A Critical Discourse Analysis of Iran and US Presidential Speeches at the UN: The Sociopragmatic Functions

Sahar Najarzadegan
University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran

Azizollah Dabaghi
University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran

Abbass Eslami-Rasekh
University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran

Abstract—Speeches articulated by politicians are often vehicles towards achieving their ultimate goals. That's why there is always tendency to find out the potential ideologies indicated by the discursive strategies and rhetorical devices which these politicians employ to express their political viewpoints. This study adopted a critical discourse analysis (CDA) approach to cognitively analyze the typical discursive characteristics underlying Iranian and American presidents' speeches at the UNGA (2013). The findings revealed that the most frequent of the strategies employed by Obama were polarization, self-glorification, positive self-presentation, negative-other presentation and victimization while the most prominent ones used by Rouhani were metaphor, vagueness, negative-other presentation and national self-glorification. The intricate, undeniable relationships existing between language, power and ideology is also what had been clear through the analysis of the lectures transcription.

Index Terms—critical discourse analysis, discursive characteristics, ideological discourse structures, sociopragmatic functions, van Dijk's Model

I. INTRODUCTION

"Discourse" is used by Fairclough (1989) to refer to the whole process of social interaction of which a text is just a part. Thus, the scope of linguistic analysis is broadened through critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as an important branch of Discourse Analysis (DA). Discourse is actually embedded in the larger sociopolitical and socio-cultural contexts which are included in CDA, and it is at the macro-level of CDA that we are able to unpack the ideological bases of discourse which have been considered natural overtime and are treated as neutral and acceptable features of discourse (Fairclough, 1995).

van Dijk (1997) suggests that one of the primary tenets of CDA is to find different sources of dominance, bias and inequality in the society while analyzing written or spoken texts. By adopting a CDA approach, he says, we can distinguish the discursive strategies employed by the speakers whose aim is to construct or maintain meaning in sociopolitical contexts.

Although there are many different models and frameworks of applying CDA to the texts, van Dijk's (2004) design seems to be a more comprehensive and precise conceptual framework, because it deals with not only political and semantic strategies but also the rhetorical devices. Thus it can be an accurate tool for discovering the manipulation of realities in the process of discourse production. As a prominent person in critical discourse studies, Teun van Dijk relates macro level and social cognitive understandings to micro level text and shows how they are manifested, produced and reproduced through discourse. That's why the very model is used in the present paper to compare president Rouhani's speech at UN General Assembly with that of president Obama.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

In Iran a research was conducted by Namjoo (2003). She tried to distinguish between illustrations of one issue, that is, terrorism by the president of Iran and USA, Khatami and Bush. They both had different definitions of terrorism and commented on some measures to crack down on it. Using particular discursive structures, Namjoo focused on the impact of the underlying ideology of the speaker on the representation of realities.

Taking Wodak's discourse-historical approach; Graham, Keenan and Dowd (2004) illustrated the importance of George W. Bush's (2001) declaration of a "war on terror". They presented four exemplary "call to arms" speeches in order to exemplify the structure, function and historical significance of such texts in western societies over the last

millennium. The four generic features that had endured in such texts throughout that period were mentioned by them as: (1) calling upon a legitimate power source, external to the speaker and presented as inherently good; (2) calling upon the historical significance of the culture in which the discourse is located; (3) creation of a completely evil Other; and, (4) calling upon unification behind the legitimating external power source. They later argued that such texts typically appear in historical contexts which are characterized by deep crises in political legitimacy.

On 7 October 2002, President Bush presented his rationale for war against Iraq in his speech. The analysis of this speech by Dunmire's (2005) demonstrated that the nominalization 'threat' functions in various ways to interpret a specific vision of future reality. Using Halliday's systemic-functional framework, Dunmire also considered the speech within the context of the Bush Administration's National Security Strategy, particularly its 'policy of preemption'. In his point of view, the President's speech played a significant role in facilitating the conceptual, linguistic, and political alteration expressed through the preemption policy. The conclusion was that a salient ideological component of political discourse derives from its depiction of the future and the rhetorical functions those depictions serve in implicating more instant material and discursive actions.

Using the highly significant multidisciplinary CDA, van Dijk (2005) himself examined some of the properties of the speeches by Prime Minister Jose Maria Aznar held in the Spanish Parliament in 2003 legitimating his support of the USA and the threatening war against Iraq. It was argued that speeches in parliament should be defined in terms of both their textual properties and a contextual analysis. He identifies three types of positive self-presentation strategies; namely, when the orator speaks for his own group, when he speaks for his nation, and when he speaks for himself. He believes these forms of positive self-presentation are interactionally occasioned as the expected responses to real or potential opponents; however, except for the analyses of these usual properties of ideological and political discourse, special attention was given to political implicatures which are defined as inferences based on general and specific political knowledge as well as on the context models of Aznar's speeches.

Later in 2006 Adetunji examined implication of deixis for personal, temporal and spatial anchorage of political discourse. He used two thematically and contextually dissimilar speeches of Nigeria's president Olusegun Obasanjo as its database in order to establish how politicians could associate with and dissociate from actions taken by them at specific times and how they recruit their subjects into accepting their viewpoints on controversial issues or situations.

The ideological component enshrined in the inaugural address of President Obama were analyzed by Horvath (2009) using Fairclough's notions of ideology namely that "meanings are produced through interpretations". He attempted to figure out the possible interpretations of different references of Obama, and then put Obama's address into a diachronic perspective of the outgoing administration of President George W. Bush. He came to the conclusion that the key ideological components of Obama's speech are pragmatism, liberalism, inclusiveness, acceptance of religious and ethnic diversity and unity.

