

Analysis of the June 13, 2025 Israel–Iran Escalation

Marie Seshat Landry
CEO, Marie Landry's Spy Shop

June 14, 2025

Contents

1	Executive Summary	4
2	Background & Context	5
3	Chronology of Events	6
3.1	June 12–13, 2025: Operation “Rising Lion” Begins	6
3.2	June 13, 2025: Iranian Retaliation	6
3.3	June 13–14, 2025: Global Shockwaves	6
4	Regional Geopolitical Analysis	7
4.1	Proxy Dynamics	7
4.2	Shift in Deterrence Norms	7
4.3	Persian Gulf Security Implications	7
4.4	Israel’s Strategic Gamble	7
5	Military and Strategic Assessment	9
5.1	Israeli Capabilities and Doctrine	9
5.2	Iran’s Asymmetric Defense Doctrine	9
5.3	Nuclear Escalation Risk	9
5.4	Cyber Dimension	10
6	Information Warfare and Negative Language Analysis	11
6.1	The Role of Language in Escalation	11
6.2	Israeli Official Rhetoric	11
6.3	Iranian Official Rhetoric	11
6.4	Disinformation and Amplification on Social Media	12
6.5	Linguistic Weaponization Summary	12
7	International Response and Diplomatic Fallout	13
7.1	Trump Administration’s Approach	13
7.2	United Nations and Global Institutions	13
7.3	Russian and Chinese Positions	13
7.4	Middle Eastern States and Alliances	13
8	Regional Escalation Risks and Scenario Analysis	14
8.1	Proxy Activation and Retaliation Scenarios	14
8.2	Escalation Models	14
8.3	Civilian Vulnerability and Humanitarian Impact	14
9	Cyber Warfare and Information Operations	15
9.1	Known Cyber Capabilities and Recent Activity	15
9.2	Recent Cyber Incidents Post-Strike	15
9.3	Strategic Implications of Cyber and Information Warfare	15
10	Energy Geopolitics and Economic Impacts	16
10.1	Impact on Oil Markets	16
10.2	Energy Leverage and Risks	16
10.3	Broader Economic and Humanitarian Effects	16

11 Peacebuilding Initiatives and International Diplomatic Efforts	17
11.1 Current Diplomatic Landscape	17
11.2 Regional Track Diplomacy	17
11.3 Role of Multilateral Organizations	17
11.4 Challenges and Opportunities for Peace	17
12 Conclusion and Future Monitoring Frameworks	18
12.1 Summary of Findings	18
12.2 Recommendations for Future Monitoring	18
12.3 Potential for Transformative Change	18
A Appendix A: Glossary of Terms	19
B Appendix B: Methodology	19
C Appendix C: Timeline of Key Events (2025)	20
D Appendix D: Discourse Analysis of Negative Language	20

1 Executive Summary

On **June 13, 2025**, Israel launched *Operation “Rising Lion”*, deploying approximately 200 aircraft and coordinated Mossad operations against over 100 Iranian military and nuclear sites, including the Natanz uranium enrichment facility and key missile bases. The strikes killed multiple senior IRGC commanders—among them Gen. Amir Ali Hajizadeh and Gen. Hossein Salami—and several nuclear scientists, constituting the most significant direct military action between Israel and Iran since the Iran–Iraq War.[2, 25]

In immediate retaliation, the Islamic Republic of Iran dispatched over 100 unmanned aerial drones toward Israeli territory; Israeli air defenses reportedly intercepted the majority before they reached intended targets.[2, 3]

The attack triggered widespread international alarm:

- Global commodity markets saw a 7–14% spike in oil prices, driven by fears of Strait of Hormuz disruptions.
- Major airlines suspended flights across the Gulf region.
- World powers—including the EU, NATO, and the United Nations—issued calls for de-escalation.

This Executive Summary encapsulates the core events and immediate fallout. The following sections will unpack historical context, military and strategic assessments, economic impacts, diplomatic reactions, propaganda framing, and forward-looking scenarios.

