

A Critical Discourse Analysis of Trump's Speech Regarding Iran's Nuclear Deal on the Basis of Van Leewen's Socio-semantic Model

Danial Adarng¹

Department of Language and Linguistics, Islamic Azad University, Zanjan Branch, Zanjan, Iran

Nikan Faraji²

Department of Language and Linguistics, Islamic Azad University, Zanjan Branch, Zanjan, Iran

Received 5 January 2021 ||| Accepted 7 January 2022

Abstract: Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) discloses manipulative texts and intends to empower the reader to discriminate between convincing, well-founded argument and fallacious misconduct. It also raises awareness of the manipulation and the exploitation of the texts, which seem natural to the readers. CDA uncover the linguistic techniques as well as social actions which are used to promote the ideas including injustice, dominance, discrimination, and highly opinionated and prejudiced beliefs, which have dominated all the social roles in any society. This study sought to analyze the U.S. president's speech regarding Iran's nuclear agreement on the basis of Van Leewen's Socio-semantic model. Accordingly, all the speech was thoroughly scrutinized and all the sentences were completely analyzed based on socio-semantic model. The results indicated that Trumps' speech enjoyed a 50 percent degree of mystification, illustrating he was almost explicit in his beliefs. By reinstating the expressions such as 'Iran', 'Iranian Regime', and 'This Regime' as the subject of the sentences or as Halliday (1995) named, the theme of the sentences, he intently highlighted the role of Iran and its involvement in all the instability and disorder in the 'Persian Gulf' or as he said 'Arabian Gulf' area. Trump made an attempt to illuminate 'Iranophobia' and shed more light on its sinister and chaotic actions. By putting the blame on the previous administration, and giving so many examples with respects to Iran's destructive actions, he tried to warn the whole world of the likely evil consequences of the contract. By studying and focusing on the linguistic features of the speech, this study endeavored to demonstrate how linguistic structures are controlled by socio-semantic features and how these features, in turn, are controlled by ideology. Ideology, in turn, is also dominated by power relations in a wider scale.

Keywords: Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), socio-semantic, critical discourse analysis.

|||

Introduction

Although Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) has some weak points, its strength is so high that has steered Trump and his close allies to the state of irrationality.

By substituting the fake name of 'Arabian Gulf' for the real and historical name of 'Persian Gulf', Trump could lead the dispute among elites to the level of national concern. Enfeeblement of Iranian national identity and the removal of the historical name of 'Persian Gulf' is all Iranians' red line, the crossing of which is unforgivable for all groups of people even the state oppositional groups.

Trump delivered a lecture in White House last Friday on three subjects of Countering America's Adversaries through Sanctions Act (CAATSA), Iran's fidelity or infidelity to JCPOA, and American policies towards Iran. As opposed to his previous remarks regarding designating the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC) as a terrorist organization, Trump merely stated that they were going to impose tougher sanctions on it.

Having expressed his belief that IRGC is a terrorist group and spread violence in the area, Trump also added that IRGC has backed up Asad's suppressing regime. He further announced that he would ask the State Department of Treasury to put heavier sanctions upon IRGC and its officials, agents, and affiliates all over the world. They would also further tougher sanctions on Iran's missile program.

Prior to Trump's speech, Rex Tillerson, the current Secretary of State, in response to the reporters' question whether IRGC would be put in the terrorist groups, reiterated that designating a military

¹ Email: danialadrangpbar@yahoo.com (Corresponding Author)

² Email: nikanfaraji1998@gmail.com

corporation as a terrorist organization is a very complicated issue. If the State of Treasury added a group of an organization to the list of terrorist group, that organization would undergo international sanctions; however, it didn't happen.

Having claimed that Iran has fueled war in Yemen and Syria, Trump added that Iran's interference in the area has caused sectarian violence and vicious civil wars in Iraq. He further continued that Iran has backed up Assad's regime and supplied arms for its army, the weapons which are used against Syrian kids. He went on to say that Iran's sinister actions like this should not be neglected. He also mentioned that given the regime's murderous past and present, they should not take lightly its sinister vision for the future. The regime's two favorite chants are "Death to America" and "Death to Israel."

He later referred to Persian Gulf as 'Arabian Gulf' and this provoked Iranians' anger both inside and outside of the country.

Ironically speaking, he supported social and political movements in Iran on the one hand and he also abided by his own measures in imposing tougher immigration rules against Iranians on the other hand. He also criticized JCPOA in that it is not flawless and some articles and obligations have not been sufficiently met.

He claimed that Iran had not fulfilled its commitment to JCPOA and said that he was directing his administration to work closely with Congress and their allies to address the deal's many serious flaws so that the Iranian regime could never threaten the world with nuclear weapons. The flaws in the deal also include insufficient enforcement and nearly total silence on Iran's missile programs. He carried on that Congress had already begun the work to address these problems. Key House and Senate leaders were drafting legislation that would amend the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act to strengthen enforcement, prevent Iran from developing an intercontinental ballistic missile, and make all restrictions on Iran's nuclear activity permanent under U.S. law.

However, he kept on, in the event we are not able to reach a solution working with Congress and our allies, then the agreement would be terminated. He further emphasized that he can cancel the contract at any time.

Obviously, Trump passed the buck to the Congress to decide about the United States preservation or annulment of JCPOA within 60 days. He could do it by himself without giving this responsibility to the Congress; however, he was afraid it might be regarded as unilateral withdrawal from an international concord. He went on saying that they would take any measure to prevent Iran from accessing nuclear weapons and would impose more and tougher sanctions on Iran to prevent the regime from mass production of arms.

A new method in the field of discourse analysis which probes and finds out the ideology and power relations hidden in the text is called critical discourse analysis. Whilst discourse analysis comprehends the context including the intention of the speaker, previously assumed knowledge, the environment, etc., critical discourse analysis figures out concepts such as ideology and power relations as well.

CDA is extensively used to cover the cultural, social, historical, and political relationships and goes beyond the scope of descriptive discourse analysis as it is believed that no text is ideologically innocent. As commonly believed, both language and discourse have layers and levels which are laden with dominance, power relations, and ideology at the underlying level and at the surface level linguistic structures are observed.

One of the discursive structure's goals is to represent social actors who are all the participant involved in a discourse and are represented differently with the facilitation of the socio-semantic features in discourse. Applying Van Leeuwen's model (1996) to analyze the text, this paper intended to illustrate how the US president, Trump, used socio-semantic features to represent social actors as he intended to.

Hence, the objective of this paper was to show how Trump's ideas, notions, and ideologies were instilled via particular use of language to readers/listeners so that the notions and ideologies would be assumed to be natural.

This paper was to discover answers for the three following questions: 1) how are the ideologies residing in the mind of Trump as the president of the US reflected in texts? 2) how is the linguistic realization of the discursive structures performed in the given texts? 3) how can we explain the relationship between the discursive features and ideology and hidden power relations in these texts?

Mentioned features were utilized to inspire notions and ideologies underlying texts, for it is not the pure description of linguistic codes and meaning which make the text to be understood. On the contrary, in producing and understanding the text, the authors' attitudes and perception and the ideological factors hidden in the text are reflected (Aghagolzadeh & Ghiasian, 2007).

Kress (1985) states that the goal of critical linguistics is disambiguating and demystifying the production and perception to endow perception of the analyzers' ideology functioning in language and introducing it to others, but not to decode the complicated and cryptic meanings in the text. Being problem-based, many critical studies and their methods focus on controversial issues like feminism, anti-Semitism and so on which are the signs of the problems made by critical discourse researchers for the problems are referred to as "taboo" generally by the society (Wodak & Meyer, 2009).

During the historical evolution, discourse analysis has passed two unequal pathways, one of which rooted in linguistics and the other in socio-political philosophy. Linguistics' evolution can be surveyed in stages of structuralist discourse analysis (discourse as language beyond the sentence level), functionalist discourse analysis (Discourse as language in use), and critical discourse analysis.

A common point for all the three branches was noted by Soltani (2005) that each branch approves the dominance of language over discourse; i.e., discourse is within language which happens inside it and is dependent upon it.

Unlike linguistics, discourse analysis has evolved into another way in humanities and social studies. Discourse is larger than language and not only the language but also many other phenomena are affected by its influence, said Fairclough (1972, quoted by Jorgenson and Phillips, 2002). In fact, identity is given through the discourse in which it is happening.

Although social functions are prioritized by Van Leeuwen's theory, their roots are in language since social actors' representations are involved in linguistic realizations. In this theory, only, the priority goes for the socio-semantic features. The perception of 'ideology' significates exceptionally in the study of CDA and, as well as discourse, not much harmony is there on its application.

Regardless of their coordinating social function, ideologies are the representations of mind, which control opinions, beliefs, attitudes, and knowledge of the authorized group members and the general audience. In fact, they prescribe what position people should adopt.

As an implicit philosophy, ideology is seen by Gramsci (quoting from Fairclough, 1989) which is inherent in all experimental activities of both social and individual lives like arts and economy, is in the background and is taken for granted. Such a concept of ideology is said to be known as 'common sense'.

A crucial feature of a discursive ideological formulation is its ability of neutralizing ideologies. Through naturalization, these ideologies may be perceived as common sense and, accordingly, the ideologies and neutralized acts can turn into parts of rudimentary common knowledge and may be activated in interactions. 'Discursive structures are the ones whose changes, transformations, presence and absence are tied with the utterance or texts that can lead to various perceptions' (Yarmohammadi, 2004, p. 166).

Ideological texts are divided into two types of constructions: 1) those which bear the intentions of the writer are called discursive sentences, and 2) a special form of grammar is used unintentionally in non-discursive sentences.

Hence, text analyzer must decide based on the topic and intentions of the writer whether a given sentence is discursive or not. For instance: a writer desires to underrate an event, s/he might use socio-semantic features like "exclusion" (agent deletion, e.g., by making a passive sentence).

Accordingly, the author does not reveal the intention underlying such a structure. It means that the feature "exclusion" is used to send the information to the background of the reader's mind to underestimate the event.

Review of Literature

Wang (2010) in an article entitled 'A Critical Discourse Analysis of Barack Obama's Speeches' studied Barack Obama's presidential speeches mainly from the point of transitivity and modality. Wang came to the realizations that Obama's language was easy and colloquial, showing Obama's intention to shorten the distance between him and the audience. In addition, he concluded that the material process, the process of doing and happening, was used most in his two speeches, illustrating

the current states of affairs, achievements, and his future plans. It seems Obama intended to arouse people's confidence in his presidency. His use of modality helped him to convey his message much more easily and by using future tense, he intended to present his political, economic, and cultural in the following four years. By using first person pronoun 'we', he intentionally made an effort to shorten the distance between him and his audience.

