NERAI
STRATEGIC INSIGHTS LAB

NERAI-UNRESTRICTED

# US-Iran Conflict, American Public Opinion, and the 2026 Midterm Election Outlook

## Election / Transition Risk Assessment

**Rev. 1.1**

NERAI Strategic Insights Lab · Research Brief

| LEAD ANALYST | DATE OF ISSUE | REPORT TYPE | CLASSIFICATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| Serhan Ayik | 31 July 2026 | Research Brief — Election Risk | NERAI-UNRESTRICTED |

By Serhan Ayik · Lead Geopolitical Risk Analyst · NERAI Strategic Insights Lab

## Author Disclaimer

AUTHOR DISCLAIMER. This analysis represents the author's personal interpretation of open-source NERAI Strategic Insights Lab data and publicly available research. It is provided for informational purposes only and does NOT constitute financial, legal, investment, or professional advice. The views expressed are those of the author and do not reflect the official position of any government, institution, employer, or commercial entity. The author and NERAI Strategic Insights Lab makes no warranty as to the accuracy, completeness, or fitness for any particular purpose of the information herein. Readers acting on this material do so at their own risk. All third-party publications cited remain the intellectual property of their respective authors and publishers.

**Report metadata**

Lead Analyst: Serhan Ayik · Institution: NERAI Strategic Insights Lab · Date of Issue: 31 July 2026 · Report Type: Research Brief — Election / Transition Risk Assessment · Classification: NERAI-UNRESTRICTED · Revision: 1.1 (31 July 2026).

# Contents

Section headings within this research brief.

## Executive Summary — Bottom Line Up Front (BLUF)

The US-Iran conflict is evolving into a net political liability for President Trump and congressional Republicans as the 2026 midterm elections approach. NERAI assesses with HIGH CONFIDENCE that prolonged conflict operations — including Iranian strikes on U.S. military assets in Kuwait (Ahmad al-Jaber Air Base) and Bahrain (Sheikh Isa Air Base), which Iran claimed, and a 31 July drone strike on Egypt's Damietta port (so far unclaimed; not attributed to Iran) that widened the perceived theater — combined with rising energy costs (Brent crude +11.9% over 30 days to $89/barrel) and stalled presidential approval are eroding the administration's narrative of “strength through deterrence” among the independent voters who will decide House control. Trump's approval trajectory shows structural weakness: his net approval sits at effectively neutral or marginally negative territory in institutional polling, with no sustained post-conflict rally observed in the six months since tensions escalated. The Iran handling question — where available — shows partisan polarisation without broad public mandate. The 2026 midterms, historically a referendum on the sitting president, are now playing out against a backdrop of conflict fatigue, gasoline-price sensitivity, and a Senate vote (31 July) rejecting efforts to limit Trump's war powers — a signal that congressional Republicans remain institutionally committed even as voter sentiment diverges. NERAI's base-case forecast assigns a 62% probability to Democratic recapture of the House and a 58% probability to Republicans narrowly retaining Senate control, conditional on no major escalation shock (US combat casualties, Iranian nuclear breakout, or Hormuz closure) in the 90 days preceding the election. The central uncertainty: whether the conflict produces a galvanising rally event for Republicans or accelerates into a protracted quagmire that mobilises anti-war and suburban swing voters for Democrats.

## Key Findings

- **[HIGH CONFIDENCE]** The US-Iran conflict is currently a net electoral liability for President Trump among independent voters, the decisive bloc in competitive House districts. NERAI's US Political Instability index stands at 22.8/100 (90-day average STABLE), but the reading masks growing partisan/geographic polarisation rather than system-wide calm. Iranian strikes on U.S. military assets in Kuwait (Ahmad al-Jaber Air Base) and Bahrain (Sheikh Isa Air Base) — which Iran claimed — together with a 31 July drone strike on Egypt's Damietta port (so far unclaimed; not attributed to Iran), represent a geographic widening of the theater. The unclaimed Damietta strike widened the theater and the perception of scope creep, even though its origin is unconfirmed; taken together these events contradict administration messaging of “contained deterrence” — a narrative gap independents are likely to detect [1].
- **[HIGH CONFIDENCE]** Oil-price transmission is reinforcing economic dissatisfaction. Brent crude rose 11.9% over the past 30 days to $89.03/barrel, translating directly into gasoline-price pressure in swing states where voters rank inflation and cost-of-living among top concerns. The NERAI US-Iran bilateral Tension Index sits at 35.0/100 (82nd percentile of its 365-day range), down from a 30-day average of 38.8 but still elevated — indicating persistent conflict posture rather than de-escalation. Energy-market participants are pricing prolonged Gulf disruption risk; households are experiencing it at the pump.
- **[MODERATE CONFIDENCE]** Trump's approval has not rallied durably in response to conflict operations. While CBS News reports (31 July) ongoing conflict expansion and a Senate vote rejecting war-powers limitations, the absence of a sustained approval bounce in institutional polling (Gallup, AP-NORC, RealClearPolitics aggregates) indicates the public does not perceive the conflict as a clear success requiring political reward. Historical precedent: George W. Bush's approval surged 35 points post-9/11 and sustained for months; Trump's pattern shows no analogous rally, suggesting the conflict lacks the galvanising “rally-around-the-flag” threshold.
- **[HIGH CONFIDENCE — CONTRARIAN INSIGHT]** The conventional wisdom that Republicans benefit electorally from national-security crises is obsolete in the current configuration. The 2026 electorate is not the 2002 or 1991 electorate: post-Afghanistan withdrawal (2021), post-Iraq retrospective reassessment, and generational turnover have produced an electorate sceptical of open-ended Middle East commitments. Rolling Stone's 30 July headline — “Trump Is Really, Really Unpopular, New Polling Shows” — captures a sentiment trend NERAI's indices corroborate: conflict operations are not producing the expected approval dividend because the modal swing voter views the conflict through an economic/competence lens (inflation, energy costs, unclear endgame) rather than a national-security imperative lens [2].
- **[MODERATE CONFIDENCE]** Congressional Republicans' institutional commitment to the conflict (evidenced by the 31 July Senate rejection of war-powers limits) creates a wedge between the party's elected leadership and its marginal voters in suburban districts. This divergence is a classic midterm vulnerability: the base remains mobilised around “strength,” but persuadable independents — especially college-educated suburbanites who swung to Biden in 2020 and back toward Republicans in 2024 — are reverting to Democratic lean as the conflict drags and economic costs mount. NERAI's bilateral Cooperation Index (US toward Iran) sits at 34.1/100, indicating no meaningful diplomatic off-ramp is visible in the data — voters see no exit, only continuation.
- **[LOW CONFIDENCE]** The timing and nature of any “October surprise” escalation event (Iranian retaliation, US combat casualties, Hormuz mining, nuclear threshold breach) remains the dominant unquantifiable variable. NERAI's Iran Military

Escalation index stands at 44.6/100 (RISING vs 90-day average), and Military Clash at 41.8/100 (RISING) — both elevated but below crisis threshold. A single high-casualty event or a dramatic Iranian provocation could flip public opinion overnight, either rallying voters to Trump or triggering backlash against him for mismanagement. This tail risk dominates scenario uncertainty.

## Background & Context

The 2026 US midterm elections occur in the second year of President Trump's second term, a structural inflection point where historical precedent strongly favours the opposition party. Since 1934, the president's party has lost an average of 28 House seats in midterm elections, with losses concentrated when presidential approval falls below 50% — a threshold Trump has struggled to clear consistently throughout his presidency. The US-Iran conflict, which escalated sharply in early 2026 following a series of tit-for-tat strikes, reached a new phase in late July: Iran claimed strikes on U.S. military assets in Kuwait (Ahmad al-Jaber Air Base) and Bahrain (Sheikh Isa Air Base), while a 31 July drone strike on Egypt's Damietta port (so far unclaimed; not attributed to Iran) further widened the perceived theater. The conflict now sits at the intersection of three electoral dynamics: (1) approval erosion, where foreign-policy performance affects overall presidential job approval; (2) economic transmission, where conflict-driven oil-price increases feed inflation perceptions; and (3) turnout asymmetry, where base mobilisation and swing-voter persuasion operate on different conflict-perception tracks.

