



Thousands of people gather in Tehran, Iran, for the funeral procession of Hamas leader Ismail Haniyeh on August 1, 2024. The sign reads, "Avenging the blood of the guest is our certain promise."
● SNN



Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu (R) shakes hands with Sen. John Fetterman (D-Pa.) after the latter delivered a controversial address to a joint session of Congress in Washington, D.C., on July 24, 2024.
● ALLISON BAILEY/AFP

Adventurer is in Tel Aviv

By Ebrahim Namdar
Middle East affairs expert

OPINION EXCLUSIVE

Recent statements from officials of the Islamic Republic of Iran suggest a resolute intent to retaliate for the terrorist act perpetrated by the Israeli regime in Tehran, resulting in the assassination of Ismail Haniyeh, the head of the Hamas Political Bureau. Global media outlets have been abuzz with analyses and speculations about this brazen act of terror and Iran's potential response.

In the past, Tehran has retaliated against Israeli terrorist operations in Damascus, which targeted Iranian military advisors at the Iranian consulate, with a major missile and drone strike against targets inside Israel. Now, many analysts are arguing that Tehran not only has the right to hit back but will also exercise that right. Allowing such terrorist actions to go unanswered would signal a weakness in Iran's defense and encourage the Israeli regime to continue its aggressive acts.

However, Iran's potential response, regardless of its magnitude, timing, and scope, has sparked international concerns about a possible new war in the West Asia region or an escalation of the ongoing Gaza conflict. The assassination of the Hamas leader indicates that Benjamin Netanyahu has no intention of pursuing peace or ending the war. As some experts have suggested, the targeted killing of Haniyeh in Tehran was likely intended to provoke Iran into a war with Israel.

It is obvious that Israel lacks the capacity to engage in a new war on multiple fronts with the axis of resistance and is heavily dependent on unwavering support from the United States. Conversely, the Americans have publicly expressed their reluctance to engage in a new war in the region. They maintained a similar stance during the previous confrontation between Iran and Israel and made extensive diplomatic efforts and held talks with Iran, regional countries, and even Iran's friends to prevent a new war or a spillover of the existing one and to persuade Tehran to exercise restraint. It appears they are now adopting a similar approach, urging Tehran to stand down.

If the Americans and Europeans are genuine in their statements opposing a wider war, they must acknowledge the potential consequences for Europe and America as well. However, mere statements of opposition are insufficient to prevent a new war. It requires proactive initiatives and

actions from the powers that have influence over regional dynamics. Netanyahu's belligerent adventures may soon become a fait accompli, leaving little room to mitigate the fallout.

As Israel's strategic ally, the United States, along with supportive European countries, should have long ago implemented measures to prevent such incidents. Their eleventh-hour calls for restraint from Tehran, without exerting any meaningful pressure on Israel, contradict their professed positions against war. The US president's hopes for Tehran's restraint ring hollow alongside his explicit support for Israel.

Tehran, drawing on its extensive experience dealing with Israel, will undoubtedly respond to this terrorist act based on meticulous security, political, regional, and international assessments. It will choose the appropriate time and place for its response, safeguarding its interests and strengthening its deterrence. As demonstrated in the past, this could include missile and drone strikes on positions in occupied territories without fanning the flames of war.

If influential powers in regional affairs genuinely seek to avert the consequences of heightened tensions between the Resistance Front and Israel, they should refrain from jumping to conclusions and exerting all their diplomatic and field pressure on one side. It is Tel Aviv, not Tehran, that needs to be reined in and held accountable for its adventurism and warmongering.

Iran's response to assassination of Ismail Haniyeh

From diplomacy to battlefield



By Navid Kamali
Foreign affairs expert

OPINION EXCLUSIVE

The cowardly assassination of Ismail Haniyeh in Tehran marks a significant point in the hybrid warfare of Israel against Iran and the Axis of Resistance. This incident, occurring on the night of Masoud Pezeshkian's inauguration as the new president of Iran, is by no means coincidental. It aligns with the strategic objectives of Israel against the Axis of Resistance, which is led by the Islamic Republic of Iran.

As the positions taken by Western and Israeli think tanks and research institutes indicate, one of the main objectives of this terrorist act was to pose political and security challenges for the new Iranian government, disrupting the government's ability to focus on priority political and economic issues and hindering it from fulfilling its promises. Therefore, this assassination has several dimensions that must be addressed with an intelligent response, leveraging various capacities of the Resistance Front.

Analyzing this terrorist incident requires first examining its timing. Executing this operation on the night of the new president's inauguration allowed Israel to exploit potential security and political vulnerabilities. However, the prudent reaction of Tehran, including the measured messages from the Leader and Pezeshkian, demonstrated that this expectation was naive. The government wisely refrained from making hasty reactions to this

crime, stabilizing the country. Nevertheless, the primary aim of this terrorist act was to preoccupy Pezeshkian and his government with the repercussions of this assassination, thereby preventing them from focusing on other crucial issues. This would have perpetuated the economic and social challenges, creating public dissatisfaction and labeling the government as ineffective. It is evident that the Zionists and their overt and covert allies are determined to foil the new

Iranian government's plans, viewing any potential setbacks and failures in fulfilling Pezeshkian's promises as valuable achievements. Moreover, Israel's new gamble is rooted in the heavy blows it received in the Gaza war. The Zionist regime's cabinet, engaged in a prolonged and attritional war, attempts to directly involve Iran in this war and use global platforms to garner European and American support to end its own political isolation. The Is-

raelis are aware that the Islamic Republic of Iran cannot ignore a terrorist attack on a foreign official on its soil, as it constitutes an assault on the country's sovereignty and security. According to international rules, a proportionate response to this crime is legitimate. Therefore, it seems the Zionist regime aims to force Iran into a predictable stance, enabling it to shape subsequent conditions and reactions to its advantage. Hence, in response to the Zionists' crime, including the

assassination of Martyr Ismail Haniyeh, Iran must employ a calculated strategy, utilizing the country's capacities. The international dimensions of this terrorist incident and its connection to the US elections should also be noted, as this assassination is not unrelated to the fate of the White House. Kamala Harris, the vice president of the United States and the Democratic presidential candidate, has so far taken positions against the current Israeli cabi-

net led by Benjamin Netanyahu, especially regarding the Gaza war. However, in the American election atmosphere and under the influence of Zionist lobbies, any escalation in West Asia may compel her and her party to support Netanyahu's warlike policies. That is because not decisively supporting the Zionists in a war against a power like Iran could weaken her political position against her Republican rival, Donald Trump. Consequently, Israel can create political