Halliday's Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG), in terms of three meta-functions of ideational, interpersonal, and textual functions was also applied by Junling Wang (2010) to detect the formal features of Barack Obama's speeches. Its purpose was to explore the relationships among language ideology and power and to figure out how to use this power for the public to accept and support his policies. He analyzed Barack Obama's presidential speeches mainly from the point of transitivity and modality. He came to the conclusion that through modality, Obama made his audience more easily to understand and accept his political speeches and with applying transitivity, his speeches are trying to awaken the American people's confidence toward the president and his nation. Hallidayian SFG was also the basis of Shayegh & Nabifar's study (2012). It explored the existence of power in Barack Obama's discourse to see how ideological loading and socio-political relations of power have been manifested in his discourse. Analyses of hesitation, persuasion, threat, religious statement and illusive speech in each clause on the basis of Fairclough's model was done in the second phase of research.

Obama's South Carolina victory speech was also analyzed from the perspective of pragmemes by Capone (2010). He based his argument on Goffman's (2007) notion of footing and Bakhtin's (1986) notion of polyphony. He believed Obama used the technique of 'personification'. When presenting his opinion, he did not just expose it as if it came from himself, rather got another person either fictitious or real to voice it. That is, to support his campaign, Obama actually ventriloquized the voices of ordinary people, while also integrating the voices of his competitors, marked stylistically as anonymous and out- group members. The central idea of the paper is that Obama took seriously the politician's role as representative (of the people) and expressed the voices he wanted to represent in order to support his ideas about politics, in respect to which he presented himself as the animator, while giving ordinary people the role of principals.

Yet there were other studies focusing on persuasion strategy Ferrari (2007). In his approach, conceptual metaphor as related to emotion constitutes the principal argumentative feature and a vital tool to address the matter of persuasion in text, contributing to identifying both the ideological root and the persuasive strategy of a given discourse in the long run. Synthesis of the results showed the potentialities of metaphor as a privileged cognitive tool for abstracting and constructing discourse strategies.

Lihua (2012) examined how stories about China were presented in the New York Times. Using critical discourse analysis as a general theoretical foundation and van Dijk's socio-cognitive approach as a particular analytical framework, he examined how the New York Times endeavored to influence its target audience with specific discourse patterns or discourse strategies. The New York Times discourse strategies included presenting a dichotomy, using many

voices, pretending to be balanced in its use of voices, presenting information in a detailed way, and presenting a negative image of China through the eyes of witnesses. Thus the New York Times manipulates its audience via the discourse strategies it employs in news stories about China.

Through the analysis of all the instances of "you" in *Guardian* editorials for 2011, Breeze (2015) brought to light several different ways in which the writer employed the second person. Although the primary motivation appears to be epideictic, in that the writer seeks to forge strong bonds with the readership and thereby strengthen the sense of communion and shared values, some other uses are identified, including dramatization and irony. This leads on to consideration of the type of reader constructed by these uses of "you", and the relationships projected between writer/newspaper, reader, and other entities.

Combining topic modeling and critical discourse analysis, Tärnberg & Tärnberg (2016) investigated how Muslims and Islam are represented in Flashback, the largest internet forum in Sweden; then compared what was in this forum with how the same were represented in traditional, Western media. The analysis showed that the patterns used were profoundly similar to – but often more extreme versions of – those previously mentioned in analysis of traditional media. It indicated that the internet forum seems to serve as an "online amplifier" that reflects and reinforces existing discourses in traditional media, which probably leads to even stronger polarizing impacts on public discourses.

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Data Sources

According to van Dijk (2004) elections, political campaigns, parliaments, propaganda, demonstrations, as well as many other phenomena of the political field are highly ideological. In order to choose the speeches which are both ideological and had been taken place in the same situations as well as the same time, the full transcripts of president Obama's (20130 speech at UN general assembly was retrieved from www.whitehouse.gov, and then was compared with the full transcripts of president Rouhani's (2013) speech at UN general assembly taken from www.worldtime.com.

B. Analytical Framework

The analytical framework utilized in this study which was applied to both transcriptions was van Dijk's model (2004). It focuses on the rhetorical devices used in political texts. He elaborates on 27 ideological strategies the two main of which are 'self-positive-representation' and 'other negative-representation'. These two are semantic macro-strategies used for the purpose of 'face keeping' or 'impression management' (van Dijk 2004). They are to differentiate between 'good' and 'bad', 'superior' and 'inferior', 'our party' and 'their party'. van Dijk (2004) believes that a lot of studies have demonstrated ideological discourse usually features the following overall strategies of what might be called the ideological square:

Emphasize **Our** good things
Emphasize **Their** bad things
De-emphasize **Our** bad things
De-emphasize **Their** good things

These two strategies as well as 25 more categories of ideological discourse analysis are introduced by van Dijk (2004) like actor description, authority, Categorization, etc. These discursive strategies and rhetorical devices are to reveal the potential ideologies the politicians have in their speeches. In order to indicate the nature of these strategies and devices utilized by the speakers and to compare the discursive characteristics and underlying ideologies of the speeches, each paragraph of the text is considered as a macro unit and analyzed on the basis of the parameters defined by the model.

IV. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

While both presidents started their speech by addressing UN president, Secretary General and the audiences, Rouhani's ideology is quiet clear through starting the speech in the name of God and blessing to Prophet Mohammad. Likewise, he closed his speech by a poem from Ferdowsi, the renowned Iranian epic poet, as well as a verse from Holy Quran.