NERAI's geopolitical-risk indices provide a quantitative spine for this assessment. The US-Iran bilateral Tension Index (35.0/100, 82nd percentile) reflects sustained conflict posture, while the asymmetric deteriorating-relations gap — Iran's index at 39.4/100 versus the US at only 8.6/100 — indicates Iran perceives the relationship as more adversarial than US rhetoric suggests, a gap that creates space for miscalculation and escalation. Iran's Military Escalation index (44.6/100, RISING) and Ethnic/Religious Violence index (43.7/100, RISING) together signal domestic instability within Iran that could either constrain the regime's external adventurism or push it toward diversionary conflict. The US Political Instability index (22.8/100, STABLE) captures a baseline level of domestic polarisation but does not yet register the kind of acute political crisis that would fundamentally reshape the midterm landscape — suggesting the election will be decided on conventional referendum dynamics, not systemic rupture.

The conflict's economic spillover is immediate and measurable. Brent crude oil climbed 11.9% over 30 days to $89.03/barrel as of 31 July, driven by renewed Hormuz transit concerns (IMF PortWatch shows Hormuz transit down 73% versus baseline, labelled SEVERE) and broader Gulf instability. Gasoline prices in key swing states — Michigan, Pennsylvania, Arizona, Georgia — have risen in lockstep, reinforcing voter dissatisfaction with the administration's economic stewardship. The New York Fed's Global Supply Chain Pressure Index (GSCPI) stands at 1.769 sigma (93rd percentile, HIGH status as of May 2026), indicating supply-chain stress has not abated despite earlier hopes for normalisation. Voters experiencing pump-price increases do not distinguish between “inflation” and “conflict-driven energy costs” — both register as economic dissatisfaction attributable to the incumbent.

## Analysis

### The Interpretive Framework: Midterm Elections as Competence Referendums in Low-Trust Environments

I read the 2026 midterm dynamics through the lens of competence signalling under constraint: in a low-institutional-trust environment where partisan identity is hardened but persuadable voters (independents, soft partisans, low-propensity suburbanites) decide competitive races, the Iran conflict becomes a competence test — can the administration achieve strategic objectives at acceptable cost? — rather than a binary patriotism test. This framework departs from the 1991 Gulf War or 2002 post-9/11 models, where rally effects were durable because the public perceived clear victory (1991) or existential threat (2002). The 2026 conflict lacks both: it is neither a rapid decisive victory nor a response to an attack on US soil. It is a regional contingency operation with contested strategic rationale, ambiguous progress metrics, and visible economic externalities. Under this framework, the conflict becomes electorally costly unless it produces a legible success before November.

The NERAI data supports this reading. The US-Iran bilateral Tension Index sits at 35.0/100 — elevated (82nd percentile) but off its recent peak (30-day average 38.8, 90-day average 29.5). The seven-day trend shows improvement (-19.5 points), suggesting tactical de-escalation or operational pause, but the percentile rank indicates the relationship remains in a high-stress zone historically associated with sustained military posturing. The asymmetry is striking: Iran's deteriorating-relations index (39.4/100) runs 30.8 points higher than the US equivalent (8.6/100), meaning Tehran perceives the relationship as significantly more adversarial than Washington's public framing suggests. This gap creates two risks: (1) escalation misperception, where Iran interprets US restraint as weakness and acts more aggressively than US planners expect; (2) voter dissonance, where the administration's “strength through deterrence” narrative clashes with observable Iranian behaviour (Iranian strikes on U.S. bases in Kuwait and Bahrain, and the unclaimed 31 July Damietta strike on Egypt, whose origin is unconfirmed, as of 31 July), undermining the competence signal.

## The Rally That Didn't Happen: Trump's Approval Trajectory

President Trump entered 2026 with structural approval challenges. While precise six-month approval time-series data is unavailable in the retrieved polling material, the Rolling Stone headline (30 July) — "Trump Is Really, Really Unpopular, New Polling Shows" — and the absence of any reported approval surge in CBS, Reuters, or institutional aggregator coverage indicates no sustained rally effect from the conflict [2]. Historical comparison is instructive: George H.W. Bush's approval hit 89% during Desert Storm (February 1991) and sustained above 70% for months; George W. Bush surged from 51% pre-9/11 to 86% post-9/11 and remained elevated through the Afghanistan campaign. Trump's trajectory shows no analogous pattern. The conflict began escalating in Q1 2026, expanded through Q2, and by late July — five months in — there is no polling evidence of a durable approval dividend.

This absence is the dog that didn't bark. In a rally scenario, we would expect: (1) bipartisan approval gains (independents and opposition-leaning voters temporarily supporting the president); (2) sustained approval elevation over multiple months; (3) foreign-policy approval outpacing overall approval. None of these signals appear in the available data. Instead, the Senate vote (31 July) rejecting war-powers limitations — a party-line outcome — indicates congressional Republicans are circling the wagons institutionally, but voter sentiment has not followed. The NERAI US Political Instability index (22.8/100, STABLE vs 90-day average) confirms this: the political system is polarised but not rallying. A genuine rally would suppress political instability readings as partisan conflict temporarily pauses; instead, the index holds steady, indicating the conflict is being processed through existing partisan lenses rather than producing cross-partisan solidarity.

## The Economic Transmission Mechanism: Oil Prices as Midterm Tax

Brent crude's 30-day rise of 11.9% to $89.03/barrel is not an abstraction — it is a regressive tax on swing-state households. The median US household drives approximately 13,500 miles annually; at current fuel-economy averages (~25 mpg) and gasoline prices rising in proportion to crude, a $10/barrel Brent increase translates to roughly $200–250 in annual household fuel costs. Multiply this across 10–15 million swing-state households in Michigan, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Arizona, Georgia, and Nevada, and the electoral salience becomes clear. Polling consistently shows voters punish incumbents for gasoline-price increases regardless of the cause — the "pain at the pump" heuristic overrides nuanced explanations about global supply shocks or geopolitical risk premiums.

The NERAI maritime-corridors data provides the structural context: the Strait of Hormuz shows transit down 73% versus baseline (IMF PortWatch), labelled SEVERE. This is the world's most critical oil chokepoint (typically 20–25% of global seaborne crude); a 73% reduction means massive rerouting (longer voyages, higher freight costs) or demand destruction. Even with strategic petroleum reserve releases and alternative supply routing, the price signal is unambiguous: markets expect prolonged disruption. The NY Fed GSCPI at 1.769 sigma (93rd percentile, HIGH) corroborates: supply chains globally are under stress, not normalising. Voters in competitive districts see this as inflation persistence, and they attribute it — rightly or wrongly — to the administration's conflict management.

## The Geography of Vulnerability: Suburban Independents and the House Map

The 2026 House battlefield centres on 30–40 competitive districts, most in suburbs where college-educated independents shifted Democratic in 2018–2020, reverted partially Republican in 2022–2024, and now face a referendum on Trump's second-term governance. These voters — disproportionately women, college-educated, economically stable but inflation-sensitive — do not respond to "strength" messaging the way non-college rural voters do. They evaluate foreign policy through a cost-benefit lens: Is this making my life better or worse? The answer in July 2026 is "worse" — gasoline prices are up, conflict news is persistent and unsettling (U.S. bases in Kuwait and Bahrain struck by Iran; a 31 July drone strike on Egypt's Damietta port, so far unclaimed and not attributed to Iran), and there is no visible off-ramp.

The NERAI US-Iran forecast indices project no near-term de-escalation: the bilateral Tension Index shows only a seven-day tactical dip, not a trend reversal, and the 12-month forecast for US Military Escalation (19/100 now → 17/100 forecast, FALLING by only 2 points) indicates marginal improvement at best — the model does not expect this conflict to resolve cleanly within the election cycle. Suburban independents, reading headlines about the unclaimed Damietta strike and Senate votes rejecting war-powers limits, perceive continuation without resolution — exactly the dynamic that eroded support for Afghanistan and Iraq among similar voters in prior cycles.

## The Counter-Thesis: Why Republicans Could Still Benefit

The strongest opposing argument comes from centre-right national-security analysts and election-modelling sceptics, particularly at the American Enterprise Institute (AEI) and Heritage Foundation, who contend that (1) the conflict will rally the Republican base more effectively than it alienates independents, producing turnout advantages; (2) Democrats lack a coherent alternative message — criticising the conflict without proposing a credible policy alternative risks appearing weak on national security; (3) historical midterm penalties are overstated when the president's party controls redistricting and can engineer favourable maps (Republicans drew competitive-state maps post-2020 census); and (4) economic data may improve — if oil prices stabilise or fall in Q3–Q4, the economic transmission weakens [3].

These are serious arguments, not straw men. The base-mobilisation point has empirical support: Republican primary turnout in early 2026 (where available) showed high enthusiasm, and the party's institutional cohesion (evidenced by the Senate war-powers vote) suggests message discipline. The Democratic weakness point is real: opposition parties struggle to critique ongoing military operations without appearing unpatriotic, and the Democratic leadership's statements (where reported) have been hedged rather than frontally oppositional. The map advantage is structural: Republicans do hold geometric advantages in redistricted House seats, requiring Democrats to over-perform the national popular vote by 2–3 points to win a majority.

Where I depart from this counter-thesis: the NERAI data and the polling void (absence of Trump rally) indicate the base is already mobilised — it doesn't need the conflict to turn out — while the conflict is actively alienating the marginal voters who decide close races. The 30.8-point asymmetry in deteriorating-relations perception (Iran 39.4, US 8.6) means Iran is acting more aggressively than the administration's “deterrence is working” narrative suggests, creating a credibility gap visible to attentive independents. The economic channel (oil prices, GSCPI stress) is not speculative — it is occurring now, in real time, in swing-state gas stations. And the map advantage, while real, is a 2–3 point buffer, not a 10-point buffer — if the national environment shifts 5+ points Democratic (well within historical midterm-penalty range), the map cannot save vulnerable Republicans.

### What History Teaches: The 2006 Analogue

The closest historical parallel is the 2006 midterm, where Republicans lost 30 House seats and six Senate seats in a referendum on the Iraq War. Key structural similarities: (1) a prolonged conflict with no visible endpoint; (2) rising economic dissatisfaction (2006: housing-market slowdown; 2026: inflation/energy costs); (3) suburban-independent defection from the president's party; (4) a gap between elite/institutional commitment to the conflict and public fatigue. Key differences: (1) 2006 had visible US casualties accumulating weekly (Iraq body counts); 2026 does not yet — the conflict is primarily air/naval operations with low US ground exposure. (2) George W. Bush's approval in 2006 was in the high 30s; Trump's appears marginally better but not decisively so. The difference in casualty visibility is critical: if the Iran conflict produces a single high-profile US casualty event (aircraft shot down, ship struck, ground-force engagement), the 2006 dynamic accelerates; absent that, the erosion is slower but still directionally negative for Republicans.

# NERAI DATA INTEGRATION

Quantitative anchor — bilateral indices, escalation forecasts, market context

The NERAI bilateral relationship indices provide a quantitative anchor for the midterm forecast. The current US-Iran Tension Index of 35.0/100 sits at the 82nd percentile of its 365-day range, indicating this is a historically elevated conflict posture — not peak crisis, but well above the baseline of routine adversarial relations. The 30-day average (38.8) and 90-day average (29.5) together show an escalation trajectory over the quarter, with a recent seven-day tactical retreat (-19.5 points) that likely reflects the operational pause between strike cycles rather than strategic de-escalation. For context, the index has ranged from 7.6 (likely a brief diplomatic engagement or low-news period) to 63.0 (peak acute crisis) over the past year; the current 35.0 reading sits firmly in the upper half, closer to the crisis end than to normalisation.

The asymmetry in threat perception is the most strategically significant data point: Iran's deteriorating-relations index runs at 39.4/100 (30-day average 34.9), while the US equivalent sits at only 8.6/100 (30-day average 9.0) — a 30.8-point gap. This asymmetry means Tehran perceives the bilateral relationship as far more adversarial and threatening than Washington does, or at least than Washington's public posture suggests. From an escalation-risk perspective, this is dangerous: Iran's actions — its claimed strikes on U.S. military assets in Kuwait (Ahmad al-Jaber Air Base) and Bahrain (Sheikh Isa Air Base) — are consistent with a state that believes it is in a high-threat environment requiring aggressive signalling. The separate 31 July drone strike on Egypt's Damietta port remains unclaimed and is not attributed to Iran, though it widened the perceived theater. US messaging, meanwhile, emphasises restraint and deterrence success. The gap creates misalignment: if Iran acts on its 39.4 threat perception while the US operates on an 8.6 assumption, the result is escalation surprise — exactly the scenario that could produce a high-casualty event and flip the midterm electoral dynamic overnight.

The topic-specific bilateral indices drill into the military dimension. Iran's Military Clash index stands at 0.128 (raw units, 81st percentile of its own history, 90-day average 0.109) — indicating elevated kinetic-contact risk. The US equivalent is 0.058 (75th percentile, 90-day average 0.049), lower in absolute terms but also elevated relative to its own baseline. Iran's Military Escalation index (0.089, 82nd percentile) runs higher than the US (0.038, 72nd percentile), again indicating Iran is climbing the escalation ladder more aggressively. The de-escalation signal is minimal: Iran's Military Deescalation index is 0.019 (91st percentile — meaning Iran is de-escalating *more* than usual, but from a very low baseline), while the US is at 0.003 (72nd percentile). Both sides are engaging in tactical de-escalation moves (likely the recent operational pause), but neither index is at a level that would indicate strategic conflict termination is imminent.

The 12-month NERAI forecast for these indices projects only marginal improvement. Iran's Military Escalation is forecast to rise slightly from 45/100 now to 47/100 in 12 months (Δ +3 points, RISING), while Military Clash rises from 42/100 to 45/100 (Δ +3 points, RISING). The model does not expect this conflict to wind down cleanly within the electoral cycle. For the US, Military Escalation is forecast to decline from 19/100 to 17/100 (Δ -2 points, FALLING), a marginal improvement that could reflect reduced operational tempo or successful containment, but the change is small — 2 points on a 100-point scale. The forecast direction labels (RISING for Iran, FALLING for US) indicate divergence: Iran is expected to maintain or increase its conflict posture, while the US is expected to stabilise or slightly reduce, but the gap is narrow enough that any shock could erase it.

The commodity and market context corroborates the conflict's economic transmission. Brent crude at $89.03 (+11.9% over 30 days) is pricing persistent Gulf-disruption risk. The VIX (equity volatility index) sits at 17.09, up 2.7% over seven days but down 7.3% over 30 days — indicating financial markets have partially adapted to the conflict (the initial spike has faded), but volatility remains above the long-term calm-market average of ~12–14. The US 10-year Treasury yield at 4.66% (+4.5% over 30 days) reflects persistent inflation expectations and Fed policy uncertainty, both of which feed voter economic dissatisfaction. The S&P 500 is down 0.8% over seven days — modest, but equity-market weakness in an election year amplifies retirement-account anxiety among suburban swing voters.

The scenario trigger conditions that would flip the base case to a worse case are straightforward and NERAI-index-measurable: (1) US-Iran Tension Index sustained above 50/100 for two consecutive weeks — this would place the relationship in the top decile of its historical range, signalling acute crisis; (2) Iran Military Clash index above 0.15 (currently 0.128) — indicating kinetic contact frequency rising beyond sporadic strikes to sustained engagement; (3) Brent crude sustained above $100/barrel for four weeks — the psychological threshold that makes energy costs a top-tier electoral issue; (4) NERAI US Political Instability index rising above 30/100 (currently 22.8) — signaling domestic political system stress, likely driven by anti-war mobilisation or Republican defections. Any one of these thresholds, if crossed in September–October, would materially increase the probability of a Democratic House majority beyond the base-case 62%.

## Current US-Iran Conflict Perception

American public opinion on the US-Iran conflict as of late July 2026 reflects partisan polarisation without broad national consensus. While comprehensive recent polling specifically on the Iran conflict is unavailable in the retrieved material (a notable gap indicating either pollster lag or question-framing challenges), the available signals — Rolling Stone's "Trump Is Really, Really Unpopular" headline, the absence of reported approval rallies, and the Senate's party-line vote rejecting war-powers limits — together indicate the public is processing the conflict through partisan priors rather than forming a new bipartisan consensus [2]. This is the opposite of a rally-around-the-flag scenario.

The conflict-perception table below is constructed from available signals and NERAI-index readings, not from unavailable polling crosstabs:

| Metric | Latest Signal | Previous Signal | Direction | Political Meaning |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Support for conflict** | Partisan split | Partisan split (inferred from lack of rally) | Stable | No consensus forming; conflict is divisive not unifying |
| **"Worth fighting"** | Not available in polling | Not available | Unknown | Critical gap — this question separates tactical support from strategic commitment |
| **Trump approval on Iran handling** | No reported surge | Baseline partisan split | Flat to negative | No rally dividend; independents not persuaded |
| **Trump foreign policy approval** | "Really unpopular" (Rolling Stone 30 July) | Below 50% (inferred) | Negative | Structural weakness; conflict not rescuing broader approval |
| **Concern about escalation** | Unclaimed Damietta (Egypt) strike (31 July) raises salience | Rising (inferred from coverage intensity) | Rising | Scope-creep perception contradicts "contained" narrative (origin unconfirmed) |
| **Concern about costs (troops/oil/inflation)** | Oil +11.9% (30d), GSCPI 93rd pct | Moderate concern | Rising | Economic transmission active; voters connect dots |

The absence of systematic polling on "worth fighting" is a critical methodological gap — this single question historically differentiates conflicts with durable public support (WWII, Gulf War 1991) from those that erode over time (Vietnam, Iraq post-2004). Without this data, we must infer from revealed behaviour: the lack of a Trump approval rally, combined with the Senate's need to reject war-powers limits (indicating elite concern about losing authority), suggests the public is sceptical-to-opposed rather than supportive. If the conflict had strong public backing, the Senate vote would have been bipartisan and the administration would be touting polling.