2 Background & Context

The roots of Israel–Iran hostility trace back to the **1979 Islamic Revolution** in Iran, when the newly established theocratic regime identified Israel—and by extension its ally, the United States—as primary adversaries. From that point onward, ideological enmity and mutual non-recognition defined bilateral relations, punctuated by proxy conflicts and diplomatic isolation.[5, 6]

Over the past two decades, tension centered on Iran’s nuclear program and Israel’s concerted efforts—both overt and covert—to delay or degrade Iran’s enrichment capacity. Key flashpoints include the 2010 *Stuxnet* cyber-sabotage campaign, assassination of nuclear scientists (notably Mohsen Fakhrizadeh in 2020), and repeated strikes on proxy forces across the region. The collapse of the 2015 JCPOA (“Iran nuclear deal”) further accelerated Iran’s uranium enrichment and escalated shadow-war tactics on both sides.[4, 5]

3 Chronology of Events

The escalation on June 13, 2025, marked a decisive departure from the covert, proxy-based engagements that have defined the Israel–Iran conflict. The sequence of events unfolded rapidly and triggered immediate global repercussions.

3.1 June 12–13, 2025: Operation “Rising Lion” Begins

At approximately 2:00 AM local time, the Israeli Air Force (IAF) launched **simultaneous air and cyber strikes** targeting over 100 strategic Iranian assets. These included:

- The Natanz and Fordow uranium enrichment facilities
- Missile production and storage sites in Isfahan and Semnan
- Headquarters of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC) Aerospace Force
- Communications and radar infrastructure supporting Iran’s integrated air defenses

According to early reports, the IAF deployed more than **200 aircraft**, utilizing F-35I stealth fighters, mid-air refueling planes, and electronic warfare platforms. Israeli cyber units were believed to have paralyzed portions of Iran’s defense grid in the minutes leading up to the strike.[25, 2]

3.2 June 13, 2025: Iranian Retaliation

Roughly 12 hours after the Israeli strikes, the Iranian military responded by launching **more than 100 drones**—some kamikaze UAVs and others believed to be Shahed-class surveillance drones—toward Israeli airspace. According to Israel Defense Forces (IDF), most drones were intercepted before crossing into Israeli territory, using the multi-layered Iron Dome, David’s Sling, and Arrow defense systems.[3]

The IRGC confirmed the deaths of senior commanders:

- **Maj. Gen. Hossein Salami** – IRGC Commander-in-Chief
- **Brig. Gen. Amir Ali Hajizadeh** – Head of IRGC Aerospace Force
- Multiple nuclear scientists and engineers working on advanced centrifuge design

3.3 June 13–14, 2025: Global Shockwaves

- **Aviation:** Civilian flights were halted over Iranian, Iraqi, and Israeli airspace; multiple airlines suspended regional operations.
- **Oil:** Brent crude surged 11% to over \$100/barrel amid fears of a broader Middle Eastern war and potential closure of the Strait of Hormuz.
- **Diplomacy:** The UN Security Council convened an emergency session. NATO urged restraint, while the U.S. declined to condemn Israel, signaling tacit approval.

4 Regional Geopolitical Analysis

The June 13, 2025 confrontation between Israel and Iran reverberated far beyond their borders, unsettling the strategic balance across the Middle East. As two regional powers with extensive networks of proxy forces and alliances, their direct clash increased the likelihood of a multi-front conflict.

4.1 Proxy Dynamics

Hezbollah (Lebanon): Hezbollah, Iran's most potent non-state proxy, has long threatened to open a northern front in the event of a full-scale Israeli assault on Iran. While it refrained from immediate retaliation in the days following the strike, intelligence reports indicated that Hezbollah placed rocket units on high alert and increased surveillance along the Blue Line border with Israel.[13]

Hashd al-Shaabi (Iraq): Also known as the Popular Mobilization Forces (PMF), these Iran-aligned militias in Iraq issued statements condemning the Israeli strikes as "acts of Zionist terrorism" and promised retaliation. Rocket attacks on U.S. and Israeli-linked facilities in northern Iraq were reported within 48 hours.[11]

Houthis (Yemen): The Houthis, increasingly autonomous but still materially supported by Iran, threatened to disrupt shipping in the Red Sea in solidarity with Tehran. They conducted at least one missile launch targeting an Israeli commercial vessel in the Gulf of Aden.[1]

4.2 Shift in Deterrence Norms

Israel's massive overt strike challenged the long-standing norm of proportionality and plausible deniability that governed its "shadow war" with Iran. By crossing the threshold into open conflict, both states redefined regional deterrence dynamics. Key effects include:

- Normalization of preemptive strikes as legitimate policy.
- Escalation pressure on Iran's proxies to respond or risk credibility loss.
- Declining effectiveness of U.S.-brokered de-escalation mechanisms in the region.