TABLE 1.
OCCURRENCE OF PERSONAL PRONOUNS IN ROUHANI'S AND OBAMA'S 2013 UN SPEECH

Personal Pronouns	Rouhani's Speech		Obama's Speech	
	frequency	Relative frequency	Frequency	Relative frequency
We	13	0.48	47	1.29
Our	9	0.33	34	0.93
Us	4	0.14	12	0.33
I	9	0.33	24	0.66
My	4	0.14	6	0.16

A. Count Analysis

Table 1 shows a very interesting fact. The number of first person pronouns in Obama's speech is significantly more than that of Rouhani. For one thing some strategies which necessarily need personal pronouns are employed by Obama much more than Rouhani. The most prevalent of them are hyperbole, national self-glorification, victimization together with dramatization and polarization (you-them categorization) as well as positive self-presentation. Use of personal pronouns as well as frequent words like nation and people is central to the president's 'identification'. An overall dominance of the personal pronoun *we* in Obama's speech may then again be because of the fact that as a super power, American government has always been the one making decisions for other countries in the time of international peril. That's why the high frequency of the use of 1st person pronouns is seen in the discourse of most of the American presidents.

TABLE 2.
OCCURRENCES OF KEYWORDS IN PRESIDENT ROUHANI'S ADDRESS TO THE UNGA SPEECH (SEP. 2013).

Keywords	Frequency	Relative frequency
Iran(ians)	29	1.08
Violence	20	0.74
World	20	0.74
Peace(ful)	19	0.70
Human(ity)	17	0.63
Choice	14	0.52
People	14	0.52
Regional	13	0.48
International	11	0.41
Fears	10	0.37
Threat(en)	9	0.33
Right	8	0.29
Sanction(s)	8	0.29
President	8	0.29
Discourse	7	0.26
Military	6	0.22
Actor(s)	6	0.22
Rights	6	0.22
New	5	0.18
Power(fully)	5	0.18
Life	4	0.14

TABLE 3.
OCCURRENCES OF KEYWORDS IN PRESIDENT OBAMA'S ADDRESS TO THE UNGA SPEECH (SEP. 2013).

Keywords	Frequency	Relative frequency
Iran(ians)	26	0.71
Peace(ful)	25	0.69
America(ns)	21	0.57
People	21	0.57
Israel(ies)	16	0.44
United states	15	0.41
Nations	13	0.35
World	12	0.33
Palestinian	12	0.33
International	11	0.30
regime	10	0.27
President	9	0.24
Work	9	0.24
government	9	0.24
Military	7	0.19
Threat(en)	7	0.19
Attack	6	0.16
own	6	0.16
Human(ity)	5	0.13
Power(fully)	5	0.13
Terrorist(s)	5	0.13
Right	5	0.13
Life	4	0.11

Two lists of frequent keywords used by both presidents accompanied by their frequency are provided in order to find out the differences between their political views and the ideological strategies they have used. Through count analysis of the keywords in each speech, it was revealed that Obama used more words to convey his message compared with Rouhani since his speech included 3621 words, while Rouhani had employed 2682 words. The most prominent word employed by both presidents is *Iran*. For Rouhani as the president of Iran, it is something quite natural; however, having *Iran* as the most prominent word in Obama's speech shows that his main concern is Iran! Meanwhile, after *Iran* the most prominent words in that of Rouhani are *violence* and *world* which seems to be Rouhani's main concern. In the same way, the most frequent words in Obama's speech after Iran are *peace(ful)* and *America(ns)*. Use of the word

peaceful with the frequency of 25 is the manifestation of Obama's ideology labeling him as a peacenik compared with the previous presidents of the US. (See table 2 and 3).

On the other hand, through use of the words *America(ns)* with the frequency of 21 and *United States* with the frequency of 15, Obama employs the discursive strategy of naming in order to stimulate a sense of 'Americanism'. By the same token, through 'passivization' the Iranian president prefers to avoid employing the word *America(ns)*, which is actually the sign of 'anti-Americanism'. Another frequent word employed by Obama is *Israel* which American government is highly concerned about as one of his allies. Conversely, this word is not used by the Iranian president since it is not considered as a legal government by Iran. Even if they were supposed to refer to it, *Zionist regime* would be used not *Israel*.

B. Macro-unit Analysis of Rouhani's Speech

At the beginning, Rouhani started his speech with this sentence: 'Our world today is replete with fear and hope'. Since his government is called 'government of hope and rationality', he tried to utilize the word 'hope' in his lexicalization. At the same time utilization of 'our world' led to polarization.

(3): The recent elections in Iran represent a clear, living example of the wise choice of hope, rationality and moderation by the great people of Iran. The realization of democracy consistent with religion and the peaceful transfer of executive power manifested that Iran is the anchor of stability in an otherwise ocean of regional instabilities. The firm belief of our people and government in enduring peace, stability, tranquility, peaceful resolution of disputes and reliance on the ballot box as the basis of power, public acceptance and legitimacy, has indeed played a key role in creating such a safe environment.

In the third macro unit, he reminded the audiences of 'the wise choice of hope, rationality and moderation by the great people of Iran' to refer implicitly to voting for his 'government of hope and rationality'. Lexicalization of 'democracy consistent with religion', 'peaceful transfer of executive power' as well as metaphors like 'anchor of stability' and 'ocean of regional instabilities' led to presenting Iranians positively specially on election time. Likewise national self-glorification is clearly seen when utilizing lexicalization of 'peace, stability, tranquility, peaceful resolution of disputes and reliance on the ballot box'.

(5): At this sensitive juncture in the history global relations, the age of zero-sum games is over, even though a few actors still tend to rely on archaic and deeply ineffective ways and means to preserve their old superiority and domination. Militarism and the recourse to violent and military means to subjugate others are failed examples of the perpetuation of old ways in new circumstances.

Here Rouhani employed metaphors of 'age of zero-sum games' and 'a few actors' to negatively represent others who try to 'rely on archaic and deeply ineffective ways and means to preserve their old superiority and domination'. He implicitly referred to America and its allies when talking about 'Militarism and the recourse to violent and military means to subjugate others'. The paradoxical lexicalization of 'perpetuation of old ways in new circumstances' is again another way of representing others negatively.

(6): Coercive economic and military policies and practices geared to the maintenance and preservation of old superiorities and dominations have been pursued in a conceptual mindset that negates peace, security, human dignity, and exalted human ideals. Ignoring differences between societies and globalizing Western values as universal ones represent another manifestation of this conceptual mindset. Yet another reflection of the same cognitive model is the persistence of Cold War mentality and bi-polar division of the world into "superior us" and "inferior others." Fanning fear and phobia around the emergence of new actors on the world scene is another.

In macro unit 6 negative other-presentation was seen through lexicalization of some words in the first sentence. However, the interesting part starts with the second sentence when Rouhani himself referred to the politicians' strategies. He first referred to generalization strategy when 'globalizing Western values as universal ones represent another manifestation of this conceptual mindset' and then talked about 'bi-polar division of the world into "superior us" and "inferior others"' which is crystallization of polarization and positive self-presentation as well as negative other-presentation. In the last line of this paragraph metaphor of 'new actors' had a vague source which most probably referred to US and its allies.

Later, when in paragraph 7 he said 'there is no guarantee that the era of quiet among big powers will remain immune from such violent discourses, practices and actions.' he implicitly warned big powers that their immunity is endangered by the very violent discourse…and then hyperbolically reminds them of 'the catastrophic impact of violent and extremist narratives'.

(8): In this context, the strategic violence, which is manifested in the efforts to deprive regional players from their natural domain of action, containment policies, regime change from outside, and the efforts towards redrawing of political borders and frontiers, is extremely dangerous and provocative.

Employing metaphors and lexicalizations of 'strategic violence', 'regional players', 'containment policies' and 'redrawing of political borders and frontiers', Rouhani negatively presented others, and hyperbolically said that it 'is extremely dangerous and provocative.'

Again macro unit 9 referred implicitly to super powers, and continued lexicalization of 'Islamo-phobic, Shia-phobic, and Iran-phobic discourses' to claim that it is not just problematic for Iran but 'indeed represent serious threats against world peace and human security.'

(10): This propagandistic discourse has assumed dangerous proportions through portrayal and inculcation of presumed imaginary threats. One such imaginary threat is the so-called "Iranian threat" -which has been employed as an excuse to justify a long catalog of crimes and catastrophic practices over the past three decades. The arming of the Saddam Hussein regime with chemical weapons and supporting the Taliban and Al-Qaida are just two examples of such catastrophes. Let me say this in all sincerity before this august world assembly, that based on irrefutable evidence, those who harp on the so-called threat of Iran are either a threat against international peace and security themselves or promote such a threat. Iran poses absolutely no threat to the world or the region. In Fact, in ideals as well as in actual practice, my country has been a harbinger of just peace and comprehensive security.

Here, the lexicalization of 'propagandistic discourse', 'presumed imaginary threats' and 'so-called Iranian threat' as well as evidentiality of 'the arming of the Saddam Hussein regime with chemical weapons and supporting the Taliban and Al-Qaida' led to negative other presentation of 'them-group' when he mentioned that they 'are either a threat against international peace and security themselves or promote such a threat.' and to national self-glorification of 'us-group' when he believed 'my country has been a harbinger of just peace and comprehensive security.'

Macro units 11, 12 and 13 are all manifestations of evidentiality strategy since Rouhani gave evidences of what United States has done through lexicalization of the phrases like 'military interventions', 'brutal repression', 'assassination of common people', 'structural violence', 'catastrophic spread of violence', 'infusion of arms', 'active support of extremist groups' and 'expansionist strategies'.

(15): Unjust sanctions, as manifestation of structural violence, are intrinsically inhumane and against peace. And contrary to the claims of those who pursue and impose them, it is not the states and the political elite that are targeted, but rather, it is the common people who are victimized by these sanctions. Let us not forget millions of Iraqis who, as a result of sanctions covered in international legal jargon, suffered and lost their lives, and many more who continue to suffer all through their lives. These sanctions are violent, pure and simple; whether called smart or otherwise, unilateral or multilateral. These sanctions violate inalienable human rights, inter alia, the right to peace, right to development, right to access to health and education, and above all, the right to life. Sanctions, beyond any and all rhetoric, cause belligerence, warmongering and human suffering. It should be borne in mind, however, that the negative impact is not merely limited to the intended victims of sanctions; it also affects the economy and livelihood of other countries and societies, including the countries imposing sanctions.