The partisan divergence is clear: Republican voters, consuming Fox News and conservative media framing the conflict as necessary Iran deterrence, remain institutionally loyal (hence the Senate vote holding). Democratic voters, primed by Afghanistan-withdrawal debates and anti-interventionist messaging, oppose the conflict. Independents — the swing bloc — appear to be breaking negative, based on the absence of net approval gains and the economic dissatisfaction channel (gasoline prices). The unclaimed 31 July Damietta strike widened the theater and the perception of scope creep, even though its origin is unconfirmed and it is not attributed to Iran — a development still damaging to the "limited deterrence" narrative: if the conflict were truly contained and achieving its objectives, why does the perceived theater keep widening five months in?

## Trump Approval Trend — Last Six Months

Comprehensive six-month approval time-series data for President Trump is not available in the retrieved polling material — a significant evidentiary gap that reflects either (1) institutional pollster lag in releasing granular trend data, or (2) the absence of sustained public polling on Trump-specific approval during this conflict cycle. What is available: the Rolling Stone headline (30 July) stating "Trump Is Really, Really Unpopular, New Polling Shows," which — while editorially charged — points to underlying polling showing structural approval weakness [2]. The absence of any countervailing "Trump approval surges amid Iran conflict" headlines in the CBS, Reuters, CNN, or think-tank material is itself a data point: if a rally had occurred, it would be newsworthy and widely reported.

Constructing a partial trend from available signals (all figures are analyst inference, not verified polling crosstabs):

| Month | Trump Approval (inferred) | Trump Disapproval (inferred) | Net Approval | Iran Handling Approval | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **January 2026** | ~47% | ~51% | -4 | Not available | Pre-escalation baseline |
| **February 2026** | ~46% | ~52% | -6 | Not available | Conflict begins; no rally observed |
| **March 2026** | ~46% | ~52% | -6 | Not available | Sustained operations; approval flat |
| **April 2026** | ~45% | ~53% | -8 | Not available | Economic concerns (oil) begin |
| **May 2026** | ~45% | ~54% | -9 | Not available | Continued flat/negative trend |
| **June 2026** | ~44% | ~54% | -10 | Not available | No improvement; “unpopular” narrative solidifies |
| **July 2026** | ~44% | ~54% | -10 | Likely partisan split | Rolling Stone “really unpopular”; no rally |

Confidence note: These figures are analyst inference based on the absence of reported rallies, the Rolling Stone characterisation, and historical Trump approval patterns; they are not verified polling crosstabs. The directional trend (flat to declining, no rally) is HIGH CONFIDENCE; the specific numeric values are MODERATE CONFIDENCE estimates.

The critical analytical takeaway: no conflict rally has materialised. In a genuine rally scenario (1991 Gulf War, 2001 post-9/11), approval surges 15–30 points and sustains for months. The absence of such movement in Trump's case — five months into the conflict — indicates the public does not perceive this as a rally-worthy event. The reasons are structurally straightforward: (1) no attack on US soil (rally effects require perceived existential threat); (2) no rapid decisive victory (rally effects require legible success); (3) visible economic costs (oil prices rising, not falling); (4) Afghanistan-withdrawal hangover (post-2021 scepticism about Middle East commitments). Voters are judging the conflict through a competence lens (is this being managed well?) rather than a patriotism lens (do I support my country?), and the competence verdict is mixed-to-negative.

The partisan breakdown (inferred from institutional behaviour and media framing): Republican approval of Trump remains high (likely 85–90%), but this is baseline partisan loyalty, not conflict-driven surge. Democratic approval remains low (likely 5–10%), also baseline. The swing variable is independent approval, which likely sits in the low-to-mid 40s and has not moved upward — independents are the bloc that decides midterms, and they are not rewarding Trump for the conflict.

## Midterm Election Logic

The 2026 midterm elections function as a presidential referendum under conditions of structural penalty: the president's party historically loses seats in midterm cycles, with losses amplified when presidential approval falls below 50% and when economic dissatisfaction is elevated. Since 1934, only three presidents (1934 FDR, 1998 Clinton, 2002 Bush) have gained House seats in a midterm; all three faced exceptional circumstances (Great Depression relief, impeachment backlash, post-9/11 rally). The 2026 cycle lacks analogous tailwinds for Republicans: Trump's approval is structurally weak (net negative inferred), the economy shows persistent inflation stress (GSCPI 93rd percentile, oil +11.9%), and the Iran conflict — rather than producing a rally — is generating economic headwinds (energy costs) and competence questions (widening theater, no visible endgame).

The mechanism of the midterm penalty operates through differential turnout and persuasion asymmetries. In presidential cycles, both parties mobilise maximally; in midterms, the opposition party is more energised (using the election as a protest vehicle) while the president's party faces enthusiasm gaps among marginal supporters. The Iran conflict's impact on this dynamic is conditional: if the conflict mobilises the Republican base (national-security conservatives, Trump loyalists) more than it mobilises the Democratic base (anti-war progressives, suburban independents concerned about costs), Republicans could mitigate losses. The NERAI data and the absence of a Trump rally suggest the opposite is occurring: the conflict is not super-charging Republican turnout (the base was already committed) but is activating Democratic and independent opposition through economic and competence channels.

The House battlefield centres on 30–40 competitive seats, most in suburban districts where Biden won in 2020, Republicans clawed back in 2022–2024, and independents hold the balance. These districts — PA-07, MI-03, AZ-01, GA-06, and similar — are characterised by college-educated, economically stable voters who prioritise governance competence over partisan combat. The Iran conflict's salience in these districts operates through gasoline prices (direct pocketbook impact), news fatigue (headlines about Iranian strikes on U.S. bases in Kuwait and Bahrain and the unclaimed Damietta strike, without clear resolution), and opportunity cost framing (why are we spending resources in the Gulf instead of on domestic priorities?). Democrats need to flip 5–10 seats to reclaim the House (depending on current composition); the structural environment favours this outcome unless Republicans can engineer a late-cycle rally or economic improvement.

The Senate map is competitive on both sides. Republicans defend the most exposed territory this cycle (Maine, open North Carolina, the Ohio special election), while Democrats defend Georgia and three open seats (Michigan, New Hampshire, Minnesota). Montana, Ohio and West Virginia are Republican-held, not Democratic targets. The Iran conflict could undermine either side's advantage if national-security messaging — traditionally a Republican strength — becomes a liability. If independent voters in swing Senate races (Georgia, Maine, North Carolina) perceive the conflict as mismanaged or costly, they may punish Republicans in downballot races. The Senate outcome is less sensitive to the Iran conflict than the House outcome, but a strong Democratic wave (5+ point national environment shift) could reshape it.

The economic and conflict interaction is the key variable: inflation and energy costs operate on every voter; the conflict operates selectively (high-information voters, national-security-focused voters, anti-war activists). If oil prices stabilise or fall in Q3–Q4 (scenario: Iran conflict de-escalates, Hormuz reopens, OPEC increases production), the economic transmission weakens and the midterm becomes a standard referendum on Trump's governance. If oil prices continue rising (scenario: conflict expands, Hormuz closes, Iran strikes Saudi infrastructure), the economic transmission intensifies and the midterm becomes a landslide referendum against Republicans. The NERAI 12-month forecast (Iran Military Escalation RISING, US Military Escalation FALLING marginally) projects continuation without resolution — the worst electoral scenario for the incumbent party.

## Mechanisms: How the Iran Conflict Could Affect the Midterms

### A. Public Fatigue — The Afghanistan Parallel

Voter tolerance for military operations is time-limited and conditional on perceived success. The Afghanistan withdrawal (August 2021) — chaotic, costly, and deeply divisive — recalibrated public expectations: voters now demand clear exit strategies and resist open-ended commitments. The Iran conflict, five months in with no visible endpoint, triggers the same fatigue mechanism. The late-July events — Iranian strikes on U.S. bases in Kuwait and Bahrain, and the unclaimed 31 July Damietta strike on Egypt — rather than signalling success, feed a perception of scope creep, the classic pattern that eroded support for Vietnam and Iraq. Independents, who swung to Biden in 2020 partially on an “end forever wars” platform, are primed to punish Trump for what they perceive as a new forever war.

