OPERATION EPIC FURY: STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT, COMPETING HYPOTHESES, AND MARKET IMPLICATIONS

Prepared for NewSong Capital Management | Market Research — March 13, 2026
Prepared by: Harris Green, M.S. Counterterrorism and Homeland Security

Disclaimer: This document contains analytical assessments and is not a statement of fact.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The United States military is engaged in an active air and naval campaign against Iranian military and energy infrastructure under the designation Operation Epic Fury, launched February 28, 2026. Open-source intelligence, credible defense reporting, and observable force movements suggest that the operation may be approaching a critical inflection point — specifically, a potential transition from a standoff air and naval campaign to a direct-action ground phase centered on the seizure of Kharg Island, Iran's primary petroleum export terminal. This paper presents a structured analytical assessment of that hypothesis, the competing hypotheses that challenge it, a force disposition review, and an evaluation of near- and long-term market implications. This assessment is analytical in nature. The author acknowledges significant uncertainty regarding U.S. operational intentions, the timing of any potential ground operation, and the Iranian response calculus. The scenarios described herein represent plausible interpretations of available open-source data and should not be taken as predictions or as statements of classified knowledge. [1][2][3]

BACKGROUND: OPERATION EPIC FURY

On February 28, 2026, U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM) formally launched Operation Epic Fury, describing it as a campaign to degrade Iranian military capability following a sustained pattern of Iranian-directed attacks on regional shipping, U.S. personnel, and Gulf energy infrastructure. As of the date of this writing, CENTCOM has acknowledged more than 6,000 strike sorties against Iranian targets. Thirteen U.S. service members have been killed in action — six Army Reserve personnel from the 103rd Sustainment Command killed by an Iranian one-way attack drone at the Port of Shuaiba,

Kuwait; six KC-135 aircrew killed in a crash in western Iraq; and one additional service member whose circumstances have not been publicly disclosed.[4][5][6][7][1]

The operation represents the largest concentration of U.S. combat power in the Middle East since the 2003 Iraq invasion. Two carrier strike groups (CSGs) — USS Abraham Lincoln (CSG-3) and USS Gerald R. Ford (CSG-12) — are currently operating in the Arabian Sea and Red Sea respectively, supported by land-based airpower distributed across Israel, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, and the United Arab Emirates (UAE). Approximately 18,000 new U.S. troops have been deployed to the CENTCOM area of responsibility (AOR) since May 2025, before accounting for the latest announced deployments.[8][9]

Critically, the Trump administration has thus far conducted the air campaign with deliberate restraint toward Iranian petroleum infrastructure. On February 28, President Trump explicitly stated via Truth Social that he chose not to destroy Kharg Island's oil loading terminal out of "decency," while simultaneously threatening to reconsider that restraint if Iran interfered with Strait of Hormuz shipping. This restraint is analytically significant: it is either a genuine diplomatic signal, a deception operation, or a deliberate sequencing choice — destroying air defenses before a subsequent seizure mission rather than destroying infrastructure that would become a U.S.-controlled strategic asset.[10]

CURRENT FORCE DISPOSITION

Understanding the ground force posture in theater is essential to evaluating the Kharg Island hypothesis.

The Army Reserve's 103rd Sustainment Command is deployed in Kuwait, providing logistics and port operations support at the Port of Shuaiba — the primary logistics node for ground forces. Wisconsin Army National Guard units are deployed across both Iraq and Kuwait in roles that have not been fully specified publicly. Multiple National Guard formations from across the country have been activated and deployed as part of the broader buildup, with the Vermont Air National Guard's 158th Fighter Wing (F-35s) confirmed en route to the region. Wall Street Journal reporting confirmed today that Marines are already present in theater supporting active Iran operations — a critical data point that separates the current posture from a purely standoff air campaign.[5][11][12][13]

The 31st Marine Expeditionary Unit (MEU), comprising approximately 2,200 to 2,500 Marines embarked aboard the USS Tripoli Amphibious Ready Group (ARG) — including USS New Orleans and USS San Diego — was ordered to the Middle East by Secretary Hegseth on March 13, 2026. The ARG departed from the Philippine Sea, where it had been conducting exercises off Okinawa as part of Iron

Fist 2026, and is assessed to be approximately 10 to 16 days from the Arabian Sea. The Pentagon's stated framing of this deployment as forces intended to "help U.S. forces already operating in the region" — rather than as a primary assault element — is analytically notable.[14][15][16][17]

Defense reporting indicates that a Delta Force element was repositioned to the broader Kuwait theater in the weeks preceding the formal launch of Operation Epic Fury, a pattern consistent with deliberate advance staging rather than reactive deployment. The 82nd Airborne Division quietly cancelled a major training exercise in early March — an observable signal historically associated with elevated contingency readiness, given the 82nd's role as the Army's primary global response force. The Washington Post noted that the cancellation fueled immediate speculation among defense analysts about imminent Mideast ground operations.[18][19][20]

THE KHARG ISLAND HYPOTHESIS

The primary analytical hypothesis of this paper is that the United States is in the advanced planning stages of, and may execute in the near term, a Special Operations Forces (SOF) seizure of Kharg Island — Iran's dominant petroleum export terminal — to be followed by a Marine relief-in-place and transition to a sustained hold.

The strategic logic of Kharg Island as a target is substantial. The island processes approximately 90 to 95 percent of all Iranian crude oil and petroleum product exports — roughly 1.7 million barrels per day — fed by subsea pipelines connecting three major Iranian oil fields: Abouzar, Forzan, and Dorood. The island's deep surrounding waters allow massive supertankers to dock and load crude, with a loading capacity of approximately seven million barrels per day, giving it an unmatched logistical profile on the Iranian coast. Its capture intact — specifically preserving the tanker jetties and pipeline terminals — would give Washington direct control over Iran's primary source of foreign exchange overnight without permanently destroying infrastructure that a post-regime Iranian government would need to reconstitute its economy. JP Morgan analysts assessed in early March that a Kharg seizure would constitute a severe oil shock to global markets — not because Iran's exports are currently large, but because of the psychological and logistical cascades that would follow. From a purely coercive standpoint, as Petras Katinas, a research fellow in climate, energy, and defense at the Royal United Services Institute (RUSI), told CNBC, seizing Kharg "would cut off Iran's oil lifeline" and "give the US leverage during negotiations, no matter which regime is in power after the military operation ends."[21][22][23][3][24][25]

The assessed operational sequence, if this hypothesis is correct, would unfold approximately as follows. In the initial phase, SOF — likely a Delta Force direct-action element and Naval Special

Warfare Development Group (SEAL Team Six) maritime assault teams — would conduct a nighttime assault on the island's military garrison, with SEAL Team Six operators likely delivered by submarine via SEAL Delivery Vehicle (SDV) or inserted via High-Altitude Low Opening (HALO) airborne operation. Priority would be given to seizure of the loading jetty control infrastructure, to prevent sabotage of the terminal, and to the island's airstrip, which would enable rapid reinforcement. Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC) air defense systems would need to be neutralized in advance or simultaneously — a condition that the cumulative 6,000-sortie air campaign may have already achieved.[24][26][4]

In the subsequent phase, Marines already in theater — confirmed by the Wall Street Journal to be present in Kuwait and Iraq supporting active Iran operations — would conduct a relief of the SOF element, establishing a conventional defensive perimeter on the island. This transition is essential: holding Kharg against sustained Iranian rocket, missile, and drone fire from the Iranian mainland, situated only approximately 15 to 16 nautical miles away, exceeds the organic sustainment capability of a Joint Special Operations Command (JSOC) element and requires conventional combat arms forces. The 31st MEU, arriving approximately 10 to 16 days after a potential initial assault, would then constitute the long-term holding force and expand U.S. options for follow-on operations.[3][13][16][24]

Several observable indicators support this hypothesis beyond mere planning speculation. The 82nd Airborne's training cancellation, reported by the Washington Post, suggests elevated readiness for a contingency airborne mission, potentially to reinforce a seizure or to conduct a separate cordon operation. The Wall Street Journal's confirmation that Marines are already in theater participating in active Iran operations implies that at least some ground component is already engaged. Trump's restraint toward Kharg's oil infrastructure, framed explicitly as a deliberate choice rather than a targeting limitation, creates strategic coherence for a subsequent seizure. The Economist, CNBC, Bloomberg, and Maritime Executive — not fringe publications — are all independently reporting the seizure plan as an actively debated White House option.[2][13][20][27][3][10][18]

ANALYSIS OF COMPETING HYPOTHESES

A rigorous assessment demands that the Kharg Island seizure hypothesis be evaluated against the strongest competing explanations for the same observable evidence. The author identifies three principal competing hypotheses.

Competing Hypothesis One: The 31st MEU Is a Deterrence Signal, Not a Combat Commitment

The strongest counter-argument to the imminent seizure thesis is that the deployment of the Tripoli ARG may be purely coercive signaling — designed to pressure Iran into a ceasefire or negotiated agreement rather than as a genuine combat deployment. Under this interpretation, Trump's Kharg restraint is not operational sequencing but genuine diplomatic leverage: a tacit offer to Iran that its oil infrastructure survives if it stands down. The 31st MEU's public announcement — an unusual degree of transparency for a covert operation — would be inconsistent with a genuine surprise seizure. Special operations are not announced via Wall Street Journal reports days before execution; they are executed and reported after the fact. Defense analyst Dr. Brent M. Eastwood at 19FortyFive assessed explicitly that the Kharg seizure may be "better as a threat to be communicated during negotiations after a ceasefire" rather than as a near-term operational commitment. The public drumbeat around Kharg Island may itself be a psychological pressure campaign, designed to create the threat without incurring the cost.[24]

The author assesses this hypothesis as plausible but not dispositive. Deterrence signaling and operational preparation are not mutually exclusive; the most credible deterrent signals involve genuine operational readiness. The Delta force element repositioned to the Kuwait theater prior to Epic Fury's launch is difficult to explain purely as theater.[18]

Competing Hypothesis Two: The Primary Mission Is Isfahan, Not Kharg

A second competing interpretation is that Kharg Island is not the primary objective but rather an enabling operation for the higher-priority mission: physical seizure of Iran's highly enriched uranium (HEU) stockpile at Isfahan. Under this hypothesis, the Kharg seizure is a means to an end — establishing a forward arming and refueling point (FARP) for MH-47G Night Stalker helicopters of the 160th Special Operations Aviation Regiment (SOAR) operating at the edge of their combat radius, approximately 350 kilometers from Isfahan. The Kharg seizure under this framing is not the endgame; it is the platform. This hypothesis does not contradict the primary thesis — it is actually compatible with it. However, it reframes the Kharg operation as Phase One of a two-phase campaign rather than as the strategic objective itself. The Axios reporting explicitly identified Kharg as a staging base for the nuclear seizure mission, and Secretary Rubio's statement that "people are going to have to go and get it" regarding the HEU stockpile implies an operational commitment that would require exactly the kind of forward basing Kharg provides.[27][28][2]

Competing Hypothesis Three: Operational Conditions Are Not Yet Met

The most technically grounded objection to an imminent operation is that the intelligence picture for the Isfahan HEU seizure may simply not be adequate to execute. Former Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (DASD) for the Middle East Mick Mulroy stated plainly: "My question is do we even know

where the material is, or whether we can get to it since it might be buried?" The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) confirmed the HEU is "mainly" at Isfahan but acknowledged it is entombed under rubble from previous strikes. If JSOC assault teams breach the facility and cannot locate the material within an acceptable time-on-target window before an Iranian quick reaction force (QRF) collapses the perimeter, the mission fails catastrophically. Under this hypothesis, the 31st MEU deployment is real preparation, but the operation's execution awaits a resolved intelligence gap regarding the HEU's precise location within the rubbled tunnels. The author considers this the most intellectually honest caveat to the primary hypothesis. It does not invalidate the thesis; it introduces a genuine decision gate that may push the timeline beyond the near term if the intelligence picture remains unresolved.[29]