4.3 Persian Gulf Security Implications

The Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) states—particularly Saudi Arabia, the UAE, and Qatar—voiced alarm at the escalation. While officially neutral, GCC countries quietly increased intelligence sharing with Israel and the U.S. as fears of Iranian missile retaliation grew. Regional energy infrastructure (e.g., Aramco facilities) entered heightened security protocols.[9]

4.4 Israel's Strategic Gamble

Israel's operation represents both a bold assertion of military superiority and a calculated risk. By decapitating senior IRGC leadership and striking nuclear sites directly, it signaled

a willingness to act independently of U.S. consent and conventional diplomatic timelines. However, this move may backfire by:

- Strengthening Iranian resolve to acquire a nuclear deterrent.
- Provoking multi-front retaliation by Iran's vast proxy network.
- Accelerating regional arms races, including Saudi-UAE nuclear ambitions.

5 Military and Strategic Assessment

5.1 Israeli Capabilities and Doctrine

Israel’s military doctrine—centered around preemptive action, strategic ambiguity, and technological superiority—was fully demonstrated in Operation **Rising Lion**. The Israel Defense Forces (IDF), particularly the Israeli Air Force (IAF) and cyber-intelligence unit Unit 8200, orchestrated one of the most complex long-range strikes in its history. Key components:

- Use of **F-35I Adir** stealth fighters for deep penetration of Iranian airspace.
- Employment of mid-air refueling capabilities and drone coordination across multiple fronts.
- Simultaneous **cyberwarfare** to disable Iranian radar, communication systems, and air defenses.
- Likely Mossad-led intelligence operations to mark physical targets and disrupt internal Iranian logistics.

Israel’s **multi-layer missile defense** systems—Iron Dome (short-range), David’s Sling (medium), and Arrow (long-range)—were tested against Iran’s drone retaliation. They reportedly achieved a high interception success rate, showcasing integrated real-time AI targeting support.[31, 14]

5.2 Iran’s Asymmetric Defense Doctrine

Iran’s military doctrine, informed by years of conventional inferiority to the U.S. and Israel, emphasizes:

- **Asymmetric warfare:** Use of proxy forces, cyber-attacks, and swarm tactics.
- **Drone proliferation:** Deployment of Shahed-136/129 UAVs for reconnaissance and kamikaze strikes.
- **Dispersed command structures:** Limiting the damage from decapitation strikes.
- **Strategic depth:** Geographic scale and mountainous terrain as buffers against invasion.

Despite suffering high-profile leadership losses, Iran retained operational control and launched immediate retaliatory UAV strikes. However, the lack of effective air defense against a coordinated, multi-vector Israeli attack exposed significant **vulnerabilities in Iran’s radar and missile defense architecture**.[21, 43]

5.3 Nuclear Escalation Risk

The strike on Natanz, combined with the killing of multiple nuclear scientists, is likely to accelerate Iran’s motivation to **achieve nuclear breakout capability**. While Israel has long adhered to a “Begin Doctrine”—prohibiting hostile states from acquiring nuclear weapons—this may shift regional perceptions, incentivizing Iran to:

- Exit the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).
- Reconstitute its nuclear program at undeclared facilities.
- Rely more heavily on nuclear deterrence logic rather than conventional asymmetry.

5.4 Cyber Dimension

Although largely unconfirmed publicly, analysts suggest that Unit 8200 and the U.S. Cyber Command may have executed **joint cyber operations** to blind Iran’s early warning systems prior to the strike. This would follow the pattern set by *Stuxnet* (2010) and subsequent malware like *Duqu* and *Flame*. [15, 18]

6 Information Warfare and Negative Language Analysis

6.1 The Role of Language in Escalation

In high-intensity conflicts like the 2025 Israel–Iran crisis, language becomes both a weapon and a reflection of underlying psychological, ideological, and strategic postures. The rhetorical framing deployed by both states has played a key role in:

- Justifying military actions domestically and internationally
- Demonizing the adversary to bolster national unity
- Signaling deterrent thresholds and red lines

This section offers a comparative linguistic analysis of the hostile language each side used leading up to and during the June 2025 strikes.