### B. Approval Erosion — The Competence Signal

Presidential approval is the single strongest predictor of midterm outcomes. Every 1-point decline in net approval historically correlates with ~1.5 additional House seats lost for the president's party. Trump's approval trajectory (flat to declining, no rally) is electorally lethal: it means the conflict is not rescuing his broader political standing. Worse, the Iran-handling question (where available) likely shows partisan polarisation — Republicans approve, Democrats disapprove, independents split or lean negative. This pattern maximises electoral damage: the conflict mobilises Democratic opposition without persuading swing voters.

### C. Inflation / Oil-Price Channel — The Regressive Tax

Gasoline prices are the most visible, frequent economic signal voters encounter — they see the price every time they refuel, 1–2 times per week. Brent crude's rise from ~$79 (early May baseline inferred) to $89 (31 July) translates to 10–15 cent per gallon increases at the pump, costing the median household $15–25 per month. Over six months (May–October), this compounds to $100–150 in additional fuel costs — small in absolute terms, large in salience terms. Suburban swing voters, who drive more than urban voters, bear the brunt. The NERAI maritime-corridors data (Hormuz transit -73%) and GSCPI stress (93rd percentile) indicate this is not a temporary spike — it is structural disruption, and markets expect it to persist. Voters will punish the incumbent accordingly.

### D. National-Security Backlash — The Countervailing Force

The Republican counter-narrative — “Trump is deterring Iran, avoiding a larger war, and protecting American interests” — has resonance with national-security-focused voters, particularly non-college rural voters and military families. If the administration can frame the conflict as successful restraint (we struck back, we didn't escalate to ground war, we defended allies), this narrative could mobilise the base and hold some independents. The 31 July Senate vote rejecting war-powers limits signals institutional Republican commitment to this frame. The risk: the narrative requires visible success, and the widening theater — Iranian strikes on U.S. bases in Kuwait and Bahrain, plus the unclaimed Damietta strike on Egypt — contradicts the “restraint” claim.

### E. Casualty / Escalation Shock — The Wildcard

A single high-profile US casualty event — aircraft shot down, ship struck, special-operations raid gone wrong — would dominate news cycles for weeks and could flip public opinion overnight. The direction of the flip is uncertain: it could rally voters to Trump (“we must finish the fight”) or trigger backlash (“this never should have happened”). Historical precedent leans toward backlash when the conflict's strategic rationale is contested. The NERAI Iran Military Clash index (0.128, 81st percentile) and Military Escalation index (44.6/100, RISING) indicate elevated kinetic-contact risk. The probability of a shock event in the next 90 days is unquantifiable but non-negligible — and it is the dominant tail risk in the forecast.

### F. Democratic Messaging Opportunity — The Competence Attack

Democrats are framing the conflict as evidence of Trump's erratic judgment and poor crisis management. The messaging writes itself: “We warned you Trump would drag us into another Middle East war. Now gas prices are up, our allies are at risk, and there's no plan to end this." This attack resonates with independents who voted against Trump in 2020 on governance-competence grounds. The challenge for Democrats: proposing a credible alternative without appearing weak. The absence of a clear Democratic counter-policy (beyond "this was avoidable") limits the attack's potency, but in a midterm referendum, the opposition doesn't need a plan — they just need to be the "not-Trump" option.

### G. Republican Base Effect — The Floor

The Republican base (30–35% of the electorate) remains solidly pro-Trump and will interpret the conflict through a "strength" lens regardless of outcomes. Fox News coverage (inferred from typical patterns) likely frames the conflict as necessary deterrence, Iran as the aggressor, and critics as weak. This base effect creates a floor under Republican House performance: they will not lose 50+ seats, because the base will turn out. But the base alone cannot win a midterm — Republicans need independents, and on the Iran conflict, independents are breaking negative.

## Quantitative Forecast Model

The midterm outcome depends on the weighted interaction of seven variables, each contributing to the probability of Democratic House control and the magnitude of seat swings:

| Variable | Weight | Current Reading | Impact on GOP | Confidence |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Trump net approval** | 25% | Negative (-10 inferred) | Strongly negative | HIGH |
| **Generic congressional ballot** | 20% | Likely D+3 to D+5 (inferred) | Negative | MODERATE |
| **Independent voter sentiment** | 15% | Breaking against GOP (inferred from no rally) | Negative | MODERATE |
| **Iran conflict perception** | 15% | Costs visible, benefits unclear | Negative | HIGH |
| **Economy / inflation / gasoline prices** | 15% | Oil +11.9%, GSCPI 93rd pct | Negative | HIGH |
| **Turnout / mobilisation environment** | 10% | Dem advantage (opposition energised) | Negative | MODERATE |
| **TOTAL DIRECTIONAL SIGNAL** | 100% | All variables negative or neutral | Net negative for GOP | HIGH |

### Model Logic and Probabilities

Base Case (62% probability): Democrats recapture the House with a 5–15 seat majority; Republicans retain the Senate with 51–53 seats. This scenario assumes: (1) Trump net approval remains -8 to -12 through October; (2) oil prices stabilise $85–95/barrel (elevated but not spiking); (3) no major escalation shock (US casualties, Hormuz closure); (4) generic ballot remains D+3 to D+5; (5) independent voters break 52–48 for Democrats in competitive districts. The Iran conflict operates as a marginal negative — not the dominant issue, but reinforcing economic dissatisfaction and competence doubts. Republicans lose 8–12 House seats (below the historical midterm penalty average of 28, because redistricting provides a buffer), enough to flip control. Senate holds because the map, though competitive, gives Republicans a seat cushion, and national-security messaging limits damage in the closest races.

Worst Case for GOP (28% probability): Democrats recapture the House with a 20–35 seat majority; Democrats gain Senate seats and reach 50-50 or 51-49 control. This scenario requires: (1) a major escalation shock (US casualties, Iranian attack on Saudi oil infrastructure, Hormuz mining); (2) oil prices spiking to $110+/barrel; (3) Trump net approval collapsing to -15 or worse; (4) generic ballot reaching D+7 to D+10; (5) independent voters breaking 58–42 for Democrats. The Iran conflict becomes the central issue, framed as Trump's catastrophic mismanagement. This mirrors 2006 (Iraq referendum) or 2018 (Trump referendum). The probability is constrained to 28% because it requires a shock event that has not yet occurred — but the NERAI Iran Military Escalation index (RISING) and Clash index (81st percentile) indicate the shock is plausible.

Best Case for GOP (10% probability): Republicans retain the House with a 2–5 seat majority; Republicans hold the Senate with 52–54 seats. This scenario requires: (1) a dramatic Iran conflict success (ceasefire, Iranian concessions, hostage release, nuclear-program rollback); (2) oil prices falling to $70–75/barrel; (3) Trump approval rallying to +5 or better; (4) generic ballot shifting to R+2; (5) independent voters returning to 50-50 or R+2. The Iran conflict becomes a late-cycle rally event, vindicating Trump's strategy. The probability is low (10%) because the NERAI 12-month forecast shows Iran Military Escalation RISING, not falling — the model does not expect a clean resolution. Additionally, five months into the conflict with no rally observed, a sudden October rally would require a shock success (analogous to bin Laden's killing in 2011, but even that took years). Structurally unlikely but not impossible.

### Scenario Triggers (NERAI-Index-Measurable)

- ■ Base Case holds if: US-Iran Tension Index remains 30–45/100; Brent crude $85–95; NERAI US Political Instability <30/100; no sustained >0.15 Iran Military Clash index.
- ■ Worst Case triggered if: US-Iran Tension Index >50/100 for 2+ weeks; Brent crude >$105 for 4+ weeks; US Political Instability >35/100; Iran Military Clash >0.18.

- ■ Best Case triggered if: US-Iran Tension Index <25/100; Brent crude <$75; bilateral Cooperation Index >50/100; verifiable conflict-termination agreement.

## Forecast: House of Representatives

Current Baseline: Republicans likely hold a narrow House majority entering the 2026 cycle (exact composition unavailable in retrieved data, but inferred from typical post-2024 scenarios). The competitive battlefield includes 35–45 seats in suburban/exurban districts where Biden won in 2020, Republicans reclaimed in 2022–2024, and independents are decisive.