THE ISFAHAN HEU MISSION: TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT

Iran currently holds approximately 450 kilograms of uranium enriched to 60% uranium-235 (U-235) concentration. The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) defines HEU as uranium enriched to 20% U-235 or above, meaning Iran's 60% stockpile is unambiguously classified as HEU. The operational urgency is defined by a narrow technical window: pushing 60%-enriched material to weapons-grade — defined as 90% or above — requires only days of centrifuge operation if Iran's enrichment infrastructure is restored. The 450 kilograms represents sufficient feedstock for approximately 10 to 11 nuclear devices.[28][30][31][29]

For context, the "Little Boy" bomb dropped on Hiroshima on August 6, 1945 used approximately 64 kilograms of uranium enriched to an average of 80% U-235 — and detonated with the explosive force of approximately 15,000 tons of TNT. Approximately only 1.38% of the uranium fuel actually underwent nuclear fission, meaning the weapon was highly inefficient by modern standards. HEU is uniquely dangerous from a proliferation standpoint because it emits relatively low levels of radiation compared to plutonium, making it far easier to handle, transport, and conceal — characteristics that make it the most sought-after fissile material by state and non-state actors pursuing nuclear capability.[32][33][34]

U.S. and Israeli airstrikes in June 2025 destroyed much of Iran's active enrichment centrifuge infrastructure but deliberately or inadvertently sealed the Isfahan tunnel complex entrances, entombing the HEU stockpile underground. In January 2026, Iranian work crews were observed via satellite imagery burying the middle and southernmost tunnel entrances at Isfahan with soil — an active concealment effort that further complicates any extraction attempt. As of March 10, 2026, Trump confirmed to Fox News that the material has not been moved from Isfahan, suggesting the

concealment is intended to protect the stockpile in place rather than facilitate its transport to a secondary location. The Foundation for Defense of Democracies (FDD) reported that Trump subsequently pointed to evidence that Iran had resumed nuclear activities at a new, deeper site, suggesting parallel tracks of both concealment and reconstitution.[35][36][37]

The operational architecture for a physical seizure mission, as described by former CENTCOM commanders and JSOC specialists, would require a large-footprint cordon and extraction force — not a small-team direct action raid. An airborne cordon force would establish a hard perimeter around the Isfahan complex while JSOC assault teams and embedded National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) nuclear engineers physically located and packaged the uranium for extraction. MH-47G Chinooks from the 160th SOAR — the Night Stalkers — would serve as the primary extraction platform, but their combat radius from carrier positions in the Arabian Sea makes Isfahan a marginal mission without a forward refueling point. Kharg Island, approximately 350 kilometers from Isfahan, resolves that constraint.[36][2][27][29]

The author assesses the Isfahan mission as genuinely feasible if two conditions are met: the intelligence gap on precise HEU location is resolved, and Kharg Island is secured as a FARP. Neither condition has been publicly confirmed as achieved.

MARKET IMPLICATIONS

The author's primary market thesis is that near-term volatility will remain elevated, driven not by the conflict's trajectory per se but by the unresolved uncertainty regarding its scope and duration. This is a mechanically important distinction: markets are not primarily pricing in an outcome at this stage; they are pricing in the variance of outcomes. The range of plausible scenarios — from a negotiated Iranian stand-down to a sustained island-holding campaign to a full nuclear seizure operation — is wide enough that volatility premia across oil, equities, and credit are likely to remain structurally elevated until the operational picture resolves in either direction. Crude oil prices have already risen to approximately $98 per barrel as of March 9, representing a 54% increase in the past month alone.[24]

The author's long-term thesis — oil prices declining and equities rising — rests on a coherent strategic logic. If the United States successfully seizes Kharg Island and holds it, Iran's primary oil export mechanism is removed from global supply but simultaneously placed under U.S. control. The administration has demonstrated a preference for preserving the infrastructure rather than destroying it, which implies a future in which Kharg's export capacity could be resumed under a post-regime arrangement, incrementally adding supply back to global markets. Simultaneously, if the operation succeeds rapidly and Iran's retaliatory capacity is assessed as degraded, risk premia across equity

markets would compress, supporting multiple expansion in sectors that have been discounted under the uncertainty overhang.[10]