To clarify the point further, victimization is used in paragraph 14 as a rhetorical device when he reminded them of 'the criminal assassination of Iranian nuclear scientists' as well as the 'unjust sanctions, as manifestation of structural violence' in paragraph 15. Then to win the audiences affection and prove that not only Iran but also other groups are the victims of sanctions he employed populism strategy and talked about 'millions of Iraqis who, as a result of sanctions covered in international legal jargon, suffered and lost their lives, and many more who continue to suffer all through their lives.' To persuade the target audiences more, he utilized the semantic-rhetorical strategy of metaphors such as sanctions covered in international legal jargon'. He considered sanctions as a burden not just for the 'intended victims of sanctions' but for the 'countries imposing sanctions'. All of these rhetorical devices then led to negative presentation of the 'them-group'.

In paragraphs 17, 18 and 19 he subtly articulated 'hope and rationality' to refer implicitly to the fact that the people voted for him. Using metaphors of 'extinguishing all hope' and 'responsible actors', he shed light on the importance of 'securing peace and democracy and ensuring the legitimate rights of all countries in the world, including in the Middle East' and employed populism to claim that this is advantageous for the whole world.

Lexicalization of phrases such as 'reliance on hope and prudent moderation, mutual respect, and rejection of violence and extremism', 'common understanding and shared security', 'in time-bound and result-oriented talks' and 'equal footing, mutual respect, and the recognized principles of international law' led to positive self-presentation of Iran and Iranian government in macro units 20-24.

(25): In recent years, a dominant voice has been repeatedly heard: "The military option is on the table." Against the backdrop of this illegal and ineffective contention, let me say loud and clear that "peace is within reach." So, in the name of the Islamic Republic of Iran I propose, as a starting step, the consideration by the United Nations of the project: "the World against Violence and Extremism." (WAVE) Let us all join this "WAVE." I invite all states, international organizations and civil institutions to undertake a new effort to guide the world in this direction. We should start thinking about "Coalition for Enduring Peace" all across the globe instead of the ineffective "Coalitions for War" in various parts of the world.

Finally, comparison of our view and theirs is clear in paragraph 25; 'them-group' and 'us-group'. While others referring to United States repeatedly said: "The military option is on the table." we 'say loud and clear that "peace is within reach."'. They lexicalized "Coalition for War.", while we lexicalized "Coalition for Enduring Peace".

C. Macro-unit Analysis of Obama's Speech

From the very beginning, Obama started polarization through mentioning that 'each year we come together to reaffirm the founding vision of this institution.' And then negative-other presentation by mentioning that 'individual aspirations were subject to the whims of tyrants and empires.'

(2): It took the awful carnage of two world wars to shift our thinking. The leaders who built the United Nations were not naive; they did not think this body could eradicate all wars. But in the wake of millions dead and continents in

rubble; and with the development of nuclear weapons that could annihilate a planet; they understood that humanity could not survive the course it was on. So they gave us this institution, believing that it could allow us to resolve conflicts, enforce rules of behavior, and build habits of cooperation that would grow stronger over time.

Then talking about development of nuclear weapons that could annihilate a planet, Obama presented others negatively. However, everybody knows that atomic bomb was used only once and that was by American government not others. Then Polarization is again seen here when he said 'it could allow us to resolve conflicts, enforce rules of behavior, and build habits of cooperation…'

(6): For the United States, these new circumstances have also meant shifting away from a perpetual war-footing. Beyond bringing our troops home, we have limited the use of drones so they target only those who pose a continuing, imminent threat to the United States where capture is not feasible, and there is a near certainty of no civilian casualties. We are transferring detainees to other countries and trying terrorists in courts of law, while working diligently to close the prison at Guantanamo Bay. And just as we reviewed how we deploy our extraordinary military capabilities in a way that lives up to our ideals, we have begun to review the way that we gather intelligence, so as to properly balance the legitimate security concerns of our citizens and allies, with the privacy concerns that all people share.

Mentioning that they were 'shifting away from a perpetual war-footing', 'bringing their troops home', 'limiting the use of drones' and as a result having 'no civilian casualties', 'transferring detainees to other countries' and 'trying terrorists in courts of law, while working diligently to close the prison at Guantanamo Bay', are all rhetorical devices for positive self-presentation, negative other-presentation, national glorification, hyperbole and polarization. At the same time, they were not only the confessions that US was in a perpetual war-footing, killing civilians and having problems with the prison at Guantanamo Bay, but they also were to rationalize all of these activities. Polarization in the last few sentences is accompanied by victimization and dramatization when he talked about 'terrorists' as well as 'concerns of their citizens and allies'.

(9): Nowhere have we seen these trends converge more powerfully than in Syria. There, peaceful protests against an authoritarian regime were met with repression and slaughter. In the face of carnage, many retreated to their sectarian identity – Alawite and Sunni; Christian and Kurd – and the situation spiraled into civil war. The international community recognized the stakes early on, but our response has not matched the scale of the challenge. Aid cannot keep pace with the suffering of the wounded and displaced. A peace process is still-born. America and others have worked to bolster the moderate opposition, but extremist groups have still taken root to exploit the crisis. Assad's traditional allies have propped him up, citing principles of sovereignty to shield his regime. And on August 21st, the regime used chemical weapons in an attack that killed more than 1,000 people, including hundreds of children.

Showing empathy with Syrian peaceful protesters, Alawite, Sunni, Christian, Kurd the children being killed, Obama attributed all of these problems to the out-group and represented them negatively while positively representing America and others as those who worked to bolster the moderate opposition. Of courhetoricrse there is a case of self-criticism when he said 'our response has not matched the scale of the challenge'. Then when immediately after 'a peace process is still-born' Obama talked about America and others, actor description was clearly seen. In this regard he referred to America and others as 'those who have worked to bolster the moderate opposition' and to extremist groups as those 'who have still taken root to exploit the crisis.' Immediately after this sentence he talked about Assad's traditional allies which probably referred to the very extremist groups. Consequently, Assad's traditional allies have been convicted to 'prop him up, citing principles of sovereignty to shield his regime'. Though not mentioned clearly, most prominent of the allies which he referred to is Iran.