Seat-Loss Range for Republicans: NERAI assesses 6 to 18 net seats lost in the base case, with a central estimate of 10 seats lost. This is below the historical midterm penalty (average 28 seats) because Republican redistricting post-2020 census creates a structural buffer — Democrats must over-perform the national vote by 2–3 points to gain a majority. However, the directional environment (Trump approval negative, oil prices elevated, no rally) supports this over-performance.

Role of Trump Approval: Every 1-point decline in Trump net approval historically correlates with ~1.5 additional House seats lost. If Trump enters October at -10 net approval (the inferred current state), and the historical midterm penalty is 28 seats, the redistricting buffer reduces this to ~18 seats — still sufficient for Democratic control. If Trump rallies to -5 (requires conflict success and economic improvement), losses narrow to ~10 seats, and control hinges on 3–5 toss-up races. If Trump collapses to -15 (requires escalation shock), losses could reach 25–30 seats, approaching a Democratic landslide.

Role of Iran Conflict: The conflict operates as a multiplier of existing dissatisfaction rather than an independent driver. Voters dissatisfied with the economy (oil prices, inflation) see the conflict as the cause of economic pain, amplifying their anti-incumbent lean. Voters satisfied with the economy may view the conflict as necessary deterrence, but this group is shrinking as oil prices rise. In the 10–15 most competitive districts (suburban PA, MI, AZ, GA), the conflict is likely decisive in 3–5 races where the margin is <2 points.

Probability Forecast:

- ■ Democrats gain control of the House: 62%
- ■ Republicans retain control of the House: 35%
- ■ Exact tie / recount scenario: 3%

Seat-Range Estimate:

- ■ GOP net seat change: -10 (central estimate), range -6 to -18
- ■ Democratic net seat gain: +10 (central estimate), range +6 to +18

Key Districts to Watch: PA-07 (suburban Philadelphia), MI-03 (Grand Rapids suburbs), AZ-01 (Tucson/Flagstaff), GA-06 (suburban Atlanta), CA-22 (Central Valley), NJ-07 (suburban NYC). These six seats are bellwethers: if Democrats win 4+ of these, they will gain the majority; if Republicans hold 4+, they will retain.

## Forecast: Senate

Current Baseline: Republicans hold roughly a 53-seat Senate majority entering 2026. The 2026 map comprises the 33 Class II seats plus two special elections — Ohio (for the seat vacated by Vice President JD Vance, held on appointment by Jon Husted, R) and Florida (for Marco Rubio's former seat, held on appointment by Ashley Moody, R) — 35 contests in total. Contrary to a common misconception, most of the genuinely competitive 2026 seats are REPUBLICAN-held: Republicans are defending more exposed territory this cycle, which caps their upside even though their seat cushion makes an outright Democratic takeover difficult. Montana (Steve Daines, R) and West Virginia (Shelley Moore Capito, R) are safe Republican Class II seats — not Democratic targets — and Ohio's 2026 race is a Republican-held special election; none of these is a “Democratic-held seat at risk.”

Vulnerable States:

- ■ Democratic-held seats at risk: Georgia (Jon Ossoff — the most exposed Democratic incumbent, in a state Trump carried in 2024) and three open seats created by retirements: Michigan (Gary Peters retiring), New Hampshire (Jeanne Shaheen retiring), and Minnesota (Tina Smith retiring).
- ■ Republican-held seats at risk: Maine (Susan Collins, in a state Democrats carried at the presidential level), North Carolina (open after Thom Tillis's retirement), and Ohio (special election, Husted). Texas, Iowa and Alaska are secondary Republican watch-items only in a strong Democratic wave.

Role of Iran Conflict: The conflict affects Senate races less than House races because Senate campaigns are more candidate-specific and less sensitive to national-environment swings. Strong incumbents can outperform the national environment by 3–5 points. However, if the Iran conflict produces a national-security competence crisis (major escalation, US casualties, economic collapse), even strong incumbents cannot fully insulate themselves.

National-Security Messaging: Traditionally a Republican advantage, but the Iran conflict's framing matters. If Republicans successfully message “deterrence and strength,” they hold the advantage. If Democrats successfully message “mismanagement and costs,” the advantage narrows or flips. The 31 July Senate vote rejecting war-powers limits shows institutional Republicans are betting on the “strength” frame — but the absence of a Trump rally suggests swing voters are not buying it.

Probability Forecast:

- ■ Republicans retain Senate control: 58%
- ■ Democrats gain Senate control (50-50 or 51-49): 38%
- ■ Split / special-election contingency: 4%

Seat-Range Estimate:

- ■ GOP net seat change: -1 (central estimate), range +2 to -3
- ■ Democratic net seat gain: +1 (central estimate), range -2 to +3

Key Races to Watch: Georgia (Ossoff, D — top Democratic vulnerability), Maine (Collins, R), North Carolina (open, R-held), Michigan (open, D-held), New Hampshire (open, D-held), and Ohio (special, R-held). If Democrats net the two seats needed for control, it would most plausibly come from Maine + North Carolina while holding Georgia and the open Michigan/New Hampshire seats; Republican retention rests on that seat cushion, NOT on flipping Montana, Ohio or West Virginia.

## Three Scenarios

### Scenario 1: Controlled Deterioration (Base Case — 62% probability)

Narrative: The Iran conflict continues through October at elevated but sub-crisis intensity. Limited strikes and counter-strikes persist; oil prices fluctuate $85–95/barrel; no major US casualties occur; diplomatic back-channels (possibly via Oman or Qatar) explore off-ramps but yield no breakthrough before the election. Trump's approval remains structurally weak (-8 to -12 net), neither rallying nor collapsing. The economy shows persistent inflation stress (GSCPI elevated, gasoline prices 10–15% above 2025 levels), but no dramatic worsening. Independent voters break modestly Democratic (52–48) in competitive districts, driven by economic dissatisfaction and conflict fatigue rather than acute crisis.

Electoral Outcome: Democrats recapture the House with a 8–12 seat majority (220–224 seats vs Republicans' 211–215). Republicans retain the Senate 51–52 seats: they hold Maine and North Carolina narrowly and pick up no net Democratic seats, while Democrats hold Georgia and the open Michigan/New Hampshire seats. (Neither Arizona nor Pennsylvania is on the 2026 Senate ballot; Montana, Ohio and West Virginia are Republican-held and not competitive.) The result is divided government with Democrats controlling the House, Republicans controlling the Senate, and Trump facing legislative gridlock for his final two years.

NERAI Index Conditions: US-Iran Tension 30–45/100, Iran Military Escalation 40–50/100, US Political Instability 20–28/100, Brent crude $85–95, GSCPI 1.5–2.0 sigma.

Policy Implications: Democrats use House control to launch investigations into conflict decision-making, block further military authorisations, and pressure Trump toward diplomatic resolution. Republicans use Senate control to confirm judges and block progressive legislation. The conflict becomes a frozen posture — neither escalating to full war nor resolving diplomatically — through the 2028 election cycle.

### Scenario 2: Escalation Shock (Worst Case for GOP — 28% probability)

Narrative: A major escalation event occurs in September or October: Iranian forces shoot down a US aircraft (F/A-18, MQ-9, or similar), killing US service members; or Iran strikes Saudi oil infrastructure (Abqaiq-scale attack), sending Brent crude to $110+/barrel; or Iran crosses a nuclear threshold (enrichment to 90%, weaponisation activity detected). The Trump administration responds with expanded strikes, potentially including limited ground operations or cyber-attacks on Iranian critical infrastructure. The conflict dominates news cycles for 4–6 weeks straight. Gasoline prices spike 25–40 cents per gallon in swing states. Independent voters, already sceptical, break decisively against Trump (58–42 Democratic lean), perceiving the escalation as catastrophic mismanagement. Trump's approval collapses to -15 or worse. Anti-war protests (analogous to 2003 Iraq protests) mobilise on college campuses and in major cities, energising Democratic turnout.

Electoral Outcome: Democrats recapture the House with a 25–35 seat majority (230–240 seats vs Republicans' 195–205), approaching the 2006 Iraq-referendum magnitude. Democrats also gain Senate seats, reaching 50-50 (with VP tie-break) or 51-49, flipping Maine and North Carolina while holding Georgia and the open Democratic seats. The result is unified Democratic control of Congress, setting up two years of investigative oversight and policy gridlock with Trump.

NERAI Index Conditions: US-Iran Tension >55/100, Iran Military Escalation >60/100, Iran Military Clash >0.20, US Political Instability >35/100, Brent crude >$110, GSCPI >2.5 sigma.

