

Iran's Retaliations: differences and similarities

	April 13 th , 2024	August ??, 2024
The context	Attack to Iranian Embassy	Assassination of HAMAS Leader within Iran
Scope of retaliation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> pre-warned, designed for limited targeting and damage, learning about strengths and weaknesses of AD systems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> uncertainty about warning, scope, targeting, and escalation Built on coordinated attacks of proxies Objective is to saturate Iron Dome, which is likely deemed de-escalatory for Israel's future steps
Character of retaliation	responsive but de-escalatory	unknown, likely de-escalatory, but escalation is still plausible
International Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> firm support to Israel lack of support to Iran 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> firm support to Israel, G7 statement lack of firm support from China and Russia,
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> face-saving, first direct targeting of Israel, limited damage, failed to build deterrence under the best conditions for Israel, and the worst conditions for Iran 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> face-saving, more intense targeting of Israel, considerable damage, adequate to build deterrence under the worst conditions for Israel, better conditions of Iran

Fusion4Strategy Assessment:

- The context of the retaliation in terms of the sovereignty resembles, but the assassination of HAMAS leader within Iran is perceived as an act humiliation, which increases the likelihood of a stronger retaliation.
- The likely objective of the retaliation is to saturate the Iron Dome to deter Israel from future acts against Iran, which will likely be ensured with wider damage against Israel's military assets and bases.
- While Iran highly likely feels obligated to retaliate with an objective to deter Israel from future escalatory acts within its territory, simultaneously Iran will likely refrain from further escalation, which is deemed destructive to its security, presuming that Israel and the West are seeking a pretext to justify a military intervention to the extent of triggering a regime change and degrading its nuclear program.
- Given the fact that Iran refrains from direct confrontation thanks to its strategic patience until it acquires nuclear capability, and the lack of international support to Iran reduces the likelihood for extensive and destructive retaliation to Israel.
- However, uncertainties about the Iranian capabilities (on hypersonic missiles, naval drones, and nuclear) and the intent significantly increase the risks of wider escalation.