

Matt Finally Gets to Talk about Iran  
Presented by Matthew Raphael Johnson and Sven  
Longshanks  
March 5, 2026

The Israeli-American attack was an attempt to “decapitate” the [Iranian](#) government. The country's Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Khamenei, was killed, along with almost his entire family, in a bombing of his residence and office. There were also serious violations of humanitarian law with attacks against a primary school, resulting in the deaths of over one hundred children.

Unlike previous cases where Israel attacked Iran, this time the Islamic Republic reacted immediately – and not only against Israel. All US-allied countries in the Middle East have been – and continue to be – targeted by Iranian missiles and drones in a relentless bombing campaign. Israel, the UAE, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Bahrain, Kuwait, Iraq, Jordan, Oman and even British bases in Cyprus have been targeted by Iran.

Tehran is trying to inflict as much damage as possible to all military and energy infrastructure that enables US and Israeli operations. Oil facilities in the Gulf are being destroyed, as well as ships linked to Israel or the West in the Strait of Hormuz – which is currently only partially

open, with Iran allowing passage only to ships from certain partner countries.

It is clear that the US and Israel were not prepared for such a profound reaction from Iran. American and Israeli authorities seemed to expect a late and moderate reaction, as occurred in the Twelve-Day War. The intensity and frequency of the Iranian attacks have caused a kind of partial “strategic paralysis” in the US and Israel – as well as in the affected allied countries – which simply could not anticipate the bombings to activate security measures efficiently.

Media reports indicate that the US approached Iran through the Italian government to suggest a ceasefire agreement, which was promptly rejected. There seems to be no interest on the part of Iran in de-escalating the conflict in the coming days or weeks. The situation becomes particularly tense considering that it involves not only military and strategic factors, but also issues of national pride and patriotic sentiments, considering the assassination of the Supreme Leader and civilians, including children.

1.

American authorities, including President Donald Trump himself, publicly stated that the operation had achieved its

objective of eliminating the Iranian leadership and that from that moment on it would be up to the local Iranian population to fight against state forces and complete a total regime change – thus seeking so-called “Iranian freedom.” However, the popular reaction was in the opposite direction, with increasing popular support for the Iranian retaliation.

This miscalculation on the part of the US and Israel is typical of their military mentality focused on decapitation attacks and quick assaults. The US is accustomed to short-duration wars, rapid invasions, causing high destruction to the enemy and promptly evacuating without significant attrition. Similarly, Israel, being a small country with limited resources, has always maintained a strategy of decapitation attacks, attempting to eliminate the leadership of anti-Zionist countries and armed groups in a fast manner and with minimal military effort.

However, this strategy is extremely limited. The US has been successful in operations against small countries in Latin America and some ‘failed states’ in Africa, but has always suffered when facing prolonged wars of attrition, such as in Vietnam or Afghanistan. Similarly, Israel has not even managed to neutralize Hamas and Hezbollah, which are non-state militias, by carrying out their decapitations in recent years. All this reveals the clear limitations of this type of strategy.

Iran is a country of considerable size, with over 90 million inhabitants and a complex political structure consolidated since the 1979 Islamic Revolution. Popular support for the state is widespread – otherwise, the country would have already undergone some regime change, considering that the west constantly promotes mass protests and attempts at color revolutions there. Countries with such structure and complexity cannot be easily destabilized by quick decapitation operations.

2.

Many in the United States could scarcely identify the difference between Iran and Iraq, both countries based on ancient civilizations so chronologically distant as to be fiction. If not Marvel, it's not marvelous. But another fiction came into play towards the end of February as the United States and Israel reprised their role as world rogues and crockery breakers by attacking Iran for a second time in less than a year in a joint campaign called Operation Lion's Roar and Epic Fury. Following the vulgar playbook on regime change used against Iraq in 2003 by the US-led forces, a variation of the same theme is being used against Iran.

The difference here is that neither the US nor Israel are willing to commit ground forces. They will kill key

leaders and figures across the Iranian regime, leaving an inchoate resistance against the clerics to seize the day. Iran's supreme leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, has apparently been killed, with US President Donald J. Trump calling him "one of the most evil people in history". Israel also claims that the opening strikes killed seven senior defense and intelligence officials, including Khamenei's top security advisor Ali Shamkhani, Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps Commander Mohammad Pakpour, Defence Minister Aziz Nasirzadeh and the chief of Iranian military intelligence Saleh Asadi.

The February 28 statement from Trump was posted on Truth Social in a brief video declaring that the objective of the attack was "to defend the American people by eliminating imminent threats from the Iranian regime." This was curious given the previous US-Israeli attacks in June 2025 that had apparently "obliterated the regime's nuclear program at Fordo, Natanz and Isfahan."

In this haze of confusion, Trump had concluded that Tehran had, after all, decided to "rebuild their nuclear program and to continue developing long range missiles that can now threaten our very good friends and allies in Europe, our troops stationed overseas, and could soon reach the American homeland." Their missile industry would be razed, the navy annihilated, the proxies crippled. Members of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard

would receive total immunity if they laid down their weapons, “or you will face certain death.” As for the unspecified “great proud people of Iran,” they should stay sheltered as the bombing continued. When done, the government “will be yours to take.”

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu’s statement also confirmed the objective of ending “the threat of the Ayatollah regime in Iran.” That regime had domestically repressed its citizens, “instilled fear in the peoples of the region,” created a global terror network, “invested enormous resources to develop atomic bombs and tens of thousands of missiles intended, as it defined it, to erase Israel from the map of the world.” They armed “terrorist proxies.”

There will, no doubt, be some cheer within Iran at these strikes, notably from the young who have suffered at the hands of a clerical, authoritarian regime. Washington’s allies will snivel with coerced approval citing the brutality of Iran’s regime while ignoring breaches of international law they are condoning. (Australia’s response was particularly despicable.) The Shia-Sunni division will be tested, with various US bases and military assets already struck in the Gulf States by a regime trying to survive. The United Nations will continue being treated like a bed-ridden dowager whose influence was from another day, conduct more contemptible even than 2003 when many

Western states did, at the very least, show solidarity in rejecting the use of force by the United States and its allies in the absence of a Security Council resolution. In the meantime, American diplomats who open their frontier-stretched mouths claiming interest for peace and negotiations should make everyone reach for the gun.

3.

*“The Iranian regime, a vicious group of very hard, terrible people; its menacing activities directly endanger the United States, our troops, our bases overseas and our allies throughout the world.”*

President Trump's [statement](#) above is a composite of ignorance and lies. Iran has never been a threat to the United States nor to US “allies around the world.”. Nuclear negotiations ended with a deadlock in Geneva on Friday 27 February. Iran has made several concessions but did not agree with the Trump Administration’s demand for zero enrichment for civilian purposes, and to dismantle all related infrastructure. Trump claimed the stalemate “negotiations” as a reason for finally getting to grips with Iran's nuclear threat. The deadlock of the Geneva “indirect” nuclear negotiations between the US and Iran is understandable.

Most certainly such a coordinated Netanyahu-Trump

attack on Iran's strategic sites cannot be carried out overnight without months of prior preparation. In fact, negotiations were scheduled to continue this coming week in Vienna, Austria, where the UN-regulated International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) is headquartered. Thus, it just shows how fake such US-led negotiations are. Not for the first time, they are planned as a deception – to disguise an attack on the negotiating partner. How do Americans react to the Zionist-US “tandem” assault on Iran? According to a March 1, 2026 Reuters poll, only one in four US Americans support the Trump-Netanyahu aggression; meaning that Trump’s popularity is taking another deep-dive.

The assault was of course carried out in full coordination with Israel. Israeli Defense Minister Israel Katz announced that the country had carried out a “preemptive strike on Iran to remove threats against the State of Israel.” President Trump later confirmed US participation in the attack, vowing to dismantle the Iranian nuclear program, “raze [the Iranian] missile industry, “annihilate their navy.” With the Zionists having “martyred” Iran's Supreme Leader Ayatollah Khamenei and many members of his family, the Trump-Netanyahu couple from hell may feel the first step towards regime change is made.

Even if it does not immediately achieve its goal, lots of intermediate “benefits” may accrue for the aggressors:

Petrol prices may rise, increasing oil companies' profits. The potentially temporary oil and gas shortages may negatively impact the economies of China and Europe, and the US and Israel may control a huge junk more of Middle Eastern energy resources, let alone, the trillion dollars-worth of hydrocarbons off-shore of Gaza

4.

*[I'm surprised at Pete on this, this is how a novice would talk].*

What if the attack succeeds somehow, getting rid of the current Iranian government, though not being able to replace it with a western friendly leadership, a scenario of a chaotic “Libya 2.0” could emerge. This might risk sectarian and ethnic violence, resulting in disruption of supply chains and a slow-down of global economies, including the US. Would such a scenario be of any benefit to the United States? Unlikely. Just look at Libya and Afghanistan which have dangerously deteriorated in the second decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

The aggression on Iran looks like a classic case of prioritizing short-term tactical and domestic political gains at the expense of long-term strategic stability — a situation that could inflict lasting damage on the western civilization *[what civilization?]*. Alternatively, the Middle

East could slide into a regional war on a scale not previously witnessed – with unpredictable outcomes and the potential for a massive ecological, humanitarian and economic crisis. The repercussions may be way beyond the Persian Gulf States [*No kidding Captain Obvious*].

This is why desperation – not strategy – is driving the US-Zionist strikes in Iran. In addition to Tel Aviv and Haifa, Tehran's rockets hit primarily Bahrain, Qatar, the UAE, Kuwait, Jordan and Saudi Arabia. All Arab states. You may argue that they are all dotted with US military bases. Yes. But they also were among the first ones to commit funding for Trump's “Board of Peace” (BoP), supposedly to rebuild Gaza according to the Trump-Netanyahu's criminal plan to “destroy and rebuild,” while annihilating the Gaza population.

The BoP was proposed by Trump in September 2025 and formally established on the sidelines of the 56<sup>th</sup> World Economic Forum (WEF) Conference in Davos in January 2026. To become a member, Trump, the self-nominated permanent chairman of the BoP, requires an arbitrary membership fee of a billion US dollars. Of the 62 countries invited, as of January 2025, 25 nodded yes to participate. So far, they include from the Middle East: Bahrain, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and the United Arab Emirates (UAE). The United Nations approved the BoP through Security Council Resolution 2803 on November

17, 2025. In other words, these Arab countries agree tacitly or directly with the Zionist-US destruction and elimination of their Palestinian brothers. Iran has always supported and defended Gaza and Palestine as whole. Thus, membership in Trump's BoP is equal to being an enemy of Palestine. Targeting these Arab BoP members with missiles would appear a logical reaction.

5.

Iranian authorities prepared for this aggression. Apparently, Tehran arranged for deliveries of long-range air defense systems, missiles, and fighter jets from China and Russia. They also set up a system to rapidly replace top military commanders in case they are eliminated. But is Iran's military capacity sufficient for an on-scale counter-offensive? Maybe that is what Pete Hegseth referred to when he said operation "Epic Fury" may be a long-lasting one.

Moscow condemned the Trump-Netanyahu operation. The Russian Foreign Ministry described it as a "premeditated and unprovoked act of aggression" aimed at toppling a government "they deem undesirable because it has refused to yield to the dictates of force and hegemonic pressure." On a more philosophical note, and specifically referring to Trump's campaign promises as a

“Peace President,” President Vladimir Putin had the following comment:

I have already spoken to three US Presidents. . . when a person is elected, they may have some ideas. Then people with briefcases arrive, wearing dark glasses and dark suits. These people start explaining how things are done and instantly everything changes. The permanent imperial state and the corporate and foreign lobbyists that pull their strings are the ones who make the major political decisions no matter who the President is or which party is in power. The United States is ruled by a corporate oligarchy that seeks to profit and enrich themselves through a permanent war economy based on debt, slavery, resource plunder, and arms contracts.

Putin, the master of the understatement.