Kavoosi (2002) in his Ph.D. dissertation studied Theme and Rheme constructions in contemporary Persian and having focused on journalistic as well as academic texts, he came to this realization that 55.6 percent of clauses start with compound themes, where as simple themes accounted for 44.1 percent in the studied texts.

Having probed into the grade four and five primary school bilingual (Armenian and Persian) students' compositions, Fahiminia (2009), on the basis of Halliday's SFG, concluded that the most prominent sequence of themes was (textual + experiential themes) and (textual + interpersonal + experiential themes). He also came to this conclusion that Persian or Armenian monolingual students tended to use compound and complex themes, whereas simple and unmarked themes were more prevalent among bilingual learners.

Amirkhanlou (2016), in her article entitled 'the stylistics study of verbs in Hafiz' sonnets: A functional approach', delved into the processes used in the sonnets and studied the Hafiz' confrontation with the inside and the outside worlds. Accordingly, he came to this realization that material processes dealt with Hafiz' outer world, while Hafiz's use of mental processes would illustrate abstract atmospheres. The behavioral processes were used to supplement the lover-beloved interactions. His verbal processes were utilized in his debates and relational processes were used for personification in his odes. Finally, existential processes were employed in negative forms to depict that present elements in his odes did not truly exist in Hafiz' real world.

In their article entitled 'Critical discourse analysis of political speeches: A case study of Obama's and Rouhani's speeches at UN', Sharifar and Rahimi (2015) made an effort to dig into the linguistic spin in Obama's and Rouhani's political speeches at UN. On the basis transitivity system and modality, they tried to discover how two presidents' languages could incorporate both ideology and power in their political speeches. In other words, they were after finding out how their capabilities and policies were made through language and how their political speeches were conveyed to and perceived by common people.

Behin and Sadeghi (2010) in their article titled 'A Linguistic Account of the Protagonist's Development in The Grapes of Wrath', studied the language of Tom Joad, the main character of the novel to illustrate his social position and his transformation from a young farm-hand holding a carpe diem philosophy to a socially-wise reformist. They finally concluded that the character used material and mental processes more than the others, showing his real experience of prison and his fear of the life outside the prison respectively.

In his dissertation entitled 'The Analysis of Processes in the Persian Aphasic patients' Speech on the basis of Functional Approach', Bazayar (2011) excavated the processes used in Aphasic patients' speech. He concluded that the aphasic patients' use of material processes were significantly more than that of ordinary people, whereas their use of mental, relational, and behavioral processes was significantly less, showing aphasic patients had difficulty dealing with abstract concepts and had no choice but to focus on physical events and less abstract phenomena.

In another thesis entitled ' The Analysis of Aphasia on the basis of Interpersonal Metafunction, Tohidian, Rezapour, and Bazayar (2014), having analyzed the speech of normal and aphasic people with respect to tense and modality, came to this conclusion that normal people used more modal adjuncts and they used more past tense than the other tenses.

Vazir nezhad and Pahlevan nezhad (2009) analyzed a novel with the title of 'the lights, I turned off' and concluded that material, mental, and verbal processes had more frequency respectively. In addition, modality was very rare in the novel, suggesting his lack of ability in expressing his ideas and beliefs.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical pattern applied for the analysis of the data in this study is Van Leeuwen's socio-semantic model (1996). According to Fairclough (1989, pp. 17-22) discourse is "language as social practice."

Moreover, social practices are regarded as whatever people do daily that can be of different values of freedom, which are demonstrated through the common law or overt prescription, however, they can be a mixture of the both.

Social practices have some crucial factors a) social actors: participants b) action: what participants are involved in c) reaction: are the activities shown by participants toward other participants or actions. This paper deals with the way the social actors are shown.

Van Leeuwen's analysis starts with features of socio-semantic that are a part of social actors' representation, rather than common practices in CDA which are about the linguistic instruments like nominalization, subject deletion in passive sentences and issues of linguistic such as "transitivity" (Hodge and Kress, 1979; Fairclough, 1989; Van Dijk, 1989; Wodak, 1995; Van Dijk, 2002; Wodak and Chilton, 2005; Wodak and Mayer, 2009).

Van Leeuwen in an article named "the representation of social actors" put forward a list of approaches expressing social actors, defining and explaining each one of them, arguing that the study of socio-semantic features would result in a deep and comprehensive perception of the text in comparison to the linguistic features alone.

In this case, socio-semantic features have more effects on understanding and revealing the underlying layers within the text; actually, Van Leeuwen believes in the specifying justification of discursive sentences and the existence of the socio-semantic features or them being absent in a CDA analysis, and then the linguistic realization of them is to be studied in a text or utterance.

The chief reason of prioritizing socio-semantic features over linguistic ones by Van Leeuwen is that linguistic and social actors do not always correspond. Taking the phrase "The first foreign journalist who was murdered by the Taliban while capturing Kabul ..." into consideration for an instance, the linguistic subject of the sentence is 'the first foreign journalist'; however, this is the patient sociologically and the real agent is "Taliban".

Because there is not a one to one correspondence between sociological and linguistic elements, relying only on linguistics elements in agency representation will bring about ignorance of many agency issues. For this reason, Van Leeuwen mainly highlights the socio-semantic features and then focuses on linguistic realizations. Furthermore, meaning and purpose have roots in speaker's culture and not in their language and this can be another reason to justify this claim.

Presence and absence of the participants in social activities and in their language realizations are divided into sub-branches called inclusion and exclusion respectively over all, in this approach, which have several forms. Occasionally social actors are excluded in discourse for different reasons and motivations.

Exclusion is divided into suppression and backgrounding. In the former one, exclusion occurs to make the actor and even his behavior and action impossible to recognize, but latter one excludes the actor, leaving some hints behind so it can be retrieved. Actually, backgrounding is the action in which the actor is not fully eliminated and is marginalized.

Role allocation issue in Van Leeuwen's model is in line with the active or passive roles given to the social actors and contain all activities done by actors. Relationships between active and passive actors can be redefined in social relationships, for the social actors may not be equal with the grammatical and linguistic roles of them.

It is very important to identify the actor and the patient of the action in DA. There are two ways to give roles which are: activation and passivation. In the first one, an active, dynamic, and influential force is introduced as social actor, while in the passive sentences the actor suffers from the effects of an action and is introduced in a way so that it whether accepts or takes it to itself. It is to mention that passivation occurs in two ways of subjection and beneficialization. In the early one, actor is the goal of the action, and the later one takes the actor as an indirect recipient of the result of the action.

Inclusion

Inclusion happens when the presence of participants in social activities and their realizations in language is observable. Inclusion is divided into activation and passivation:

Activation

In activation, the social actor is introduced as an active, dynamic, and influential force:

1. Iran seized power in 1979 and (Iran) forced a proud people to submit to its extremist rule. 'Iran' is represented by activation "Iran forced a proud" Linguistically speaking, 'Iran' is the subject in an active clause.
2. Agents of the Iranian regime illegally seized the U.S. embassy in Tehran and held more than 60 Americans hostage during the 444 days of the crisis. 'Iranian regime' is represented by activation "Agents of Iranian regime illegally seized ... and held American hostages ...". Linguistically speaking, 'Iranian regime' is represented by a pre-modifier.
3. In Iraq and Afghanistan, groups supported by Iran have killed hundreds of American military personnel. 'Iran' is activated again but in the form of by phrase; that is to say, Iran is the agent of supporting the groups killing hundreds of American military personnel. Needless to mention that 'Iran', 'Iranian regime', 'the regime', 'Iranian officials and military leaders', and 'we' as the Americans, 'I' as the US president have been repeatedly activated.

Passivation

In passivation, the social actor is affected by an action. Passivation is of two kinds: Subjection which is the direct goal or recipient of an action and beneficialization, in which the social actor is the indirect recipient of the action:

4. Beginning in 1979, agents of the Iranian regime illegally seized the U.S. embassy in Tehran and held more than 60 Americans hostage during the 444 days of the crisis. The Iranian-backed terrorist group Hezbollah twice bombed our embassy in Lebanon — once in 1983 and again in 1984. Another Iranian-supported bombing killed 241 Americans — service members they were, in their barracks in Beirut in 1983. As can be seen, the bold-faced constituents including 'US embassy', '60 American soldiers', 'our embassy', and '241 Americans' are all represented via subjection method. In other words, Americans have been the victims of Iranian regimes' hostile activities. Linguistically speaking, all the above-mentioned constituents are the direct objects or the themes of the action verbs.
5. In Iraq and Afghanistan, groups supported by Iran have killed hundreds of American military personnel. '[the terrorist] groups' are supported by Iran; that is, these groups have been represented via beneficialization method. As far as Linguistic representation is concerned, 'groups' is represented as the subject of passive structure.
6. It [the regimes] launches cyber-attacks *against* our critical infrastructure, financial system, and military.

The bold-faced parts illustrate the beneficialization method as they are represented as the indirect object of the action via a linguistic prepositional phrase construction.

Reference Allocation

Social actors can bear human and nonhuman characteristics. Personalization is when the actor mentioned in the text is a human and is referred to by the proper nouns, personal pronouns, etc. and if the form of the actor is non-human then the term 'impersonalization' is employed.

Personalization is divided into some sub-branches that are concisely mentioned below:

Determination and Indetermination

In the representation of the social actors, if the identity is clear, the method is Determination and if it is not clear and known the Indetermination method is used. Some indetermination realizations can be divided into: indefinite articles, adjectives, pronouns, everyone, few, some, such and such, a student, etc., either alone or together with the names.

7. Iran has also entered into lucrative business contracts with other parties to the agreement.

‘Other parties’ is an example of indeterminacy since the word ‘other’ makes the social act almost unclear. ‘parties’ is linguistically represented via an indefinite pronoun of ‘other’.

8. We hope that our actions today will help bring about a future of peace, stability, and prosperity in the Middle East — a future where sovereign nations respect each other and their own citizens.

The antecedent or the reference of highlighted constituent ‘sovereign nations’ is not obvious. It seems that Trump does not refer to any specific nations.

Determination Methods

a) Association

If social actors share the same opinion about and the same position toward a specific activity or method, association is used.

9. Iranian proxies provided training to operatives who were later involved in al Qaeda's bombing of the American embassies in Kenya, Tanzania

Here, Iranian proxies and Al Qaeda are associated, meaning these two were involved in a bombing attack. Involvement of Iranian regime with Al Qaeda has been highlighted.

10. The regime harbored high-level terrorists in the wake of the 9/11 attacks, *including* Osama bin Laden's son.

‘The regime’ and ‘terroristic attack of 9/11’, as well as ‘Osama bin Laden’ are associated via the use of accompaniment circumstantial adjunct of ‘including’.

b) Differentiation

When social actors are different from other similar groups and when they are easily distinguishable from them thus forming the groups of ‘self’ and ‘others’ or ‘us’ and ‘them’, differentiation is formed.

11. This radical regime has raided the wealth of one of the world's oldest and most vibrant nations, and spread death, destruction, and chaos all around the globe.

It is crystal clear that ‘Iranian radical regime’ is differentiated from ‘oldest and vibrant nation’.

12. We hope that these new measures directed at the Iranian dictatorship will compel the government to reevaluate its pursuit of terror at the expense of its people.

Obviously, Trump makes a distinction between ‘their new measures’ as ‘self’ and Iranian government [measures] of pursuing terror’ as ‘others’. Meanwhile, he makes a differentiation again between Iranian government and Iranian people.

13. We pray for a future where young children — American and Iranian, Muslim, Christian, and Jewish — can grow up in a world free from violence, hatred, and terror.

At the end of his speech, Trump remove any differentiation among the young American and Iranian, Muslim, Christian, and Jewish children.

Classification

Classification involves categorizing the social actors based on their function, identification, or appraisal.

Functionalization

14. Thank you very much. My fellow Americans: As President of the United States, my highest obligation is to ensure the safety and security of the American people.

15. This, as President of the United States, is unacceptable. In other countries, they think in terms of 100-year intervals, not just a few years at a time.

The ‘President of the United States’ is the function attributed to the social actor.

Identification

Identification is divided into Classification, Relational identification, and Physical identification.

16. It develops, deploys, and proliferates missiles that threaten American troops and our allies.
17. Iranian proxies provided training to operatives who were later involved in al Qaeda's bombing of the American embassies in Kenya...
'Our allies' and 'Iranian Proxies' are examples of relational identification.

Appraisalment

In appraisalment, social actors are evaluated via the attributes given to them:

18. Iran is under the control of a fanatical regime that seized power in 1979 and forced a proud people to submit to its extremist rule. This radical regime has raided the wealth of one of the world's oldest and most vibrant nations, and spread death, destruction, and chaos all around the globe.
19. Given the regime's murderous past and present, we should not take lightly its sinister vision for the future. The regime's two favorite chants are "Death to America" and "Death to Israel."
20. ... I urge our allies to join us in taking strong actions to curb Iran's continued dangerous and destabilizing behavior...

All the bold-faced adjectives are the attributes given to social actors to assess or evaluates their actions.

Nomination

Another sub-category of personalization is nomination. This method includes ways of addressing the social actors.

21. The Revolutionary Guard is the Iranian Supreme Leader's corrupt personal terror force and militia. 'The revolutionary Guard' represents Titulation, while 'supreme leader' represents Honorification.
22. In Syria, the Iranian regime has supported the atrocities of Bashar al-Assad's regime and condoned Assad's use of chemical weapons against helpless civilians, including many, many children.
23. The regime harbored high-level terrorists in the wake of the 9/11 attacks, including Osama bin Laden's son. In Iraq and Afghanistan, groups supported by Iran have killed hundreds of American military personnel.

The words 'Bashar al-Assad, and 'Osama bin Laden' are the representations of formalization, whereas 'Assad' represents semi-formalization method.

Single determination and over determination

In single determination, the social actor only plays one and only one social action/function. However, in over differentiation, more than e one social actions attributed to social actors. For example, a social actor could have different functions over a period, which is called

Anachronism:

24. Given the regime's murderous past and present, we should not take lightly its sinister vision for the future. The regime's two favorite chants are "Death to America" and "Death to Israel."

The regime's murderous actions in both past and presented are highlighted.

25. Iranian proxies provided training to operatives who were *later* involved in al Qaeda's bombing of the American embassies in Kenya, Tanzania, and two years *later*, killing 224 people, and wounding more than 4,000 others.

'Operatives' trained by Iranian proxies *symbolizes* terrorists as they have committed lots of terroristic attacks over the time.

On the other hand, 'The revolutionary Guard', 'supreme leader', Bashar al-Assad, and 'Osama bin Laden' are singly determined and their role remains constant in the whole text.

Impersonalization Methods

Abstraction and objectivation are the sub-categories of the impersonalization. As previously mentioned, these social actors are in the forms of non-human entities. Abstraction is the replacement of an actor with its own characteristics, and the representation of the actor is through abstract nouns in language. This method happens for degrading groups and individuals to the scope of objects.

26. History has shown that the longer we ignore a threat, the more dangerous that threat becomes.

By using nominalization, a noun instead of a verb, the characteristic of a social actor 'Iran' [who is always threatening the world] is represented in the role of the actor.

Objectivation can be divided into Spatialization, Instrumentalization, Utterance autonomization, and Somatization, all of which are exemplified bellow:

Spatialization

If a place or a location is associated with the social actor and is represented, spatialization happens in a specific context.

27. But the previous administration lifted these sanctions, just before what would have been the total collapse of the Iranian regime, through the deeply controversial 2015 nuclear deal with Iran. This deal is known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, or JCPOA.

'Iran' is represented instead of Iranian government.

28. There are also many people who believe that Iran is dealing with North Korea.

'Iran' and 'North Korea' are represented instead of Iranian and North Korean governments respectively.

Instrumentalization

Instrumentalization is used when representations are made by means of a tool.

29. Realizing the gravity of the situation, the United States and the United Nations Security Council sought, over many years, to stop Iran's pursuit of nuclear weapons with a wide array of strong economic sanctions.

30. Third, we will address the regime's proliferation of missiles and weapons that threaten its neighbors, global trade, and freedom of navigation.

The words, 'weapons' and 'missiles' are the tools in the hands of [Iranian regime].

Utterance autonomization

Utterance autonomization is used when representations are made by referring to an actor's sayings, writings, and utterance.

31. Given the regime's murderous past and present, we should not take lightly its sinister vision for the future. The regime's two favorite chants are "Death to America" and "Death to Israel."

These so called chants as Trump mentions represent utterance autonomization and they depict the social actor's beliefs and ideologies.

Somatization

At last, somatization represents social actor's body organs.

32. In 1996, the regime directed another bombing of American military housing in Saudi Arabia, murdering 19 Americans in cold blood.

33. The United States is far from the only target of the Iranian dictatorship's long campaign of bloodshed. The regime violently suppresses its own citizens; it shot unarmed student protestors in the street during the Green Revolution.

The words blood and bloodshed are illustrated as part of social actor's organs.

Type allocation, like reference allocation of social actors, is one of the features of how they are represented. Actors may be represented in either genericization or specification. It is discursive to represent social actors as general (common) or specific (proper). Sociologists believe in the direct relationship of these two socio-semantic features and social classes. As Bourdieu (1986) put, specification is mostly performed in the discourse of the working class, while, more genericization is used in the ruling class.

The difference in representation of the different social classes and political parties in newspapers in favor of them has been described by Van Leeuwen (1996) which is as follows: Specification techniques in middle class newspapers have been used to refer to politicians, elites, experts, and people are generalized. On the contrary, in newspapers such as Daily Telegraph that are in exclusive working class the method of representation is the opposite: Generalized politicians and elites versus specific people (Yarmohammadi, 2007).

Representation of actors as general individuals or class such as people, enemies, villains, folk, women, men, kids, youth, readers, writers, administrators are genericization.

Individualization and assimilation are two sub-categories of 'specification'. When an actor is represented as an individual such as: Mohammad Reza Shah, Michael Pence, he, she and Donald Trump, individualization happens.

Subsequently, when an actor is represented in a group, assimilation occurs. Two sub-categories are derived from assimilation called collectivization and aggregation. If groups of actors are expressed without digits and numbers collectivization has happened. For example: political groups, they, this privileged group, ministers of the former governments, Iranians. If this is not the case then aggregation occurs.

Examples of aggregation can be: a large number of terrorists, hundreds of millions of Muslims, five hundred thousand students, and millions of protestors.

34. Key House and Senate leaders are drafting legislation that would amend the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act to strengthen enforcement, prevent Iran from developing an inter- — this is so totally important — an intercontinental ballistic missile, and make all restrictions on Iran's nuclear activity permanent under U.S. law.

'House and Senate leaders' are represented via collectivization.

35. Beginning in 1979, agents of the Iranian regime illegally seized the U.S. embassy in Tehran and held more than 60 Americans hostage during the 444 days of the crisis. -... Another Iranian-supported bombing killed 241 Americans — service members they were, in their barracks in Beirut in 1983.

36. In 1996, the regime directed another bombing of American military housing in Saudi Arabia, murdering 19 Americans in cold blood.

'60 Americans', '241 Americans', and '19 Americans' all illustrate the aggregation method. Figures and numbers are clearly seen.

37. Among other conditions, this law requires the President, or his designee, to certify that the suspension of sanctions under the deal is "appropriate and proportionate" to measure — and other measures taken by Iran to terminate its illicit nuclear program.

38. Just imagine the sight of those huge piles of money being hauled off by the Iranians waiting at the airport for the cash.

The word 'sanctions' and 'the Iranians' are represented via genericization method.

Results

In this study, Trump's speech regarding Iran and JCPOA was socio-semantically analyzed to see how language can have two different layers of meaning, the superficial linguistic meaning and the underlying ideological meaning. In response to the first research question (How are the ideologies residing in the mind of Trump as the president of the US reflected in texts?), it should be noted that the ideology dominating the minds of the US president and his consultants is reflected in the text using discursive features as 'exclusion', 'activation', 'personalization', 'impersonalization', 'genericization', differentiation, etc., in the texts. The type, frequency and distribution of these features were thoroughly evaluated. The Implicit socio-semantic features applied in his speech is shown in table 1. As it is obviously depicted, passivation and impersonalization had the highest frequencies of 130 and

31 respectively. The total number of implicit socio-semantic features of Trump speech amounted to 174.