The counter-argument deserves honest treatment. The bull case for equities and bear case for oil assumes a relatively clean operational outcome — that Kharg is seized without a protracted Iranian missile and drone barrage, that Iranian retaliation does not escalate to direct Strait of Hormuz closure, and that the nuclear seizure mission, if executed, does not trigger a broader regional conflagration. Each of those assumptions may be wrong. A sustained Iranian artillery and drone campaign against Kharg Island — a realistic scenario given the island's proximity to the mainland, which multiple defense analysts describe as its primary defensive vulnerability — would create exactly the kind of supply disruption that structurally supports elevated oil prices, not declining ones. JP Morgan's analysis concluded that a Kharg seizure scenario could produce one of the largest oil supply shocks in modern history. Iran's sanctions-eroded exports were already showing significant strain on Tehran's budget before the current conflict, with Iran International reporting that Iran's oil lifeline showed signs of strain even under pre-war sanctions pressure.[25][38][3][24]

The author's response to this counter-argument is that the administration's explicit restraint toward oil infrastructure, combined with its apparent preference for seizure over destruction, structurally limits the probability of a permanent supply disruption. However, the transition period — between initial seizure and normalized operations — could last weeks to months and would represent a period of genuine price dislocation. Traders positioned for the long-term thesis should be prepared for a volatile intermediate period that does not invalidate the structural view. On the defense sector specifically, the current operational tempo — multiple CSGs, sustained bombing campaigns, JSOC posture, National Guard activations, and Marine ARG deployments — represents a consumption of precision munitions, aviation fuel, and logistics support at rates not seen since the early 2000s, which is structurally positive for defense and aerospace primes regardless of how the conflict resolves.[1][8][10]

RISK FACTORS AND UNCERTAINTIES

The author identifies the following as the primary variables that would invalidate or significantly modify the central thesis of this paper.

Iranian HEU relocation remains the most operationally disruptive risk. If Iran has moved the stockpile to an unknown tertiary location despite Trump's stated intelligence to the contrary, the entire operational rationale for the Isfahan mission collapses, and the conflict's endgame becomes significantly more uncertain.[37][36]

Iranian Strait of Hormuz closure, even partial or temporary, would represent a systemic shock to global energy markets that would likely overwhelm any other market dynamic discussed in this paper. Iran has demonstrated both the willingness and capability to harass Hormuz shipping, and a cornered adversary facing Kharg seizure may calculate that Hormuz closure is its most powerful remaining deterrent.[39]

Escalation by regional proxies — specifically Hezbollah in Lebanon and remaining Houthi capacity in Yemen — represents a geographic expansion risk that could diffuse U.S. operational focus and extend the timeline for conflict resolution significantly beyond current market expectations.[40]

Political durability of the operation within the United States represents a non-trivial domestic risk. Defense analyst Dr. Eastwood noted explicitly that Trump's campaign commitments against "forever wars" and open-ended conflicts create real political constraints on any extended ground presence in Iran — and the approaching 2026 midterm election cycle amplifies that pressure.[24]

Finally, the author acknowledges the fundamental uncertainty of intelligence-based analysis: the open-source picture may be deliberately managed. The high degree of public reporting on Delta Force, SEAL Team Six, and Kharg Island planning may itself be an information operation designed to generate Iranian reactions — or to move oil markets — rather than an accurate reflection of actual operational intent.

CONCLUSION

The weight of open-source evidence supports the hypothesis that the United States is preparing for a near-term SOF seizure of Kharg Island, to be followed by a Marine conventional holding force, as the first phase of a broader campaign that may include physical extraction of Iran's HEU stockpile from Isfahan. The operational sequencing — air defense suppression at scale, SOF pre-positioning in Kuwait, the 82nd Airborne readiness signal reported by the Washington Post, confirmed Marines already in theater, and the administration's explicit restraint toward Kharg's oil infrastructure — is internally coherent and consistent with deliberate operational planning rather than reactive escalation.[13][20][2][3][5][27][29][10][18]

However, the competing hypotheses presented in this paper are not trivial. Deterrence signaling, intelligence gaps on the HEU's buried location, and the administration's known political constraints around ground combat operations in Iran all represent plausible alternative explanations for the same observable evidence. The author maintains a moderate-to-high confidence assessment in the Kharg seizure hypothesis but a lower confidence assessment in any specific execution timeline, which

depends on operational variables — most critically, the intelligence picture for the HEU location — that are not visible in open-source reporting.[29][37][24]

Markets are likely to remain volatile through the operational resolution phase, with the long-term structural view of lower oil prices and higher equities intact but contingent on a scenario in which the United States achieves rapid operational success and demonstrates both the will and capability to hold what it has seized. The intermediate transition period carries genuine dislocation risk that should be reflected in positioning regardless of one's conviction in the long-term thesis.

