

# Iran Nuclear Talks

---

The U.S. and Iran are back at the negotiating table. President Trump hopes to put a stop to Iran's nuclear weapons ambitions, while Tehran wants sanctions lifted and security guarantees.

Trust is low, and the clock is ticking – former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Mark Milley [testified](#) that Iran could produce a nuclear weapon within “several months.”

This discussion guide summarizes key insights from No Labels' [latest coverage](#), explaining what is driving both sides, what could happen next, and why the outcome matters far beyond the Middle East.

*Read More:*

- [NoLabels.org/The-Latest](https://www.nolabels.org/The-Latest)

## IRAN TODAY

---

Ever since the Iranian Revolution of 1979, Iran has been ruled by an authoritarian regime that is deeply unpopular at home. Economic decline and human rights abuses – especially against women – have fueled [mass protests and unrest](#).

Despite brutal repression, dissent continues to simmer. 81% of poll respondents inside Iran – and 99% of Iranians living abroad – [oppose](#) the current government.

*Read More:*

- [Post-Revolutionary Iran: Civil Unrest and Discontent](#)
- [Iran's Opposition Is Growing, But Divided](#)

## IRAN CAN'T HAVE A NUKE

---

A single nuclear bomb can level a city; a full-scale nuclear war could level entire continents. Even if only 1% of the global nuclear arsenal were used, it could block sunlight and collapse food systems, creating a “nuclear famine” that could put up to two billion people at risk of starvation.

That power cannot fall into the hands of Iran, the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism, according to the U.S. government. Iran trains, arms, and funds a [network of terrorists](#) that spans across dozens of countries in Asia and Africa – and perhaps as far as Latin America –

carrying out deadly attacks. A nuclear-armed Iran would embolden these proxies and make retaliation far riskier.

*Read More:*

- [\*Why Nuclear Weapons Still Pose a Global Threat, and Why the Iran Deal Talks Matter Now\*](#)
- [\*The Real Reach of Iran's Terror Network\*](#)

## HOW WE GOT HERE

---

This is [not the first time](#) America has engaged in nuclear dismantlement discussions with another country. Past nuclear rollbacks – in Libya, South Africa, and former Soviet states – show that disarmament is possible, but difficult.

The U.S. was in a similar position a decade ago when President Obama negotiated the [2015 Iran Nuclear Deal](#). That deal curbed Iran's uranium enrichment and opened its facilities to international inspectors, in exchange for sanctions relief. The deal collapsed after President Trump withdrew in 2018, after which Iran ramped up its nuclear program further.

*Read More:*

- [\*What Was the 2015 Iran Nuclear Deal?\*](#)
- [\*The History of Nuclear Disarmament, and What it Means for Iran\*](#)

## STATE OF PLAY

---

Most Americans want to prevent a nuclear Iran, but confidence in the negotiations is low. The [latest polling](#) shows **71%** of voters across party lines want Iran's nuclear facilities destroyed, and **60%** support the negotiations, but a plurality – **44%** – think it will not lead to a deal.

And then there is Congress. Due to a [little-known 2015 law](#), Congress can block any nuclear agreement with Iran and snap back sanctions if Iran violates the terms. Lawmakers could have the final say, if they choose to use their power.

*Read More:*

- [\*Does Trump Need Congress to Approve an Iran Nuclear Deal?\*](#)
- [\*Iran Nuclear Talks: Where Do the American People Stand?\*](#)

## DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

---

1. Do you believe the negotiations will be successful?
2. Do you think Iran's internal unrest makes the regime more likely—or less likely—to strike a deal?
3. Should the U.S. negotiate with regimes that support terrorism, or is that rewarding bad behavior?
4. Does focusing on Iran distract from other global threats, or is it still a top-tier concern?
5. Should the U.S. ever accept a deal that delays, but does not eliminate, Iran's nuclear program? Why or why not?
6. If diplomacy fails, what should be the U.S. fallback: military strikes, more sanctions, or something else?