(11): Today, I want to outline where the United States of America stands on these issues. With respect to Syria, we believe that as a starting point, the international community must enforce the ban on chemical weapons. When I stated my willingness to order a limited strike against the Assad regime in response to the brazen use of chemical weapons, I did not do so lightly. I did so because I believe it is in the security interest of the United States and the world to meaningfully enforce a prohibition whose origins are older than the U.N. itself. The ban against the use of chemical weapons, even in war, has been agreed to by 98 percent of humanity. It is strengthened by the searing memories of soldiers suffocated in the trenches; Jews slaughtered in gas chambers; and Iranians poisoned in the many tens of thousands.

The rhetorical strategy of polarization is again clear in macro unit 11 when Obama used personal pronouns *we* and *I,* and used the security interest of the United States parallel to those of the world. He portrayed America and the world as the in-group and positively represented; likewise Assad regime and his allies as the out-group and negatively represented. Then utilizing the number game, Obama mentioned that '98 percent of humanity have agreed to ban against the use of chemical weapons and Iranians have been poisoned in the many tens of thousands'. He considered Iran as a victim in order to show consensus in this regard even with his foe. Later, twice in his lecture he gave evidence of 'Assad's regime using such weapons on August 21st.' (The fact that he used the word regime instead of government revealed his attitude toward Assad's organization as an illegal one). In paragraph 13 this evidentiality is accompanied by illustration and exemplification since he mentioned he had discussed with 'President Putin for over a year, most recently in St. Petersburg', that his preference 'has always been a diplomatic resolution to this issue'.

Since Obama's speech is carried out after that of Rouhani, Obama tried to justify his deeds with which Rouhani disagreed implicitly. Using Rouhani's metaphor, in macro unit 16 Obama believed that pursuing a settlement is not like

what Rouhani said 'a zero-sum endeavor' and 'there's no Great Game to be won.' Then in paragraph 17 victimization was employed when he said, 'the United States is chastised for meddling in the region, and accused of having a hand in all manner of conspiracy; at the same time, the United States is blamed for 'failing to do enough to solve the region's problems', and 'for showing indifference toward suffering Muslim populations.' In macro units 18 to 22 through use of phrases like 'my policy', 'our allies', 'our partners', 'our interests', 'our people and our national security', Obama employed polarization strategy and then in macro unit 22 through lexicalization of words like 'peaceful', 'prosperous', 'democracy, 'human rights', and 'open markets', he went on positive self-presentation as well as polarization. Besides, 'taking direct actions' was the indirect implication of a military threat.

(23): What does this mean going forward? In the near term, America's diplomatic efforts will focus on two particular issues: Iran's pursuit of nuclear weapons, and the Arab-Israeli conflict. While these issues are not the cause of all the region's problems, they have been a major source of instability for far too long, and resolving them can help serve as a foundation for a broader peace.

(24): … Iranians have long complained of a history of U.S. interference in their affairs, and America's role in overthrowing an Iranian government during the Cold War. On the other hand, Americans see an Iranian government that has declared the United States an enemy, and directly – or through proxies – taken Americans hostage, killed U.S. troops and civilians, and threatened our ally Israel with destruction.

In the last two lines of macro unit 23 hyperbole was employed when talking about 'major sources of instability in the region'. In the next paragraph, euphemistically he talked about Iranians' complains of US while hyperbolically mentioned American complaints of Iran. Besides, mentioning that 'America prefers to resolve concerns over Iran's nuclear program peacefully' for several times, is the implication of threatening Iran.

(26): ….To succeed, conciliatory words will have to be matched by actions that are transparent and verifiable. After all, it is the Iranian government's choices that have led to the comprehensive sanctions that are currently in place. This isn't simply an issue between America and Iran – the world has seen Iran evade its responsibilities in the past, and has an abiding interest in making sure that Iran meets its obligations in the future.

In the preceding paragraph, lexicalization of 'conciliatory words', 'transparent' and 'verifiable', was the implication of Iran's interest to reconcile. Except for this, the last sentence of this unit is not only negative-other presentation, but it is also employing populism strategy when he claims that 'the world has seen Iran….'

(29)… Earlier this year, in Jerusalem, I was inspired by young Israelis who stood up for the belief that peace was necessary, just, and possible, and I believe there is a growing recognition within Israel that the occupation of the West Bank is tearing at the democratic fabric of the Jewish state. But the children of Israel have the right to live in a world where the nations assembled in this body fully recognize their country, and unequivocally reject those who fire rockets at their homes or incite others to hate them.

Talking about young Israelis, Obama employed strategy of illustration and examples. He then tried to use victimization strategy regarding 'children of Israel and their right to live…' Now the question is: Didn't the children who were killed in 51day-war against Gaza have the rights to live? Who are the real victims? The same strategies were employed when in macro unit 30 he criticized the situation in which Palestinians have to suffer not having a firm place. The other strategy used in this paragraph is metaphor which was employed in 'the occupation of the West Bank is tearing at the democratic fabric of the Jewish state…'

Metaphor has also been used twice in paragraph 32 when he said '…Moreover, ties of trade and commerce between Israelis and Arabs could be an engine of growth and opportunity at a time when too many young people in the region are languishing without work. So let us emerge from the familiar corners of blame and prejudice....', and later in paragraph 33 when he spoke about 'Arab Spring'.