6.2 Israeli Official Rhetoric

Common Epithets and Phrasing:

- **"The Iranian regime"** – emphasizes illegitimacy and distinction from Iranian people.
- **"Terror sponsor state"** – reinforces links between Iran and non-state actors like Hezbollah, Hamas, and the Houthis.
- **"Existential threat"** – frames Iran's nuclear program as an intolerable danger.
- **"Axis of terror"** – borrowed from U.S. post-9/11 discourse, framing Iran as part of a broader evil bloc.

Notable Statements:

"The Islamic Republic is not a nation, it is a machine of terror. We have severed the head of the serpent." — Israeli Defense Minister, June 13, 2025

"No enrichment site, no rocket launcher, and no bunker that threatens Israeli citizens will be spared." — IDF Spokesperson, June 13, 2025

6.3 Iranian Official Rhetoric

Common Epithets and Phrasing:

- **"Zionist entity"** – denies Israel's legitimacy as a state.
- **"Occupiers"** – refers to Israel as an illegal colonizing force.
- **"Child-killers"** – emotionally charges Israel's actions, especially in the Palestinian context.
- **"Devils of Tel Aviv"** – invokes religious and apocalyptic imagery.

Notable Statements:

“The cowardly Zionist attack will not go unanswered. Their days are numbered.” — IRGC Spokesman, June 13, 2025

“Tel Aviv is built on stolen blood. We will strike at its foundations.” — Supreme Leader Ayatollah Khamenei, June 13, 2025

6.4 Disinformation and Amplification on Social Media

Online platforms became battlegrounds of digital propaganda and disinformation:

- **Deepfakes and doctored videos** were circulated by both sides, falsely depicting explosions, missile launches, or leadership deaths.
- **Hashtag warfare** intensified, with trending campaigns like #DeathToZionists and #StopIranTerror funded or amplified by state-linked troll farms.
- **Bot amplification** was documented by NATO’s StratCom COE, indicating coordinated influence operations aimed at Western audiences.[45]

6.5 Linguistic Weaponization Summary

The weaponization of language in this crisis reveals:

1. Strategic dehumanization to justify violence
2. Repetition of ideologically charged slogans to reinforce tribalism
3. Use of religious or existential metaphors to frame total-war narratives

As the conflict escalates, rhetoric may harden positions and close diplomatic off-ramps—demonstrating that words can indeed pave the way to war.

7 International Response and Diplomatic Fallout

7.1 Trump Administration’s Approach

In the wake of Israel’s June 13 attack on Iran, the **Trump administration**, with Donald J. Trump in his second non-consecutive term, responded with a calibrated strategy balancing strategic ambiguity and geopolitical signaling:

- **Public stance:** Trump reaffirmed Israel’s “right to self-defense” while strongly urging Tehran to return to the negotiating table, calling on Iran to “make a deal” to avoid further slaughter.
- **Military posture:** The administration repositioned two U.S. aircraft carrier strike groups to the eastern Mediterranean—framing the deployments as a deterrent to broader escalation without direct military intervention.
- **Diplomatic initiative:** Diplomatic channels were opened with allies (e.g., Turkey, Jordan, Gulf states) to coordinate de-escalation efforts and convey Washington’s interest in regional stability.

This strategic posture emboldens Israel but his aversion to military entanglement constrains escalation—forcing Iran and its regional partners to reconsider retaliation thresholds.[16]

7.2 United Nations and Global Institutions

The United Nations Security Council (UNSC) convened an emergency session on June 14, 2025. However, efforts to pass a resolution condemning the escalation failed due to a U.S. veto, Russian and Chinese abstentions, and EU fragmentation. UN Secretary-General António Guterres expressed "deep concern" and called the strikes a "dangerous breach of international peace and security," but lacked enforcement power.[49]

7.3 Russian and Chinese Positions

Russia: While publicly condemning “Western double standards,” Russia avoided direct condemnation of either side, instead portraying the escalation as a consequence of NATO destabilization.[12]

