

# Nuclear Coexistence and Strategic Realignment: Iran's Emerging Deterrence Posture

HMSC Insight
March 2021
HMSC Intelligence Division

## Summary

As negotiations over Iran's nuclear program stall, the Middle East faces the prospect of a new nuclear coexistence era.

This Insight examines Iran's evolving deterrence strategy, the limits of Israeli and U.S. military options, and the broader implications for regional stability, arms competition, and diplomatic recalibration.

## **Strategic Intelligence Insight**

## I. Strategic Realities: The Limits of Military Options

#### • Israeli Constraints:

Israel lacks the operational depth, specialized munitions, and regional airspace access required to conduct a successful preemptive strike against Iran's fortified nuclear infrastructure.

#### • U.S. Posture:

Despite the visible deployment of B-52 bombers and forces into the Red Sea, the absence of overwhelming carrier presence signals a reluctance for direct engagement, absent a major escalation.

#### Nuclear Threshold Dynamics:

Iran retains a fine line between a civilian nuclear program and latent weaponization

capability. Should negotiations collapse, Tehran could rapidly pivot toward overt nuclear breakout.

#### II. Iran's Strategic Calculus

- Iran has drawn lessons from North Korea's deterrence model: nuclear armament provides international leverage and regime survival assurances.
- The development of medium- to long-range missile platforms, with potential nuclear payload capacity, offers Tehran a credible regional deterrence posture.
- Mutual deterrence with Israel would enforce an uneasy but stabilizing balance of power — ushering a de facto nuclear coexistence model across the Middle East.

## III. Regional and Global Implications

## Strategic Arms Race:

The normalization of a nuclear-capable Iran may accelerate regional ambitions, particularly among Gulf states, for advanced missile and nuclear capabilities.

#### Geopolitical Realignments:

A nuclear-empowered Iran could shift calculations surrounding the Abraham Accords,

U.S. Central Command posture, and broader security dynamics from Yemen to Palestine.

### Diplomatic Challenges:

Resolving ballistic missile programs, regional influence, human rights issues, and counterterrorism concerns through a single comprehensive agreement appears increasingly unlikely.

#### IV. Policy Outlook: Pathways Forward

#### Negotiation Dynamics:

Iran views its missile program as non-negotiable and strategic. U.S. efforts must balance pressure with incentives — pursuing phased sanction relief tied to verifiable Iranian concessions.

#### Return to Structured Agreements:

Reengagement with frameworks akin to the 2015 Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) — emphasizing inspections and compliance — remains the most viable path to containing nuclear risks.

#### Diplomatic Strategy:

A gradualist "carrot and stick" approach, avoiding exclusive coercive tactics, offers the

most realistic method to de-escalate tensions without triggering full-scale regional destabilization.

#### **Indicators to Monitor**

- Iranian enrichment activities and International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) access status.
- Israeli and Gulf state military posture adjustments and defensive procurement signals.
- Regional diplomatic overtures aimed at establishing backchannel crisis communication frameworks.

#### **Analyst Reflection**

The Middle East is approaching an inflection point where deterrence, rather than disarmament, may define future stability.

Iran's potential transition into a latent nuclear power, if unmanaged, could harden regional divisions and transform arms competition into the new strategic equilibrium of the region.