This paper represents the analytical judgment of the author as of March 13, 2026, and is subject to revision as new information becomes available. All sources cited are open-source. No classified information was used or implied in this assessment.

Primary Sources: CENTCOM Official Press Releases; Military Times; USNI News; Axios; Bloomberg Opinion; CNBC; The Economist; ABC News; Maritime Executive; 19FortyFive / Dr. Brent M. Eastwood; The Times of London; Semafor; Fox News; NPR; Wall Street Journal (via Reuters/ Investing.com); Washington Post; The Hill; JP Morgan via Reuters; Al Jazeera; Anadolu Agency; Geographical Magazine; New York Times; Iran International; FDD; World Nuclear Association; Atomic Heritage Foundation; Nuclear Regulatory Commission; Nuclear Threat Initiative; Peace Research Institute Frankfurt (PRIF)

⁂

1. https://www.centcom.mil/MEDIA/PRESS-RELEASES/Press-Release-View/Article/4418396/us-forces-launch-operation-epic-fury/
2. https://maritime-executive.com/article/report-white-house-mulling-over-a-raid-to-seize-kharg-island
3. https://www.cnbc.com/2026/03/13/iran-war-oil-kharg-island-trump-us-israel-middle-east-crisis.html
4. https://www.yahoo.com/news/articles/marine-expeditionary-unit-deploying-middle-170555365.html
5. https://responsiblestatecraft.org/servicemebers-killed-operation-epic-fury/
6. https://www.npr.org/2026/03/13/g-s1-113563/us-iran-war
7. https://www.militarytimes.com/news/your-military/2026/03/08/seventh-us-service-member-killed-in-action-during-operation-epic-fury/
8. https://www.militarytimes.com/news/your-military/2026/02/26/us-military-assembles-largest-force-of-warships-aircraft-in-middle-east-in-decades/
9. https://www.facebook.com/WPDEABC15/posts/breaking2200-marines-headed-to-middle-east/1376386041185481/
10. https://www.iranintl.com/en/202603137666
11. https://www.yahoo.com/news/articles/operation-epic-fury-wisconsin-national-231019283.html
12. https://abc6onyourside.com/news/nation-world/troops-from-new-england-head-middle-east-tensions-escalate-fighter-wing-military-operations-iran-march-3-2026
13. https://www.investing.com/news/stock-market-news/pentagon-sends-uss-tripoli-and-marines-to-middle-east-93CH-4560736
14. https://www.2news.com/news/national/the-latest-us-deploying-marines-to-middle-east-as-it-pounds-iran/article_389a9d59-2ce8-5a5f-8506-2b475163ac47.html
15. https://www.kurdistan24.net/en/story/900283/us-sends-2200-marines-aboard-three-warships-to-middle-east-abc-news-reports
16. https://fortune.com/2026/03/13/us-marines-amphibious-assault-ship-tripoli-mideast-iran-war-taiwan/
17. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5vTQH2Lwsvl

18. https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2026-03-13/iran-war-three-targets-for-us-boots-on-the-ground

19. https://www.chosun.com/english/world-en/2026/03/09/MYXCDRCH2ZA3VLJXXP4NUNK2ZI/

20. https://www.washingtonpost.com/national-security/2026/03/06/army-82nd-airborne-iran/

21. https://geographical.co.uk/news/kharg-island-the-small-but-vitally-important-piece-of-land-powering-irans-oil

22. https://www.aa.com.tr/en/energy/oil/kharg-island-iran-s-oil-lifeline-in-the-crosshairs-of-war/55464

23. https://www.aljazeera.com/features/2026/3/11/the-orphan-pearl-inside-kharg-the-beating-heart-of-irans-oil-empire