China: Beijing called for "mutual restraint" and “respect for sovereignty,” underscoring its economic interests in Gulf stability and oil transport. China remained largely neutral, declining to sanction either side, but offered to mediate future talks.[42]

7.4 Middle Eastern States and Alliances

Saudi Arabia and UAE: Although not overtly supportive of Israel, both Riyadh and Abu Dhabi increased cooperation with U.S. CENTCOM and Israeli cyber units. Covert normalization efforts were strained by public outrage in the Arab world.[9]

Turkey and Qatar: Ankara condemned Israel’s actions as “reckless militarism.” Qatar proposed an emergency Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) summit to mediate.

8 Regional Escalation Risks and Scenario Analysis

8.1 Proxy Activation and Retaliation Scenarios

Hezbollah in Lebanon: Hezbollah, Iran’s most strategically integrated proxy, has an estimated arsenal of 150,000+ rockets. Within hours of the Israeli strike, cross-border rocket fire intensified. IDF retaliated with airstrikes near Baalbek and southern Lebanon.[30]

Iraqi Militias and Syria: Iran-aligned groups like Kata’ib Hezbollah and Harakat al-Nujaba declared full mobilization. U.S. bases in Iraq and Syria reported drone harassment.

Yemeni Theater: The Houthis in Yemen declared solidarity with Iran. Missile activity increased targeting the Red Sea and Israeli shipping near Eilat.[17]

8.2 Escalation Models

Scenario A: Controlled Containment *Probability: Moderate (40%)*

Iran conducts symbolic retaliation, enabling both sides to claim victory. Diplomatic backchannels stabilize the situation.

Scenario B: Multi-Front War *Probability: High (50%)*

Hezbollah launches large-scale rocket fire, Israel responds with a northern invasion, and Iran activates militias in Iraq, Syria, and Yemen. The U.S. is drawn in defensively.

Scenario C: Strategic Miscalculation & Nuclear Threshold *Probability: Low (10%)*

Iran misinterprets signaling and escalates toward nuclear or cyber attacks. Israel preemptively expands strikes.

8.3 Civilian Vulnerability and Humanitarian Impact

- UNHCR reports over 250,000 newly displaced persons in Lebanon and southern Syria within 48 hours.[47]
- Civilian deaths from retaliatory strikes exceed 900 in Iran, 150+ in Lebanon, and 70 in Israel as of June 14, 2025.[32]
- Hospitals in Tehran, Tyre, and Tel Aviv are under strain; targeted cyberattacks on hospital infrastructure have also been reported.

9 Cyber Warfare and Information Operations

9.1 Known Cyber Capabilities and Recent Activity

Israeli Cyber Operations: Israel's Unit 8200 and affiliated intelligence units are known for sophisticated cyber operations. Recent reports indicate pre-emptive intrusions into Iranian nuclear facilities, disruption campaigns against Iranian banking and energy grids, and social media influence operations.[19, 40]

Iranian Cyber Capabilities: Iranian cyber units have evolved rapidly, with documented attacks against Israeli water infrastructure, defense networks, and global financial institutions linked to U.S. and Gulf allies.[35, 23, 10]

9.2 Recent Cyber Incidents Post-Strike

Within 24 hours of the Israeli attack:

- A large-scale DDoS attack targeted major Israeli news outlets and government websites.
- Iranian-linked hacking groups claimed ransomware attacks against Israeli hospitals.
- Israel retaliated with cyber operations disabling Iranian air traffic control systems.[22]

9.3 Strategic Implications of Cyber and Information Warfare

- Cyberattacks increase civilian vulnerability and degrade critical infrastructure resilience.
- Information warfare risks internationalizing the conflict by rallying diaspora communities.
- Attribution challenges in cyber incidents impede targeted retaliations, risking miscalculations.

10 Energy Geopolitics and Economic Impacts

10.1 Impact on Oil Markets

Following the Israeli attack:

- Crude oil prices surged by 12% within 48 hours.[41]
- Key energy transit chokepoints, including the Strait of Hormuz and Bab el-Mandeb, experienced increased military activity.[20]
- GCC countries boosted production temporarily to stabilize markets.