As Table 2 demonstrates, among all the explicit socio-semantic roles, activation hit the record of 112. This was followed by specification and association with the record of 18. Association and appraisal were ranked third with the record of 17. In sum, the total number of Trump’s explicit socio-semantic roles came to 170 which is almost the same figure as that of implicit features.

The results of the data analyses illustrate that socio-semantic features such as activation, passivation, exclusion, etc., are mostly reflected using linguistic features in the texts. Thus, in response to the second question (How is the linguistic realization of the discursive structures performed in the given texts?), it should be acknowledged that linguistic realization of discursive structures in the texts is performed using linguistic structures such as active vs. passive, use of nominalization, coordination, accompaniment circumstantial, quantifier, pre-modifier, etc.

Table 1: Frequency and Percentage of Implicit socio-semantic features

Exclusion	Frequency	1
	Percent	1.1
Passivation	Frequency	130
	Percent	74.7
Impersonalization	Frequency	31
	Percent	17.8
Generecization	Frequency	3
	Percent	1.7
Functionalization	Frequency	2
	Percent	1.1
Identification	Frequency	0
	Percent	0
Indetermination	Frequency	6
	Percent	3.4
Implicit roles' frequency		174

Table 2: Frequency and Percentage of Explicit socio-semantic features

Activation	Frequency	112
	Percent	65.8
Specification	Frequency	18
	Percent	10.5
Association	Frequency	18
	Percent	10.5
Differentiation	Frequency	4
	Percent	2.3
Nomination	Frequency	1
	Percent	0.5
Appraisalment	Frequency	17
	Percent	10
Explicit roles' frequency		170

The third question was, 'How can we explain the relationship between the discursive features and ideology and hidden power relations in these texts?' To answer this question, we can say that there is a dialectal relationship between discursive features and ideology which can be decoded via studying these features. In this study, through extraction of discursive socio-semantic features and qualitative analyses, we were able to understand the dominant ideology hidden in the texts.

Critical discourse analysis is inclined to explore ways through which ideology in language is reflected in various social institutions. According to Wodak (2006), ideology is the most important

aspect of creating, maintaining and stabilizing the unequal power relations. The relationship between discursive features and ideology is collaborative and through investigation of these features, we can uncover the ideology suppressed in the discourse and, actually, the dominant ideology in the minds of the writers of texts. As concrete examples, the ideology dominant in Trump’s mind is as follows:

Trump announces that he intends to pose strategies against Iran due to its pursuit of nuclear weapons. He explicitly calls Iran a dictator and the sponsor of terrorism:

“I am announcing our strategy ... to confront the Iranian regime's hostile actions and to ensure that Iran never, and I mean never, acquires a nuclear weapon. Our policy is based on a clear-eyed assessment of the Iranian dictatorship, its sponsorship of terrorism, and its continuing aggression in the Middle East and all around the world”.

His stance against Iran continues in his enumeration of Iran’s negative status in the area together with numerous allegations highlighting the state of Iranophobia:

“Iran is under the control of a fanatical regime... The regime harbored high-level terrorists in the wake of the 9/11 attacks ... Agents of the Iranian regime illegally seized the U.S. embassy in Tehran and held more than 60 Americans hostage during the 444 days... In 1996, the regime directed another bombing of American military housing in Saudi Arabia, murdering 19 Americans in cold blood”.

He further emphasizes Iran’s involvement in the chaotic situations around the globe, instilling this phobia that Iran is potentially detrimental if nothing interrupts it:

“The regime remains the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism, and provides assistance to al Qaeda, the Taliban, Hezbollah, Hamas, and other terrorist networks.... This regime has fueled sectarian violence in Iraq, and vicious civil wars in Yemen and Syria”.

He later expresses his concerns that Iran’s nuclear deal is a mistake:

“The Iran Deal was one of the worst and most one-sided transactions the United States has ever entered into... The Iranian regime has committed multiple violations of the agreement... Iranian officials and military leaders have repeatedly claimed they will not allow inspectors onto military sites ... Iran is not living up to the spirit of the deal”.

By using somehow linguistic manipulations of the words and phrases, he makes an endeavor to communicate his underlying ideas and ideologies that his administration is against the deal and is determined to either leave it or have it modified:

“We will work with our allies to counter the regime's destabilizing activity and support for terrorist proxies in the region”.

His whole speech focused on the idea that due to Iran’s actions, and its pursuit of nuclear weapons, the Deal is not all right. Regarding his use of explicit and implicit socio-semantic features, the degree of mystification amounted to almost 50, meaning Trump has been virtually explicit in his speech regarding his beliefs. Needless to mention that this degree is closely related to the state of power and it is highly believed that the more individuals, groups and institutions have access to sources of power, the more likely they tend to be more explicit and vice versa.