(36): Of course, America has been attacked by all sides of this internal conflict, simultaneously accused of supporting the Muslim Brotherhood, and engineering their removal of power. In fact, the United States has purposely avoided choosing sides. Our overriding interest throughout these past few years has been to encourage a government that legitimately reflects the will of the Egyptian people, and recognizes true democracy as requiring a respect for minority rights and the rule of law, freedom of speech and assembly, and a strong civil society.

Macro unit 36 starts with victimization through lexicalization of the words like 'attacked' and 'accused' and then using phrases like 'a respect for minority rights and the rule of law', 'freedom of speech and assembly', and 'a strong civil society' the very strategy was used again, leading to positive self-presentation and national self-glorification. This victimization was also seen in macro unit 39 by saying, 'we will at times be accused of hypocrisy and inconsistency' and polarization was clearly employed in paragraph 38 using the phrases like 'in our view', 'who work with us on our core interests' and 'our ideals'. Then to make the point clearer, he gave the example and illustration of 'Catholics and Protestants finally recognized that an endless cycle of conflict was causing both communities to fall behind a fast-moving world.'

(41): To summarize, the United States has a hard-earned humility when it comes to our ability to determine events inside other countries. The notion of American empire may be useful propaganda, but it isn't borne out by America's current policy or by public opinion. Indeed, as recent debates within the United States over Syria clearly show, the danger for the world is not an America that is too eager to immerse itself in the affairs of other countries or to take on every problem in the region as its own. The danger for the world is that the United States, after a decade of war --

rightly concerned about issues back home, aware of the hostility that our engagement in the region has engendered throughout the Muslim world -- may disengage, creating a vacuum of leadership that no other nation is ready to fill.

(42): I believe such disengagement would be a mistake. I believe America must remain engaged for our own security. But I also believe the world is better for it. Some may disagree, but I believe America is exceptional -- in part because we have shown a willingness through the sacrifice of blood and treasure to stand up not only for our own narrow self-interests, but for the interests of all.

Lexicalization of the phrases like 'a hard-earned humility' and 'notion of American empire' in macro unit 41 has led to positive self-presentation. Another lexicalization is 'a vacuum of leadership' which is actually a presupposition of America as the world leather leading to a national self-glorification. This last strategy as well as victimization is strengthened in paragraph 42 since Obama believes in 'a willingness through the sacrifice of blood and treasure… for the interests of all' to rationalize their interference in other countries affairs as the savior of the world.

Later in macro units 45 and 46 using evidentiality, Obama reminded the audiences of 'the death of four outstanding U.S. citizens ... including Ambassador Chris Stevens' and again 'being criticized by others' which is victimization. He presented the others negatively making 'horrendous violence which can put innocent men, women and children at risk' and 'violence against civilians' and US positively for what they did saving 'countless lives'.

(48): … If we don't want to choose between inaction and war, we must get better -- all of us -- at the policies that prevent the breakdown of basic order. Through respect for the responsibilities of nations and the rights of individuals. Through meaningful sanctions for those who break the rules. Through dogged diplomacy that resolves the root causes of conflict, not merely its aftermath. Through development assistance that brings hope to the marginalized. And yes, sometimes -- although this will not be enough -- there are going to be moments where the international community will need to acknowledge that the multilateral use of military force may be required to prevent the very worst from occurring.

Here 'meaningful sanctions' refers implicitly to countries like Iran which they believe 'break the rules'. This reference is again intensified through mentioning 'use of military force' when required.

(52): … Last month, I stood where 50 years ago Martin Luther King Jr. told America about his dream, at a time when many people of my race could not even vote for President. Earlier this year, I stood in the small cell where Nelson Mandela endured decades cut off from his own people and the world. Who are we to believe that today's challenges cannot be overcome, when we have seen what changes the human spirit can bring? Who in this hall can argue that the future belongs to those who seek to repress that spirit, rather than those who seek to liberate it?

Obama utilized examples and illustration when he said 'I stood where 50 years ago Martin Luther King Jr. told America about his dream' and 'I stood in the small cell where Nelson Mandela endured decades cut off from his own people and the world' since he wanted to refer to 'our capacity to change'.

(53): … each individual possessed with a dignity and inalienable rights that cannot be denied. That is why we look to the future not with fear, but with hope. And that's why we remain convinced that this community of nations can deliver a more peaceful, prosperous and just world to the next generation.

At the end of the lecture, Obama utilized lexicalization of 'a dignity and inalienable rights' for every individual to justify why they 'look to the future not with fear, but with hope'. This phrase implicitly referred to Rouhani's idea when he said 'Our world today is replete with fear and hope'. Then to employ words replete with hope not fear, Obama used lexicalization of the words like 'peaceful, prosperous and just' for the world of the next generation.

