

A Critical Discourse Analysis of Iran Sanctions: The Cases of Politico and the Hill

Maedeh Doust*, & Mansour Barati**

*M.A. of North American Studies- Faculty of World Studies- University of Tehran,

**Ph.D. Candidate of Political thoughts - Faculty of Law and Political Science- University of Tehran,

ABSTRACT

This study focuses on Iran sanctions' media coverage by two notable media outlets, Politico and the Hill by utilizing Entman's Framing Theory, which highlights the role of media on how individuals and groups perceive and construct varied forms of reality that eventually influence its perception within any given society. Critical discourse analysis of data demonstrates that the two have their own views regarding the case. Following Iran and P5+1 negotiation, Iran sanctions were transformed from a national issue to an international one, with different depictions by different media outlets in the Western media. Therefore by applying Entman's Framing theory on the editorial coverage of Iran's sanctions in the cases of Politico and the Hill, we can conclude that each promotes its own views, and treats the issue of Iran's sanctions based on its own type of framing, respectively.

Key Words: *Iran Sanctions, Framing Theory, Politico, the Hill*

INTRODUCTION

Using critical discourse analysis, this study attempts to elucidate the ideological representations of U.S. policies towards Iran sanctions in editorial positions of the Hill and Politico. This study focuses on media biased what Entman's referred to as framing. Ideological, cultural and social aspects of news are vital facts to be considered as specific and permanent approaches of two U.S. news agencies in this regards, Also people should not be the passive receiver of news from those players (Rast, 2012, P.1). The role of journalists could not be ignored, as their views impact on media. According to a survey, it is shown that media is getting more liberal through the time; however, rate of respondents identifying themselves as conservatives raised but not as quickly as liberals' increase (Hassett, 2014, P.66).

Interestingly bad news is preferred to cover more than good news. Based on the findings, rising GDP as well as durable good and retail sales are pertinent to larger front-page coverage, but they do not go through the details, so all the news are not dealt with equally. For instance: Based on same news, Republican presidents are covered about 20-30% less positive broadcasting news based on all newspapers, and 20-40% less positive coverage from ten elite newspapers, in contrast to Democrats, thus statistics are vital to be counted and associated with partisan biased manner of broadcasting based on 7-9 % increase in opinion poll respondents, relating to economic growth, thus the headlines have noticeable role on people's concepts about economy (Hassett, 2014, P.106), in case that Republicans have control over presidency and

Congress, the reports are less negative; however, when Republicans take the control of one of branches, they would receive less positive coverage than Democrats.

Newspapers coverage is essential for political parties whether to be Democrat or Republican, it is hypothesized that negative coverage of Republicans is harder for reporting, in the case that Republicans were majorities in Congress during Republican president administration, contrary they are still received less positive coverage than Democrats in the same situation and newspapers actually provide more coverage in regards to economic growth news or more durable goods, GDP growth, retail sales and jobs—and less unemployment—all are broadcasted in positive news coverage (Hassett, 2014, P. 106).

Following 5+1 negotiations on Iran, Iran sanctions are acknowledged as vital subject to focus on. The negotiators deem economic sanctions as remarkable force to push Iran to continue the negotiations. Generally imposing sanctions is not good substitute for diplomacy. As there is process of decision making between Congress and President Barack Obama. In U.S. constitution, President has the right to suspend the sanctions against countries that are imposed by U.S; but not lifting them thoroughly. Iran nuclear program is aimed at developing electricity production, medical isotopes, not bombs, in contrast to 5+1 powers' notions in this regards (Sauer, 2013, Peksen, 2010).

MEDIA, IDEOLOGY, AND SANCTIONS

Pondering the ideological functions of news media has been the subject of much scholarly interest. As mentioned in Knight and Dean, Herman and Chomsky (2002) discuss that people's beliefs and norms are made by commercial media institutions in accordance to dominant social, political, and economic interests of the state, so media has crucial impact on the public to support social interests of the elite. The dominant ideologies are acknowledged as basis of rationale (Izadi, F., & Saghaye-Biria), Gramsci (1971) concurs that ruling groups impose dominant ideology by double process of coercion and persuasion that is considered media's role in modern democratic societies. Gitlin (2003) contents that "in liberal capitalist societies, no institution is devoid of hegemonic functions, and none does hegemonic work only". He and Madrid (1986) argue that media is considered as hegemony, proposing indirect hegemonic process in modern capitalist's states, moreover he elucidates that network and major print media organizations are acknowledged as corporate elite

Weakening economic, political pillars of a country, and disturbing civilian's right, implementation of sanction is deemed as coercive foreign policy tools, thus it may result in freedom of press in target country (Peksen, 2010, P.451), sanctions are reflected on media and multilateral sanctions damage media freedom more than unilateral sanctions, effecting media openness. This study aims at responding to the questions: How are events, players, and policies about Iran sanctions are portrayed in these two cases? Are there any differences between The Hill and Politico editorials (if any) on Iran sanctions? What is historical background of sanctions imposed by U.S.? