

Assault on Iran's infrastructure revenge for strategic defeat

The aggressive American assaults on Iran's civilian infrastructure — from a hospital in Ahvaz to railways and bridges in Hormozgan, and to the maritime control tower of Chabahar, whose sole function was search-and-rescue operations for fishermen and the security of maritime commerce — have once again exhibited a stark depiction of American brutishness. Although these attacks were executed with the objective of compensating for the American defeat in the military arena, they yielded, in reality, no fruits other than the reinforcement of an unprecedented unanimity among diverse political factions in defense of Iranian security and national interests. For the targeting of public infrastructure and vital centers of a nation constitutes not an action against a government, but rather an aggression on the life, security, and interests of a populace; and whenever the territorial integrity and security of Iran are at issue, political disagreements yield their place to concord. From the perspective of numerous observers, Iran's enemy, laboring under the delusion that an assault on infrastructure might, by disrupting the everyday rhythm of popular life, deepen internal fissures and direct public opinion pressure against the establishment, has committed a miscalculation; for antecedent experiences have likewise demonstrated that external threats, far from engendering divergence, have furnished the groundwork for national convergence and cohesion. According to political operatives from various schools of thought, the defense of national security is not merely a political choice, but rather a legal right and a sovereign responsibility.

For this reason, the common message of the political elite in Iran is that the enemy, through its attack on Iranian infrastructure, will not only fail to achieve its intended objectives, but will, through the intensification of internal solidarity and its consequent support for the right of legitimate defense, incur increased political and security costs. The strategy of pressure on the Iranian nation does not, in any way, weaken national cohesion; on the contrary, it reinforces the shared resolve of disparate political movements to safeguard security, independence, and national interests — and this is precisely that reality which the adversary has once again proven incapable of apprehending in its calculations.



This bridge near Bandar Khamir, Hormozgan Province, southern Iran, has collapsed as a result of US missile strikes on July 17, 2026, setting fire to a fuel truck as well.

● TASNIM

Deterrence, necessity of real understanding of enemy



By Abbas Salimi Namin

Conservative political activist

**OPINION
EXCLUSIVE**

The attack on Iran's infrastructure, although executed under the pretext of confronting its Islamic Establishment, in practice targets the populace. The destruction of infrastructure directly affects the tranquility, security, and comfort of citizens, and its pressure is mainly applied to the people; consequently, it must be met with a resolute response. Nevertheless, the more critical point is that this experience, too, must lead to a more profound comprehension of the United States. We had achieved an accord according to which the es-

calation of tensions was to be prevented, and specific benefits for Iran had been envisaged. Even numerous Western experts maintained that this accord was more advantageous to Iran than to the United States. Of course, setting aside the perspectives of Western experts, within the country as well, the majority of experts believed that this accord could, to a considerable extent, guarantee Iranian interests. Even if we assume the minority expert opinion to have been correct, Trump's action in withdrawing from the accord nonetheless demonstrates that the accord was not beneficial to the United States. Had the achievement of the Iranian negotiating team been entirely aligned with American interests, there would have been no reason for its violation. Hence, the assertion by

certain political movements that this accord constituted "treason" is inconsistent with the existent realities. If a state has obtained complete concessions, it does not violate the accord, just as, throughout history, great powers have not abandoned treaties that served their interests. Therefore, the American withdrawal from the accord indicates that Iranian diplomacy had succeeded in securing an achievement that did not align with the bellicose objectives of the United States. For this reason, they once again adopted the path of pressure and confrontation; that is, an endeavor to weaken Iranian positions, impose pressure, and obtain further concessions in prospective future negotiations. Consequently, today more than ever, we must be vigilant lest

false internal conflicts emerge. It is immaterial whether these disagreements are instigated by electoral motives, the elimination of rivals, or any other political objective; the outcome will be the infliction of damage on the country. Hence, the costs borne by the Iranian nation must result in an increased public comprehension of American conduct. We must not presume that everyone possesses an accurate recognition of the United States. A segment of the domestic public opinion, and even of global public opinion, still lacks a precise understanding of American policies. Should we accurately recognize the adversary, we will understand that we require the cooperation of all domestic capacities as well as global public opinion. The United States possesses extensive influence within the

structure of the international system, enjoys vast experience in diplomacy, in exerting pressure on nations, and in directing public opinion; therefore, effective confrontation with such an adversary is not feasible without the persuasion of public opinion. Hence, it is anticipated that all those who are devoted to Iran and to national interests will not permit the formation of artificial disagreements and unproductive polarizations within the country. We must exploit this opportunity to augment public awareness regarding American conduct because, in confronting the United States and Israel, the accompaniment of public opinion constitutes a strategic asset, and negotiation can likewise play an effective role in this trajectory. In the current circumstances, we must concentrate on those com-

mitments that the United States has violated and, by harnessing the capacity of public opinion, increase the costs of that country's behavior. In numerous instances, the pressure of public opinion can prove more effective than military pressure. On the other hand, given that the adversary has more than before targeted infrastructure in its recent attacks, it is imperative that every aggression be met with a decisive and deterrent response, so that the costs of hostile actions for the opposing party may be increased; however, this does not signify the abandonment of diplomacy. Deterrence and diplomacy are two complementary methods that must be pursued simultaneously, in order that the United States be compelled to accept the reasonable and rational demands of the Islamic Republic of Iran.



A naval traffic control tower at Chabahar Port, Iran, appears to collapse following repeated attacks by US Army in this image shared on X by Defense Secretary Pete Hegseth on July 17, 2026. The approximately 60-meter structure was used to monitor and coordinate maritime traffic at the commercial port.

● X

Enemy's miscalculation



By Behnam Saeedi

Iranian lawmaker

**OPINION
EXCLUSIVE**

The American action in targeting Iranian civilian infrastructure is not merely a military operation; rather, it constitutes a manifest aggression against international law and humanitarian principles, and is justifiable by none of the accepted international norms. Such conduct is a clear exemplar of a policy that, instead of respecting the rights of nations, is predicated on the logic of force and pressure, and for this reason merits explicit condemnation by all governments, international bodies, and global public opinion.

The American government has consistently endeavored to present itself as the defender of international order and human rights; however, the attack on the infrastructure of a sovereign state reveals, more than

anything else, the contradiction between the United States' claims and its actions.

In the face of such aggression, the Islamic Republic of Iran, in accordance with the recognized principles of international law, particularly the right of legitimate defense, possesses the right to defend its security, sovereignty, and national interests. Legitimate defense is a right that the United Nations Charter has recognized for states, and no country can expect that, by violating the sovereignty and security of a nation, it will remain immune from the consequences of its actions. It is self-evident that the United States, the Zionist regime, and any other party that has played a role in supporting and facilitating this aggression must likewise accept responsibility for their actions.

On the other hand, the selection of public infrastructure as the target of attack, rather than being an indication of strength, signifies a shift in American strategy following its failure to achieve its stated objectives in

the field. When declared objectives are not realized through the path of direct confrontation, the endeavor to impose economic and psychological costs on the populace substitutes for military successes. This is the same strategy of attritional warfare, pursued with the aim of increasing pressure on the target state and creating disruption in the normal course of people's life.

Nevertheless, experience has demonstrated that the Iranian nation, in the face of such pressures, has not retreated; on the contrary, it has defended its rights and national interests with greater cohesion. The Islamic Republic of Iran has likewise repeatedly shown that, in response to any hostile action, while considering national interests and at the appropriate time and place, it will deliver a proportionate and deterrent response. This approach does not derive from adventurism, but rather from the consolidation of the principle of deterrence and the prevention of the repetition of such aggressions.