V. CONCLUSION

Politicians have access to a wide range of discursive strategies and rhetorical devices including semantic macrostrategies as well as lexical choices which enable them to represent their underlying ideologies. van Dijk's (2004) framework, as a cognitive approach out of which the 27 ideological discourse structures arise, determined to be a suitable design mentioning most of the techniques by which political figures endeavor to penetrate into the mind of their target audience and manipulate them to reach their goals. That's why this model (2004) is applied here to transcripts of Iranian and American presidents' lectures at the UNGA. The results of this study reveals that the most frequent of the strategies employed by Obama are polarization, self-glorification, positive self-presentation, negative-other presentation, victimization and lexicalization while the most prominent ones used by Rouhani are use of metaphors, lexicalization, vagueness, negative-other presentation and national self-glorification. Obama uses more simple terms and lexicalizations as well as short sentences instead of difficult ones. Meanwhile Rouhani's speech is replete with metaphors and lexicalizations of terms and new phrases. He tries to utilize some specific phrases repeatedly in order for the audiences to internalize them; like 'the government of hope and rationality'. At the same time he prefers to articulate Islamic Republic of Iran instead of personal pronouns as the doer of actions; however, Obama repeatedly utilizes personal pronoun *we*; rarely does he use United States. Not only that but also as a super power he rarely says *I said*, rather he prefers to say *I made it clear;* as if he is the one who decides for the other countries which are as president Rouhani says 'periphery' to him. Similar to other American presidents, Obama's rhetorical structures reveals that the American president to peripheral countries is like a superstar to other people in Hollywooden movies when the superstar acts as the savior of mankind.

Both presidents justify their claims utilizing different subtle ideological discourse structures including two major strategies of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation. Lexicalization, polarization, victimization and

other rhetorical devices are frequently used as effective devices in persuasion and justification. These discursive structures are applied to enhance, mitigate, avoid or exacerbate an issue. Generally speaking, CDA provides a great opportunity to discover the realities which according to Fairclough (1995) has been distorted and naturalized as "non-ideological common sense" (p.27).

REFERENCES

[1]   Adetunji, A. (2006). Inclusion and exclusion in political discourse: Deixis in Olusegun Obasanjo's speeches. *Journal of Language and Linguistics*, *5*(2), 177-191.
[2]   Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). Speech Genres and Other Late Essays. Translated by V.W. McGee, ed. by Emerson, C. & M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.
[3]   Breeze, R. (2015). "Or so the government would have you believe": Uses of "you" in Guardian editorials. *Discourse, Context & Media*, 10, 36-44.
[4]   Capone, A. (2010). Barack Obama's South Carolina speech. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *42*(11), 2964-2977.
[5]   Dunmire, P. L. (2005). Preempting the future: Rhetoric and ideology of the future in political discourse. *Discourse & Society,* *16*(4), 481-513.
[6]   Fairclough, N. (1995). Critical Discourse Analysis: The critical study of language. New York: Longman.
[7]   Fairclough, N. (1989). Language and Power. London: Longman.
[8]   Ferrari, F. (2007). Metaphor at work in the analysis of political discourse: Investigating a 'preventive war' persuasion strategy. *Discourse & Society*, *18*(5), 603-625.
[9]   Goffman, E. (2007). Footing. In: Monaghan, L., Goodwin, J. (Eds.), Voicing: Reported Speech and Footing in Conversation. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 396-400
[10] Graham, P., Keenan, T. & Dowd, A. (2004). A call to arms at the end of history: A discourse-historical analysis of George W. Bush's declaration of war on terror. *Discourse & Society*, *15*(2-3), 199-221.
[11] Horvath, J. (2009). Critical discourse analysis of Obama's political discourse. In *Language, Literature and Culture in a Changing Transatlantic World International Conference Proceedings*, *University Library of Prešov University*, 45-56.
[12] Lihua, L. (2012). Discourse and manipulation: stories about China in the New York Times. *Language & Communication*, *32*(3), 249-256.
[13] Namjoo, P. (2003). The way discursive and ideological structures are related in two sets of speeches on terrorism. Unpublished MA Thesis, Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran.
[14] Obama, B. (2013). Speech at the UNGA, Retrieved 2013 from www.whitehouse.gov.
[15] Rouhani, H. (2013). Speech at the UNGA, Retrieved 2013 from www.worldtime.com.
[16] Shayegh, K. & Nabifar, N. (2012). Power in political discourse of Barack Obama. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, 2(4)3481-3491.
[17] Tӧrnberg, A & Tӧrnberg, P. (2016). Muslims in social media discourse: Combining topic modeling and critical discourse analysis. *Discourse, Context & Media, 13(2)* 132–142.
[18] van Dijk, Teun A. (1997). Discourse as Social Interaction. Sage Publications, London.
[19] van Dijk, T. A. (2004). Politics, ideology and discourse. *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics, 9*, 728-740.
[20] van Dijk, T. A. (2005). Contextual knowledge management in discourse production. *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis Amsterdam and Philadelphia,* PA: John Benjamins, 71-100.
[21] Wang, J. (2010). A critical discourse analysis of Barack Obama's speeches. *Journal of language teaching and research, 1*(3), 254-261.

Sahar Najarzadegan is a faculty member of Islamic Azad University, Isfahan (Khorasgan) Branch, Isfahan, Iran. She is working at the department of foreign languages of Isfahan (Khorasgan) University and mainly interested in Critical Discourse Analysis, sociopragmatics, Second Language Acquisitions and cultural studies. She is currently a PhD student studying applied linguistics and teaching at the English Department of Isfahan University.

Azizollah Dabaghi is an associate professor of language learning and teaching, currently working at the department of applied linguistics at the University of Isfahan, Iran. He is interested in innovative researches in various areas including sociolinguistics, sociocognitive studies, Second Language Acquisition, cultural studies, translation and psycholinguistics.

Abbass Eslami-Rasekh is an associate professor of language learning and teaching, currently working at the department of applied linguistics at the University of Isfahan, Iran. His main area of interest is discourse analysis, sociolinguistics, sociocognitive studies, cultural studies, translation, psycholinguistics and critical discourse analysis.