Policy Implications: Democrats use unified congressional control to force conflict de-escalation through budget restrictions, war-powers invocation, and alliance with anti-war Republicans. International pressure (UN, EU, Arab states) intensifies for ceasefire.

Iran, having achieved strategic shock, may accept mediated talks to lock in gains. The 2028 presidential cycle becomes a referendum on “who lost the Gulf” — a catastrophic frame for Republicans.

### Scenario 3: Late Rally (Best Case for GOP — 10% probability)

Narrative: A dramatic conflict-resolution breakthrough occurs in September–October: Iran agrees to verifiable nuclear concessions (enrichment cap, IAEA inspections) in exchange for sanctions relief and conflict de-escalation; or a high-value Iranian target (IRGC commander, proxy leader) is eliminated in a raid, producing a morale/strategic win without escalation; or Saudi Arabia brokers a regional security framework that effectively isolates Iran and ends the conflict. Trump claims vindication: “deterrence worked, Iran blinked, America won without a ground war.” Oil prices fall to $70–75/barrel as Hormuz fully reopens and OPEC increases production. Gasoline prices drop 15–20 cents per gallon in the final month before the election. Trump's approval rallies to -2 to +5, driven by independents giving credit for avoiding a larger war. Fox News and conservative media amplify the “Trump won” narrative; Democrats struggle to counter because the conflict tangibly improved.

Electoral Outcome: Republicans retain the House with a 2–5 seat majority (220–223 seats vs Democrats' 212–215), defying the historical midterm penalty. Republicans hold the Senate 52–54 seats, gaining no seats but losing none. The result is continued unified Republican control, validating Trump's foreign-policy approach and setting him up for a stronger position in the final two years.

NERAI Index Conditions: US-Iran Tension <25/100, Iran Military Escalation <30/100, bilateral Cooperation >50/100, Brent crude <$75, GSCPI <1.0 sigma, verifiable conflict-termination framework.

Policy Implications: Trump claims a “peace through strength” mandate, doubles down on pressure campaigns against other adversaries (China, North Korea), and uses the momentum to push domestic priorities (immigration, tax cuts) through a Republican Congress. Democrats regroup around economic issues for 2028, framing the Iran resolution as “lucky” rather than skillful.

## Key Indicators to Watch

The following indicators, monitored weekly from August through early November, will provide early warning of scenario shifts:

### Political / Approval Indicators

- **1.** Trump net approval (target: Gallup, AP-NORC, RealClearPolitics average) — Threshold: falling below -12 signals Scenario 2; rising above -5 signals Scenario 3.
- **2.** Approval of Trump's Iran handling (target: CBS, Reuters/Ipsos) — Threshold: majority disapproval (>52%) among independents signals base-case drift to Scenario 2.
- **3.** Percentage saying conflict is “not worth fighting” (target: AP-NORC, Pew) — Threshold: >55% signals Scenario 2; <40% signals Scenario 3.
- **4.** Independent voter approval of Trump (target: partisan crosstabs in national polls) — Threshold: <40% signals Scenario 2; >48% signals Scenario 3.
- **5.** Generic congressional ballot (target: RealClearPolitics average) — Threshold: D+7 or greater signals Scenario 2; R+2 or better signals Scenario 3.

### Economic / Energy Indicators

- **6.** Gasoline prices (national average) — Threshold: >$4.00/gallon signals Scenario 2; <$3.30/gallon signals Scenario 3.
- **7.** Brent crude oil price — Threshold: sustained >$105/barrel for 4 weeks signals Scenario 2; <$75/barrel signals Scenario 3.
- **8.** NY Fed GSCPI (supply-chain pressure) — Threshold: >2.0 sigma signals Scenario 2; <1.0 sigma signals Scenario 3.

### Conflict / Escalation Indicators

- **9.** US casualty events (military KIA or WIA) — Any event with 5+ US fatalities signals immediate Scenario 2 risk.
- **10.** Congressional Republican defections (votes against military authorisations, public dissent) — 10+ House Republicans or 3+ Senate Republicans publicly opposing signals Scenario 2 drift.
- **11.** Anti-war mobilisation (protest size, frequency) — Protests >50,000 in major cities, sustained over 2+ weekends, signal Scenario 2.
- **12.** Democratic messaging convergence (unified anti-war frame from leadership) — Pelosi/Schumer joint statements calling for withdrawal signal Scenario 2 setup.
- **13.** Fox News / conservative media tone shift (criticism of Trump's handling) — Tucker Carlson or similar figures breaking with Trump signals elite Republican fracture and Scenario 2 risk.

### NERAI Platform Indicators (Quantitative Early Warning)

- **14.** NERAI US Political Instability index — Threshold: >30/100 signals Scenario 2; <18/100 signals Scenario 3.
- **15.** NERAI Iran Military Escalation index — Threshold: >60/100 signals Scenario 2; <30/100 signals Scenario 3.

- **16.** NERAI US-Iran Tension Index — Threshold: sustained >50/100 for 2 weeks signals Scenario 2; <25/100 signals Scenario 3.
- **17.** NERAI bilateral Cooperation Index — Threshold: >50/100 (indicating active diplomatic engagement) signals Scenario 3.
- **18.** NERAI Iran Military Clash index (raw) — Threshold: >0.18 signals acute kinetic escalation and Scenario 2; <0.08 signals de-escalation and Scenario 3.

**Watch Protocol**

Weekly review of all 18 indicators. If 6+ indicators simultaneously cross Scenario 2 thresholds, escalate to HIGH ALERT for Democratic wave. If 6+ indicators cross Scenario 3 thresholds, escalate to RALLY WATCH for Republican resilience. Mixed signals (3–5 indicators per scenario) confirm base case.

## Final Forecast Judgment

Is the Iran conflict currently a net positive or net negative for Trump? NET NEGATIVE (HIGH CONFIDENCE). The conflict has failed to produce a rally effect, is driving energy-cost increases that feed economic dissatisfaction, and is widening the perceived theater (Iranian strikes on U.S. bases in Kuwait and Bahrain, plus the unclaimed 31 July Damietta strike on Egypt, not attributed to Iran) in ways that contradict administration messaging of "limited deterrence." Independent voters — the decisive electoral bloc — are not rewarding Trump for the conflict; they are connecting it to gasoline-price pain and questioning his competence.

Is the political risk increasing or decreasing? INCREASING (MODERATE CONFIDENCE). The NERAI 12-month forecast shows Iran Military Escalation RISING (+3 points to 47/100) and US Military Escalation declining only marginally (-2 points to 17/100), indicating the model expects prolonged tension without clean resolution. Every additional week the conflict persists without visible progress increases the risk of a galvanising opposition narrative ("endless war, no plan") taking hold. The late-July widening of the perceived theater is a particularly damaging development, arriving in the final 100 days before the election when voters' impressions harden.

Which party is more likely to benefit if the conflict continues? DEMOCRATS (HIGH CONFIDENCE). Continuation without resolution plays to Democratic strengths: economic dissatisfaction (oil prices), competence attacks ("Trump has no endgame"), and anti-war mobilisation (progressive base energised). The Republican counter-narrative — "strength through deterrence" — requires visible success to persuade independents; absent that success, it persuades only the already-committed base. The structural midterm penalty (historical average 28 House seats lost for president's party) compounds this: Democrats need only a modest national-environment advantage (D+3 to D+5) to reclaim the House, and the Iran conflict is providing exactly that advantage.

What is the most likely midterm result? DIVIDED GOVERNMENT with Democrats controlling the House (220–224 seats) and Republicans retaining the Senate (51–52 seats). Probability: 62% base case. This outcome reflects: (1) Trump's structural approval weakness producing a modest anti-incumbent lean; (2) oil-price increases activating economic dissatisfaction in suburban swing districts; (3) the absence of a conflict-driven rally among independents; (4) Republican redistricting providing a buffer that prevents a landslide; (5) the Senate seat cushion insulating that chamber from full Democratic takeover even as Republicans defend the most exposed 2026 territory. The result sets up two years of legislative gridlock, investigative oversight, and positioning for the 2028 presidential cycle.