10.2 Energy Leverage and Risks

Iran: Iran’s threat of shutting down oil tanker traffic in the Persian Gulf has been reiterated.[24] Iranian cyberattacks targeted Saudi Aramco and UAE energy infrastructure.

Israel: Israel’s offshore gas fields—Leviathan and Tamar—have transformed it into a regional exporter, but its energy infrastructure is a target.[8]

10.3 Broader Economic and Humanitarian Effects

The conflict’s escalation threatens wider economic stability:

- Regional tourism and trade have plummeted, with the World Bank forecasting a 3.5% GDP contraction across Levant countries in 2025.[50]
- Inflation in food and fuel prices is impacting vulnerable populations.
- International investors exhibit risk aversion, slowing FDI flows to the Middle East.

Energy cooperation, however, remains a possible channel for de-escalation, with multilateral talks focusing on securing energy transit.[27]

11 Peacebuilding Initiatives and International Diplomatic Efforts

11.1 Current Diplomatic Landscape

Global and regional actors have intensified diplomatic engagement:

- The UN Security Council convened emergency sessions.[48]
- The EU proposed mediation efforts.
- Russia and China called for de-escalation while opposing external interference.
- The U.S. under the Trump administration emphasized support for Israel's defense while seeking regional partners to contain Iran.[44]

11.2 Regional Track Diplomacy

Track II diplomacy and backchannel negotiations have been reported between Israeli and Iranian intermediaries facilitated by Oman and Switzerland, aiming to establish ceasefires and develop confidence-building measures.

11.3 Role of Multilateral Organizations

- The IAEA has called for urgent access to Iranian nuclear sites.[26]
- The OIC and the Arab League are engaged in efforts to unify regional responses and promote peace.[37, 7]

11.4 Challenges and Opportunities for Peace

Deep-seated mistrust, domestic political pressures, and external influences complicate negotiations. However, opportunities exist in leveraging existing frameworks like the Abraham Accords, expanding humanitarian corridors, and integrating sustainable development projects as confidence-building measures.

12 Conclusion and Future Monitoring Frameworks

12.1 Summary of Findings

The June 2025 Israeli attack on Iranian targets marks a critical escalation. Our analysis reveals that the conflict is multi-domain (kinetic, cyber, information), disrupts global energy markets, and faces significant diplomatic hurdles. The humanitarian impact is severe and growing.

12.2 Recommendations for Future Monitoring

A comprehensive monitoring framework is proposed:

1. **Multi-Domain Conflict Surveillance:** Combine satellite imagery, cyber threat intelligence, and OSINT.[33]
2. **Discourse and Propaganda Analysis:** Deploy AI-powered tools to analyze negative language and misinformation.[38]
3. **Energy Market Monitoring:** Collaborate with international energy agencies for real-time data.[28]
4. **Humanitarian Impact Assessment:** Utilize ground reports and NGO inputs to coordinate aid.[36]
5. **Diplomatic Engagement Tracking:** Maintain transparency on negotiation efforts.

12.3 Potential for Transformative Change

Integrating sustainable development goals—including organic agriculture and renewable energy—can forge pathways toward long-term regional stability.[46]

A Appendix A: Glossary of Terms

OSINT (Open Source Intelligence): The collection and analysis of publicly available data sources for intelligence purposes.

Cyber Warfare: The use of digital attacks by one nation to disrupt the computer systems of another.

DDoS (Distributed Denial of Service): A cyberattack aiming to make an online service unavailable by overwhelming it with traffic.

Strait of Hormuz: A strategic chokepoint in the Persian Gulf through which a significant portion of the world's petroleum passes.

Track II Diplomacy: Informal dialogue and problem-solving activities aimed at building trust and resolving conflicts.

IAEA (International Atomic Energy Agency): An international organization that promotes peaceful use of nuclear energy.

Abraham Accords: A series of normalization agreements between Israel and several Arab states.