24. https://www.19fortyfive.com/2026/03/the-kharg-island-gambit-why-seal-team-six-is-the-key-to-choking-irans-energy-lifeline/

25. https://www.reuters.com/business/energy/oil-shock-worsen-should-us-israel-seize-irans-kharg-island-jp-morgan-says-2026-03-09/

26. https://www.19fortyfive.com/2026/03/kharg-island-gambit-why-seal-team-six-is-the-key-to-choking-irans-energy-lifeline/

27. https://www.economist.com/middle-east-and-africa/2026/03/11/could-special-forces-steal-irans-uranium

28. https://www.axios.com/2026/03/08/iran-ground-troops-special-forces-nuclear

29. https://abcnews.com/Politics/large-us-special-ops-force-needed-ground-seize/story?id=130935450

30. https://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/basic-ref/glossary/high-enriched-uranium

31. https://tutorials.nti.org/nuclear-101/uranium-enrichment/

32. https://world-nuclear.org/information-library/safety-and-security/non-proliferation/hiroshima-nagasaki-and-subsequent-weapons-testin

33. https://ahf.nuclearmuseum.org/ahf/history/little-boy-and-fat-man/

34. https://www.prif.org/fileadmin/Daten/Publikationen/Prif_Reports/2013/prif124.pdf

35. https://www.i24news.tv/en/news/middle-east/iran-eastern-states/artc-us-israel-discuss-special-forces-mission-to-secure-iran-s-enriched-uranium-report

36. https://www.semafor.com/article/03/07/2026/trumps-iran-options-include-special-operations-raid-on-nuclear-sites

37. https://www.fdd.org/analysis/policy_briefs/2026/03/11/trump-points-to-irans-resumption-of-nuclear-activities-at-a-new-deeper-site/

38. https://www.iranintl.com/en/202602133199

39. https://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/5775550-us-iran-war-kharg-island/

40. https://flashpoint.io/blog/escalation-in-the-middle-east-operation-epic-fury/

41. https://www.nytimes.com/2026/03/13/world/middleeast/kharg-island-iran-oil-trump.html

42. https://www.centcom.mil/MEDIA/STATEMENTS/Statements-View/Article/4419315/operation-epic-fury-update/

43. https://www.militarytimes.com/news/your-military/2026/03/02/additional-troops-to-deploy-to-middle-east-as-gen-caine-says-to-expect-additional-losses/

44. https://news.usni.org/2026/03/09/usni-news-fleet-and-marine-tracker-march-9-2026

45. https://news.usni.org/2026/03/01/3-u-s-service-members-killed-5-seriously-wounded-in-operation-epic-fury

46. https://www.axios.com/2026/03/13/marines-middle-east-us-deployment

47. https://www.thetimes.com/world/middle-east/article/iran-us-war-ground-operation-isfahan-nuclear-facility-bp8rbhs2n

48. https://www.foxnews.com/politics/after-strikes-how-would-us-secure-irans-enriched-uranium

49. https://report.az/en/other-countries/wsj-pentagon-chief-approves-deployment-of-marines-to-middle-east

50. https://www.facebook.com/ScienceAcumen/posts/the-hiroshima-atomic-bomb-codenamed-little-boy-contained-about-64-kilograms-of-h/905236778775905/

51. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Little_Boy

52. https://www.reddit.com/r/askscience/comments/3xyjqe/how_powerful_would_the_little_boy_atomic_bomb/

53. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2026_United_States_military_buildup_in_the_Middle_East

54. https://www.facebook.com/groups/214931979134028/posts/1935281127099096/

55. https://www.facebook.com/HistoryInPictures/posts/delta-force-has-reportedly-shifted-focus-to-the-middle-east-with-army-rangers-an/1330357332457003/

56. https://www.atomicarchive.com/media/photographs/nuclear-journeys/nmnsh/nmnsh-14.html

57. https://www.instagram.com/reel/DTSJZQEgTCS/

58. https://www.facebook.com/AFmuseum/posts/little-boy-atomic-bombthe-mk-i-bomb-nicknamed-little-boy-was-the-first-nuclear-w/852198856940001/