



## Overview of Presidential Candidate Positions on Iran

A cumulative comparison of Democratic and Republican candidates' policies toward Iran

	Pre-emptive military option on the table	Use of Sanctions	Direct talks with Iran without pre-conditions	Congress approval needed for military action
<b>Clinton</b>	✓	✓	✓	✓
<b>Edwards</b>	✓	✓	✓	✓
<b>Gravel</b>	X	X	✓	✓
<b>Kucinich</b>	X	X	✓	✓
<b>Obama</b>	✓	✓	✓	✓
<b>Giuliani</b>	✓	✓	X	X
<b>Huckabee</b>	✓	✓	✓	X
<b>McCain</b>	✓	✓	X	X
<b>Paul</b>	X	X	✓	✓
<b>Romney</b>	✓	✓	X	X
<b>Thompson</b>	✓	✓	X	✓

As the presidential elections draw near, Iranian-Americans are faced with the challenge of gleaning candidate positions on Iran amidst a blur of sound bytes and vague rhetoric. Which candidates support policies which decrease the risk of war with Iran? Which candidates support policies which do the opposite?

The strongest anti-war candidates include Kucinich, Gravel, and Paul, who are in favor of negotiations and staunchly oppose sanctions or military action. Edwards, Obama, and Clinton distinguish themselves from the Bush administration with their insistence on increased diplomatic negotiations in conjunction with sanctions, but they have not ruled out the use of a pre-emptive military action against Iran.

The candidates with the most aggressive policies toward Iran are Giuliani, McCain, Romney, and Thompson who focus on regime change, and dismiss the effectiveness of negotiations. All three emphasize the imminent threat posed by Iran's nuclear capabilities to the state of Israel, calling for a pre-emptive military strike without congressional approval if necessary. Huckabee follows suit with the Republican candidates except he has expressed more openness to diplomacy.

To find out more, go to [www.niacouncil.org](http://www.niacouncil.org).