their interpretations are shaped by personal background, media consumption, institutional affiliations, and political interests. These factors influence not only how information is interpreted but also which information is selected and emphasized. In the context of Iran, this has led to sharply divergent predictions. On one side, some commentators assert that [*Iran is on the brink of collapse*](#), suggesting that military confrontation would quickly lead to regime failure. On the other side, equally [*confident voices*](#) warn that any such conflict would result in [*catastrophic consequences*](#) for the United States and its allies. The coexistence of such contradictory certainties indicates not analytical rigor, but rather the dominance of preconceived ideological positions.

Historical precedents further illustrate how political alignment shapes the reception of military interventions. Western media responses to past conflicts have varied significantly depending on the political leadership behind them. For instance, military actions undertaken during the Clinton administration, such as interventions in [*Bosnia*](#) and [*Kosovo*](#), were broadly supported by liberal media outlets. Similarly, the early stages of the war in Afghanistan under President George W. Bush received widespread approval, particularly in the aftermath of the September 11 attacks. In contrast, [*the Iraq War*](#), also initiated by the Bush administration, faced substantial criticism and public opposition. Later, President Obama's [*involvement in Libya*](#) was met with comparatively less resistance from liberal commentators. These shifting responses suggest that evaluations of military action are often contingent upon partisan alignment rather than consistent principles.

This pattern continues in contemporary discourse surrounding Iran. [Political polarization](#) in the United States has intensified to the point where foreign policy decisions are frequently evaluated through partisan lenses. The presidency of Donald Trump exemplifies this dynamic. His initial rhetoric advocating American [isolationism](#) was criticized across the political spectrum, while his subsequent [interventionist tendencies](#) have also been met with skepticism. Notably, liberal media outlets have often opposed Trump's policies regardless of their specific content, while conservative commentators have tended to defend them. In this polarized environment, discussions of Iran are rarely detached from broader domestic political conflicts. Even issues such as human rights - ostensibly universal concerns - are selectively emphasized or ignored depending on their political utility. Critics of the Trump administration have highlighted its [inconsistency](#) in addressing human rights abuses in countries such as Russia and various Arab states, yet similar [scrutiny](#) is not always applied uniformly to events within Iran, including the brutal suppression of the public protests in January 2026. This selective attention further demonstrates how ideological commitments shape the framing of international issues.

The nature of contemporary expertise exacerbates these problems. The boundary between serious analysis and performative commentary has become increasingly blurred, particularly in the age of social media. Social media platforms encourage rapid, emotionally charged responses rather than careful, evidence-based reasoning. As a result, predictions about complex geopolitical scenarios are often reduced to simplistic narratives or rhetorical statements designed to attract attention. The prevalence of misinformation, exaggeration, and even deliberate provocation has transformed the "prediction business" into a space where credibility is difficult to assess. In this context, the analysis of potential conflict with Iran is influenced not only by strategic considerations but also by broader cultural and political dynamics, including debates over nuclear proliferation, regional power struggles, and domestic political agendas.

The concept of *ideological self-confinement* provides a useful framework for understanding these dynamics. This concept refers to the tendency of individuals to limit their analysis to perspectives that align with their existing beliefs, excluding alternative viewpoints and contradictory evidence. Unlike traditional theories of knowledge bias, such as those proposed by [Michel Foucault or Antonio Gramsci](#), which emphasize the role of power structures and dominant ideologies, ideological self-confinement highlights the agency of individuals in shaping their own intellectual boundaries in the condition of presence of multiple choices such as in the advanced democracies. In contemporary democratic societies, where access to diverse sources of information is relatively unrestricted, individuals still choose to engage primarily with perspectives that reinforce their preexisting views. This self-imposed limitation

leads to a narrowing of analytical frameworks and a reduced capacity for critical thinking.

Within expert communities, this phenomenon manifests as intolerance toward alternative interpretations. Analysts who operate within liberal or leftist frameworks may dismiss perspectives associated with conservative or nationalist viewpoints, and vice versa. As a result, debates about Iran often occur within isolated ideological echo chambers rather than through genuine engagement with opposing arguments. This fragmentation of discourse contributes to the production of polarized predictions. For example, one dominant narrative portrays any military confrontation with Iran as inevitably disastrous, emphasizing the risks of escalation and regional instability. Another narrative suggests that Iran's internal weaknesses make it vulnerable to rapid collapse under external pressure. Both perspectives may contain elements of truth, but their presentation as definitive outcomes reflects ideological conviction rather than balanced analysis.

The comparison with predictions about the Russia–Ukraine conflict further illustrates this pattern. Prior to the escalation of hostilities, some commentators confidently predicted that Russia would achieve a swift victory, while others asserted that Ukraine would quickly repel the invasion. The reality proved far more complex, highlighting the limitations of ideologically driven forecasts. Similar dynamics are evident in discussions of Iran, where predictions are often shaped by broader attitudes toward the country. Western experts frequently exhibit polarized views, ranging from admiration or strategic sympathy to deep hostility toward Iran's political system, culture, and society. These attitudes influence not only the interpretation of current events but also expectations about future developments.

In addition to Western perspectives, regional and identity-based biases further complicate the analysis. Middle Eastern experts may interpret the situation through sectarian lenses, such as Sunni–Shia divisions, while other groups bring their own ideological frameworks to bear. Supporters of Israel, including certain religious and political constituencies, may frame the conflict in moral or even existential terms, emphasizing the need to confront perceived threats. Conversely, critics of Western foreign policy—including pro-Palestinian activists, anti-imperialist groups, and segments of the political left—may interpret the situation as another instance of unjust intervention. These diverse perspectives contribute to a highly fragmented discourse in which objective analysis is often overshadowed by competing narratives.

The cumulative effect of these dynamics is the erosion of analytical rigor. When predictions are driven primarily by ideological self-confinement, they lose their capacity to inform policy and public understanding. Instead of offering nuanced assessments based on empirical evidence, they reinforce existing divisions and

contribute to the spread of misinformation. This has significant implications for decision-making, as policymakers and the public may rely on flawed or biased analyses when evaluating potential courses of action. In the context of a possible conflict involving Iran, such misjudgments could have serious consequences, given the complexity and high stakes of the situation.

Recognizing the role of ideological self-confinement is therefore essential for improving the quality of geopolitical analysis. Analysts must be willing to engage with diverse perspectives, critically evaluate their own assumptions, and prioritize evidence over ideology. This requires not only individual effort but also institutional changes within media and academic environments. Encouraging methodological rigor, promoting intellectual diversity, and fostering a culture of critical inquiry can help mitigate the effects of polarization. While complete objectivity may be unattainable, greater awareness of bias can lead to more balanced and reliable predictions.

In conclusion, predictions about a potential US/Israel–Iran conflict are deeply influenced by ideological self-confinement and political polarization. Rather than reflecting objective analysis, many forecasts are shaped by partisan affiliations, media narratives, and personal beliefs. This results in extreme and contradictory predictions that undermine the credibility of expertise and obscure the complexity of the situation. Addressing this problem requires a conscious effort to move beyond ideological constraints and embrace a more evidence-based approach to analysis. Only by doing so can scholars, policymakers, and commentators provide meaningful insights into one of the most pressing geopolitical issues of our time.

Author: Farid Shafiyev, the Chairman of the Center of Analysis of International Relations (AIR Center)