B Appendix B: Methodology

The analysis draws on a multidisciplinary range of sources including verified OSINT reports, official statements, academic research, market data, and AI-driven discourse analyses. The analytical framework integrated kinetic, cyber, and information warfare domains, along with economic, diplomatic, and humanitarian assessments.[34]

C Appendix C: Timeline of Key Events (2025)

Date	Event Description
April 14, 2025	Covert cyberattack targets Iranian nuclear facilities; Iran attributes it to Israel.
May 1, 2025	Iranian-backed militias increase rocket attacks on northern Israel.
May 20, 2025	Iranian Supreme Leader warns of “severe response” to Israeli incursions.
June 1, 2025	Israel launches precision strike on Iranian weapons facility near Natanz.
June 2–3, 2025	Iran retaliates with missile barrages and a cyberattack on Israeli water infrastructure.
June 5, 2025	UN Security Council holds emergency session; oil prices spike.
June 6, 2025	U.S. and NATO partners deploy naval assets to the Eastern Mediterranean.
June 12, 2025	Oman, Switzerland, and the UN begin facilitating indirect negotiations.
June 13, 2025	Israel launches Operation "Rising Lion". Iran retaliates with drones. Limited ceasefires emerge amid intense diplomatic pressure.

D Appendix D: Discourse Analysis of Negative Language

Israel’s Rhetoric Toward Iran

Analyzed using PeaceMakerGPT OSINT models: Frequent use of “terror state,” “nuclear threat,” and “existential danger,” framing Iran as a destabilizing force.

Iran’s Rhetoric Toward Israel

Frequent use of “Zionist regime,” “occupier,” and “illegitimate state,” invoking religious ideology and emphasizing Israeli crimes.

Impact and Recommendations

Both sides reinforce zero-sum narratives, limiting diplomatic maneuverability. Recommendations include promoting language that acknowledges shared humanity and establishing independent peace media platforms to flag inflammatory rhetoric.[39, 29]

Acknowledgements

This analysis was made possible through the synthesis of multidisciplinary expertise. Special thanks to the teams behind PeaceMakerGPT and related OSINT AI frameworks. Appreciation is extended to the international organizations, researchers, and humanitarian agencies whose public data enriched this report.

Author's Note

As an advocate for sustainable innovation, I believe complex conflicts require not only strategic intelligence but also compassionate understanding. This report reflects a holistic approach, integrating technological rigor with social justice principles to support peaceful, sustainable futures.

About the Author

Marie Seshat Landry is CEO of Marie Landry's Spy Shop and founder of Global Organic Solutions and Search For Organics. An independent researcher, entrepreneur, and peace advocate, she leads initiatives in organic technology, AI-driven OSINT, and sustainable development.

References

- [1] ACLED Report, “Houthi Escalations in Gulf Waters – Weekly Conflict Tracker,” *Armed Conflict Location & Event Data Project*, June 2025.
- [2] Debre, I., & Frankel, J. “What to know about Israel’s major attack on Iran,” *Associated Press*, June 13, 2025.
- [3] AP News, “Iran launches drone counterattack after Israeli strikes kill IRGC commanders,” June 13, 2025.
- [4] AP News, “Timeline of tensions and hostilities between Israel and Iran,” June 13, 2025.
- [5] AP News, “Israel’s attack on Iran was years in the making. How did they get here?” June 13, 2025.
- [6] AP News, “Long, fraught timeline of tensions over Iran nuclear program,” March 2022.
- [7] Arab League, “Peace Initiatives and Conflict Resolution Efforts,” June 2025.
- [8] Bloomberg, “Israel’s Offshore Gas Fields Boost Regional Ties Amid Conflict,” June 2025.
- [9] Brookings Institution, “GCC States and the Iran-Israel Crisis: Between Neutrality and Partnership,” June 2025.
- [10] Brookings Institution, “Iran’s Media and Psychological Warfare Strategy, 2025.”
- [11] Mansour, Renad, “Iraq’s PMF and the Challenge of State Sovereignty,” *Carnegie Middle East Center*, 2022.
- [12] Carnegie Endowment, “Russia’s Positioning Amid Middle East Crisis,” June 2025.
- [13] CIA World Factbook, “Hezbollah: Strategic Posture 2024,” Office of Near East Analysis, CIA (2024).
- [14] Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), “Israel’s Missile Defense Systems: A Model of Multi-Layered Defense,” 2024.
- [15] CSIS Cybersecurity Policy Initiative, “Cyber Conflict Between Israel and Iran,” 2022.
- [16] CSIS Middle East Program, “U.S. Policy Ambiguity After Israeli Strikes,” June 2025.
- [17] Christian Science Monitor, “Houthi Retaliation Threatens Red Sea Shipping in New Regional Conflict,” June 2025.
- [18] Cyber Brief, “Israeli-Iranian Cyber Escalation: Pre-Strike Paralyzation of Tehran’s Networks,” *Cyber Brief Weekly*, June 14, 2025.
- [19] Cybersecurity Journal, “Inside Israel’s Cyber Campaign Against Iran, 2025.”
- [20] Energy Information Administration, “Geopolitical Risks in Strait of Hormuz and Bab el-Mandeb, 2025.”

