

## CAP AND THINK PROGRESS: IRAN DENIERS

### RECENT IAEA REPORTS CLEARLY INDICATE IRAN WORKING TOWARD NUCLEAR WEAPONS:

**In Its Most Recent Report, the IAEA States That Iranian Experiments Have No Purpose Other Than Developing Nuclear Weapons.** “The IAEA published a hard-hitting report in November, stating for the first time that some of the alleged experiments can have no other purpose than developing nuclear weapons. Iran has refused to co-operate with the IAEA over such allegations until now, stating that the evidence is based on fabricated documents.” (*James Blitz, “IAEA Declares Iran Nuclear Talks A ‘Good Trip,’”* [Financial Times](#), 2/1/12)

**A 2009 IAEA Report Claimed Iran Likely Had Engaged In Nuclear Weapons Testing.** “The annexe said Iranian scientists had engaged in ‘probable testing’ of explosives arranged in a hemisphere, which is how an implosion-type nuclear warhead is triggered. There was also evidence, the report says, that Iran had worked on developing a chamber to carry a warhead on top of one of its missiles ‘that is quite likely to be nuclear.’” (*Julian Borger, “IAEA Secret Report: Iran Worked On Nuclear Warhead,”* [The Guardian](#), 9/18/09)

### DESPITE THE IAEA REPORTS, CENTER FOR AMERICAN PROGRESS AND THINK PROGRESS CONTINUE TO DOWNPLAY IRAN’S NUCLEAR AMBITIONS:

**After the Recent IAEA Report Was Released, Think Progress’ Eli Clifton Praised Washington Post Ombudsman For Calling A Headline, That Claimed Iran Wanted Nuclear Weapon, Misleading.** “The important distinction between a ‘nuclear program’ and a ‘nuclear weapons program’ was made again, on Friday by the Washington Post’s ombudsman, Patrick B. Pexton. Pexton criticized the newspaper’s headline ‘Iran’s quest to possess nuclear weapons’ and the subhead ‘Intelligence shows that Iran received foreign assistance to overcome key hurdles in acquiring a nuclear weapon, according to the International Atomic Energy Agency.’” (*Eli Clifton, “WaPo Ombudsman Calls Post Headline Saying Iran Wants Nuke Weapons ‘Misleading,’”* [Think Progress](#), 12/12/11)

**Clifton Rebuked Rick Santorum For Approving Of The Assassinations Of Iranian Nuclear Scientists.** “Santorum’s outright endorsement of targeting Iranian nuclear scientists as ‘enemy combatants’ is troubling at a number of levels. For starters, the IAEA did not definitively conclude that Iran resumed a nuclear weapons program. Santorum, it would seem, is willing to assassinate nuclear scientists who might not even be working on a weapons program.” (*Eli Clifton, “Santorum Calls Iranian Nuclear Scientists ‘Enemy Combatants,’ Would Target Them For Assassination,”* [Think Progress](#), 11/21/11)

**Clifton Admonished Quinnipiac Poll For Assuming Iran Has A Nuclear Weapons Program.** “While Quinnipiac University’s findings that ‘50 percent of U.S. voters support military action if sanctions fail’ are disturbing, the pollsters may have seriously misled respondents by suggesting that there is conclusive evidence of an Iranian nuclear weapons program or that a military attack could be effective in destroying Iran’s alleged weapons program.” (*Eli Clifton, “Quinnipiac Poll Poses Factually Inaccurate Questions Assuming Iran Has A Nuke Weapons Program,”* [Think Progress](#), 11/23/11)

## **CAP AND THINK PROGRESS MAKE THE CASE THAT A NUCLEAR IRAN WOULD NOT BE “A BIG PROBLEM” OR THREATEN THE UNITED STATES:**

**Center For American Progress Writer, Matthew Duss, Claimed A Nuclear Iran Wouldn't Drastically Change The Middle East.** “It is vitally important that we maintain focus on the goal of preventing an Iranian nuclear weapon, but it is also important for us not to talk ourselves into hysteria about what such a weapon could mean. Claims that an Iranian nuclear weapon would radically reorient the entire Middle East are asserted far more often than demonstrated, and are unconvincing. The fact is the United States remains the far stronger player on the international stage, and has contained and deterred far larger adversaries in the past.” (*Matthew Duss, “Beating The Diplomacy Drums On Iran,” [Center For American Progress](#), 11/10/11*)

**Think Progress Believes Iranian Nuclear Weapons “Aren't A Big Problem For Us.”** “The United States has good reason to worry about nuclear proliferation in general and, therefore, to worry about the Iranian program as an instance of the general phenomenon. But Iranian nuclear weapons, as such, aren't a big problem for us.” (*“Living With A Nuclear Iran,” [Think Progress](#), 11/18/07*)

## **CAP FIRST ADVOCATED REMOVING SANCTIONS ON IRAN BEFORE IT ADVOCATED FOR SANCTIONS TO INCREASE INTERNAL PRESSURE ON IRAN:**

**In 2004, CAP Argued Easing Economic Sanctions Would Increase Internal Pressure On The Iranian Regime.** “The United States has a stake in Iran's internal power struggle. By tempering its rhetoric and relaxing its economic sanctions, which are resented by averagelranians, Washington can intensify the existing internal pressures for change.” (*Ray Takeyh, “Iran: The New Reformists,” [Center for American Progress](#), 2/19/04*)

**In 2006, CAP Advocated For Economic Sanctions And Serious Negotiations To Increase Internal Pressure On The Iranian Regime.** “That's why the threat of economic sanctions in tandem with serious negotiations to end Iran's suspected pursuit of nuclear weapons is the correct policy for Washington to follow. Iran is five to ten years away from actually building a nuclear weapon, which means now's the time to demonstrate to Iran's citizens the grave economic cost of Ahmadinejad's defiance through economic sanctions.” (*“Time To Talk To Iran,” [Center for American Progress](#), 9/19/06*)