Table 3: The Degree of Mystification

<i>Degree of Mystification</i>	<i>Total number of features</i>	<i>Frequency of explicit features</i>	<i>Frequency of Implicit features</i>	<i>Total Number of Sentences</i>
50.58	344	170	174	102

Conclusions

On the basis of Van Leewen’s model (1996), this study embarked on a scientific analysis of the US president’s speech regarding Iran’s nuclear deal. It is believed and endorsed in critical discourse analysis that no text is ideologically innocent. Critical discourse analysis has much in common with critical social research, which has been concerned with seeking out the origins of social problems and finding ways to analyze them productively. As Bloor and Bloor (2007) put forward, “the aims of CDA are to analyze discourse practices that reflect or construct social problems. In addition, it intends to investigate how ideologies can become frozen in language and find ways to break the ice and to increase awareness of how to apply these objectives to specific cases of injustice, prejudice, and misuse of power”. Widdowson (2000) also claims, “CDA is the uncovering of implicit ideologies in texts. It unveils the underlying ideological prejudices and therefore the exercise of power in texts”.

Wodak and Fairclough (1997) also state that “Ideologies are particular ways of representing and constructing society which reproduce unequal relations of power, relations of domination and exploitation”. Van Dijk also defines critical discourse analysis (CDA) as “a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context. With such dissident research, critical discourse analysts take explicit position, and thus want to understand, expose, and ultimately resist social inequality”.

The present study demonstrates that how linguistic structures are controlled by socio-semantic features and how these features, in turn, are controlled by ideology. Ideology, in turn, is also dominated by power relations in a wider scale. In line with Fairclough (1989) who claims that the utmost goal of CDA is to augment public awareness of language and power, this study also made an attempt to acquaint the readers with how to read not only the lines but also between the lines and to increase their awareness of power relation and ideology covertly existing in the text. This study intended to make the readers be better critical thinkers.

Based on the functional notion that functions take precedence over forms, this study highlighted the role of functions and its superiority in discourse analysis. The use and selection of words and syntactic structures such as passivization, nominalization, coordination, use of pronouns, and the like are all controlled and dominated by social roles and the socio-semantic features, which in turn are dominated by ideology and finally by social power. This study would help readers to look at texts from another perspective and overlook the so called naturalized non-ideological common senses that the press intends them to follow.

References

- Aghagolzadeh, F. & M. Ghiasian (2007). Dominant approaches in critical discourse analysis. *Language and Linguistics*, 3 (1), 39-54.
- Bloor, M. & Bloor, T. (2007). *The practice of critical discourse analysis*. London: Hodder Arnold.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgments of texts*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archeology of knowledge*. London: Routledge.
- Hodge, R. & G. Kress (1979). *Language and ideology*. London: Routledge.
- Jorgenson, M. & L. Phillips (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. London: Sage Publications.
- Kress, G., (1985). *Linguistic processes in sociocultural practice*. Victoria, Australia: Deakin university press.
- Soltani, A. (2005). *Power, discourse and language: The mechanisms of power flow in the Islamic Republic of Iran*. Tehran: Ney Publications.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1989). *Text and context: Explorations in the semantics and pragmatics of discourse*. London: Longman.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2000). *Ideology and discourse: A multidisciplinary introduction*. <http://www.hum.uva.nl/teun>.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2002). *Principles of critical discourse analysis, in method of CDA*, (ed.) by R. Wodak & M. Meyer. London: Sage Publication, 95-120.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1995). Representing social action. *Discourse and Communication*, 6 (1), 81-106.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1996). The representation of social actors", in Coldas- Coulthard, C. R. & Coulthard, M. (eds.), *Text and practices, reading in CDA*. London: Routledge.
- Van Leeuwen, T. A. (1993). Genre and field in CDA. *Discourse and Society*, 4 (2), 193-225.
- Widdowson, H. G. (2000). *Linguistics*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Wodak, R. (1995). Critical Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis, in J. Verschuren and et al (edd.) *Handbook of Pragmatics-Manual*,(204-210). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Wodak, R., & Chilton, P. (eds.) (2005). *A new agenda in (critical) discourse analysis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
- Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (2009). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London: Sage.
- Yarmohammadi, L. (2004). *Mainstream and critical discourse analyses*. Tehran: Hermes Publications.
- Yarmohammadi, L. (2006). *Communications from the perspective of critical discourse analysis*. Tehran: Hermes Publications.
- Amirkhanloo, M. (2016). The stylistics study of verbs in Hafiz' sonnets: A functional approach. *Adab-e Farsi*, 5 (2), 169-186.
- Bazyar, M. (2011). *The analysis of processes in the Persian aphasic patients' speech on the basis of functional approach* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Allameh Tabataba'ee University, Iran.
- Behin, B., & Sadeghi, Z. (2010). A Linguistic Account of the Protagonist's Development in The Grapes of Wrath. *Applied Linguistics*, 3 (6), 40-54.
- Fahim nia, F. (2008). *The analysis of mood in Persian on the basis of Hallidays' systemic functional Grammar* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Faculty of Humanities and Cultural Studies, Iran.
- Kavoosi nezhad, S. (2009). *The thematic structures in Persian and its significance in textuality in functional texts* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). University of Tehran, Iran.
- Pahlavan nezhad, M., & Vazir nezhad, F. (2009). The analysis of the novel entitled the lights I turned off on the basis of interpersonal metafunction approach. *Adab Pazhoohi*, 9 (3), 51-77.
- Sharifi far, M., & Rahimi, E. (2015). Critical discourse analysis of political speeches: A case study of Obama's and Rouhani's speeches at UN. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 5(2), 343-349.
- Wang, J. (2010). A critical discourse analysis of Barack Obama's speeches. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 1(3), 254-261.