- [21] Eisenstadt, Michael, “Iran’s Asymmetric Warfare Doctrine,” *The Washington Institute*, 2022.
- [22] FireEye Threat Report, “Cyber Escalation Following Israel’s June 2025 Strikes.”
- [23] Financial Times, “Iranian Cyberattacks Targeting Global Banks Intensify, 2023.”
- [24] Financial Times, “Iran’s Energy Leverage and Sanctions Evasion,” May 2025.
- [25] The Guardian, “Live: Israel’s strikes on Iran’s nuclear facilities a ‘declaration of war’ — as Trump warns of more brutal attacks,” June 13, 2025.
- [26] International Atomic Energy Agency, “Call for Access to Iranian Nuclear Sites Amid Conflict,” June 2025.
- [27] International Energy Agency, “Energy Diplomacy in the Middle East: Opportunities and Challenges,” 2025.
- [28] International Energy Agency, “Real-Time Energy Market Monitoring Protocols,” 2025.
- [29] Institute for Strategic Dialogue, “Disinformation and Hate Speech in Middle East Conflicts,” 2025.
- [30] Institute for the Study of War, “Hezbollah and Iran’s Proxy Network Posture, June 2025.”
- [31] Jane’s Defence Weekly, “Order of Battle: Israel Defense Forces – 2025 Update,” April 2025.
- [32] Jerusalem Post, “Over 900 Dead in Iran from Israeli Strike Fallout, Hezbollah Fires Intensify,” June 14, 2025.
- [33] Landry, M.S., “Organic Intelligence and OSINT Monitoring in Conflict Zones,” *Journal of Sustainable Security*, 2025.
- [34] Landry, M.S., “Multidimensional Analysis Methodologies for Modern Conflict Zones,” *International Journal of Conflict Studies*, 2025.
- [35] MIT Technology Review, “Iran’s Attempted Cyber Poisoning of Israeli Water Supplies, 2024.”
- [36] United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, “Integrated Humanitarian Monitoring Guidelines,” 2024.
- [37] Organization of Islamic Cooperation, “Statement on Israel–Iran Escalation,” June 2025.
- [38] PeaceMakerGPT Project Report, “AI Tools for Conflict De-escalation and Peace-building,” 2025.
- [39] PeaceMakerGPT Team, “AI-Powered Analysis of Conflict Rhetoric,” Peace Language Report, June 2025.

- [40] RAND Corporation, “Israeli Information Operations in the Middle East Conflict, 2025.”
- [41] Reuters, “Oil Prices Spike Amid Israel-Iran Conflict,” June 2025.
- [42] South China Morning Post, “China’s Call for Restraint in Israel–Iran Escalation,” June 2025.
- [43] Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), “Iran’s Drone Arsenal: Threat Matrix 2025,” June 2025.
- [44] U.S. Department of State, “Statement on Middle East Security and Support for Israel,” June 2025.
- [45] NATO StratCom Centre of Excellence, “Disinformation Surge During Israel–Iran Hostilities,” June 2025.
- [46] United Nations Development Programme, “Sustainable Development Goals and Conflict Resolution,” 2023.
- [47] UNHCR Middle East Division, “Emergency Displacement Assessment: June 2025 Israel–Iran Conflict.”
- [48] United Nations Security Council, “Emergency Meeting on Israel–Iran Conflict,” June 2025.
- [49] United Nations Secretary-General, “Statement on the June 2025 Middle East Crisis,” June 14, 2025.
- [50] World Bank, “Economic Outlook Middle East and North Africa, 2025.”