

Abstract

Iranian nuclear program has presented a problem for many years. Even though the regime in Tehran has not formally announced its quest to develop nuclear weapons and has actually denied such accusations, the international community concluded from the actions of the regime that the development of nuclear weapons is the ultimate goal of Tehran. The United States reacted to the course of events and tried to limit the program or stop it altogether. The Bush Administration was not an exception in this regard. Even though the attitude towards Iran changed during 2001 - 2009, the nuclear program progressed further and still presents a great danger. Not only politicians but also academics, experts and analytics were trying to answer the question how to curb the program most effectively. This thesis analyzes and compares concepts of scholars with the actual policy practiced by the Bush Administration and finds out that both approaches vary quite significantly. While the majority of scholars recommended the administration to limit the economic sanctions and refrain from aggressive rhetoric concerning the possibility of military action, the American government tightened the sanctions and sustained the option of intervention. Since Iran still continues with its nuclear program, it can be asserted that the policy did not bring the desired fruits. However, it contributed to certain positive developments (the support of the international community) and therefore cannot be totally denounced. Correctness of the approach of the Bush Administration is also confirmed by the policy of the current administration, which has not significantly changed the set course.