What would change the forecast? Three developments could fundamentally alter the trajectory:

- **1.** Escalation Shock (pushes to Scenario 2, 28% probability): A high-casualty US event, Iranian strike on Saudi oil infrastructure, Hormuz closure, or nuclear threshold breach would send oil prices >$110/barrel, collapse Trump approval to -15 or worse, and trigger a Democratic wave approaching 2006 magnitude (25–35 House seats, potential Senate flip). The NERAI Iran Military Clash index (0.128, 81st percentile) and rising Military Escalation (44.6/100, RISING) indicate this risk is elevated and could materialise in the 90-day window before the election.
- **2.** Conflict Resolution Breakthrough (pushes to Scenario 3, 10% probability): A verifiable Iranian nuclear concession, high-value raid success, or Saudi-brokered regional framework that ends the conflict and drops oil prices to <$75/barrel would trigger a late Trump rally, potentially saving the House and securing the Senate. The probability is constrained because the NERAI 12-month forecast shows Iran Military Escalation RISING, not falling — the model does not expect this outcome. It would require a dramatic surprise development in September–October.
- **3.** Economic Decoupling (shifts probabilities within base case): If oil prices stabilise or fall due to non-conflict factors (OPEC production increase, demand destruction, strategic reserve release), the economic transmission weakens and the midterm becomes a purer referendum on Trump's governance. This could narrow Democratic House gains to 5–8 seats (still flipping control) and secure Republican Senate retention at 52–53 seats. The GSCPI (93rd percentile, 1.769 sigma HIGH) and Hormuz transit data (-73%, SEVERE) indicate supply-chain normalisation is unlikely in the timeframe, but external shocks (China slowdown, EU recession) could suppress oil demand.

The Iran conflict is not the sole determinant of the 2026 midterm outcome — presidential approval, the economy, candidate quality, and turnout asymmetries all matter. But the conflict is the central variable that interacts with all others: it suppresses Trump's approval, elevates oil prices (feeding economic dissatisfaction), and provides Democrats with a competence-attack narrative. Absent a dramatic shift in the conflict's trajectory, the base-case forecast of Democratic House control and Republican Senate retention holds with HIGH CONFIDENCE. The 90 days between now and the election will determine whether that base case drifts toward a Democratic wave (Scenario 2) or a Republican resilience surprise (Scenario 3). The NERAI indices will provide early warning of the drift; decision-makers should monitor the 18 key indicators weekly and recalibrate exposure accordingly.

## Footnotes

[1] CBS News, “Live Updates: Iran conflict expands as Senate again rejects effort to limit Trump's war powers,” 31 July 2026.

[2] Rolling Stone, “Trump Is Really, Really Unpopular, New Polling Shows,” 30 July 2026.

[3] American Enterprise Institute and Heritage Foundation (general institutional positions on national-security political dynamics, not specific to this cycle; cited as representative of the centre-right analytical counter-thesis).

> **Revision Note**
> Rev. 1.1 (31 Jul 2026): corrected the 2026 Senate map (Montana, Ohio and West Virginia are Republican-held; Arizona and Pennsylvania are not on the 2026 Senate ballot) and clarified that the 31 July Damietta (Egypt) drone strike was unclaimed and not attributed to Iran.

## Sources & Methodology

### Think Tank & Policy Analysis:

- Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), “Conflict-Driven Chokepoint Disruptions” and “The U.S. Economy Was Shaky Before the Iran War. Now It's in Real Trouble.”
- RAND Corporation, “A ‘Nixon to China’ Moment with Iran?” and “Experts” series.
- Brookings Institution, “The end of the American way of war?”
- Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), “Renewed Iran War Would Test Diminished Interceptor Inventories” and “Why the United States and Iran Keep Fighting While They Negotiate.”
- Chatham House, “The Houthi Red Sea blockade: Will collective maritime security be defended, or break down?”
- Middle East Forum, “Why Diplomacy Will Not Change the Islamic Republic of Iran” and “New Data Reveal the Full Scale of War Damage to Iran's Industrial Sector.”
- Korea Economic Institute of America, “How South Korea Is Weathering the Iran War Oil Shock.”

### News & Polling:

- CBS News (Iran conflict coverage and Senate votes, 31 July 2026)
- Rolling Stone (Trump approval analysis, 30 July 2026)
- Reuters (Iran conflict reporting and international dimensions)
- CNN (Egypt / Damietta port drone-strike coverage, 31 July 2026)
- CNBC (Kuwait and Bahrain strike reporting, 31 July 2026)
- Fox News (Trump statements and Saudi military posture, 31 July 2026)
- The New York Times (cyberattack reporting and intelligence assessments)
- The Guardian (Iran internal crises, 30 July 2026)
- New York Post (Trump-Netanyahu consultations)
- The Jerusalem Post (CENTCOM operations)

### Data & Indices:

- NERAI Strategic Insights Lab bilateral relationship indices, political instability indices, military escalation forecasts, and 12-month scenario projections (proprietary; data as of 30–31 July 2026).
- New York Federal Reserve Global Supply Chain Pressure Index (GSCPI), May 2026.
- IMF PortWatch maritime chokepoint transit data (Strait of Hormuz, Black Sea, Dover Strait, Malacca Strait), July 2026.
- Commodity market data (Brent crude, VIX, US 10-year Treasury yield) as of 31 July 2026.

### Methodology Note:

This report integrates quantitative NERAI geopolitical-risk indices (US-Iran bilateral tension, military escalation, political instability) with available public polling signals, economic data (oil prices, supply-chain stress), and historical midterm-election patterns to produce a probabilistic forecast of the 2026 US midterm election outcome. The central analytical framework treats the Iran conflict as a competence test in a low-trust political environment, where independent voters evaluate the administration's crisis management through economic and strategic-success lenses rather than through a binary patriotism frame. The absence of comprehensive recent polling (AP-NORC Iran-specific questions, Gallup six-month approval time-series, FiveThirtyEight aggregates) required inference from available signals (Rolling Stone characterisation, absence of reported rallies, Senate voting patterns). Where data gaps exist, confidence levels are explicitly downgraded (MODERATE or LOW). Scenario probabilities (62% base case, 28% escalation shock, 10% late rally) are derived from historical precedent (2006 Iraq midterm, 1991 Gulf War rally, 2002 post-9/11 rally), weighted by NERAI index readings (Iran Military Escalation RISING, US Political Instability STABLE, bilateral Tension 82nd percentile), and stress-tested against economic transmission mechanisms (oil-price elasticity, gasoline-price voter sensitivity). The forecast is conditional on no exogenous shocks (major natural disaster, terrorist attack on US soil, third-party military conflict) and assumes current legal/institutional frameworks hold (no Supreme Court intervention, no election-administration breakdown).

Revision history: Rev. 1.1 (31 Jul 2026) corrected the 2026 Senate map — Montana, Ohio and West Virginia are Republican-held, and Arizona and Pennsylvania are not on the 2026 Senate ballot (they remain House battlegrounds via districts such as AZ-01 and PA-07) — and clarified that the 31 July Damietta (Egypt) drone strike was unclaimed and not attributed to Iran, while Iran did claim the strikes on U.S. military assets in Kuwait (Ahmad al-Jaber Air Base) and Bahrain (Sheikh Isa Air Base). All NERAI index values, probabilities and historical facts are unchanged from the original issue.

## About the Author

| Field | Detail |
|---|---|
| **NAME** | Serhan Ayik |
| **TITLE** | Founder & Lead Geopolitical Risk Analyst, NERAI Strategic Insights Lab |
| **LOCATION** | Brussels, Belgium |
| **CONTACT** | kagan@neraicorp.com · linkedin.com/in/serhan-a |

Serhan Ayik is the founder and Lead Geopolitical Risk Analyst at NERAI Strategic Insights Lab, an AI-enabled strategic intelligence firm based in Brussels (NERAI BV, VAT BE 0726.888.207). With over 15 years of combined analytical experience spanning government intelligence and independent research, he specialises in geopolitical risk, political and economic risk analysis, and sanctions-sensitive environments — with deep regional expertise across the Middle East (Turkey, Syria, Iraq, Gulf), Eastern Europe, and Russia-sensitive jurisdictions.

Prior to founding NERAI in 2019, he served as a Senior Intelligence & Strategy Analyst at the Turkish Prime Ministry (2005–2016), where he led structured primary information-gathering, risk analysis, and escalation support across multi-stakeholder geopolitical, security and international affairs issues, supporting senior decision-makers on sensitive cross-border matters.

He holds a Master's in International Affairs / Security Studies from Pennsylvania State University and a Bachelor's in International Relations from Middle East Technical University (Ankara). His current work through NERAI applies AI-enabled risk monitoring across 60+ countries to deliver real-time, decision-relevant intelligence for institutional and private-sector clients across supply-chain risk, country risk, and cross-border investment decisions.

This research brief is part of NERAI Strategic Insights Lab's open-source strategic-analysis series. For commissioned bespoke risk assessments or institutional client engagement, contact kagan@neraicorp.com.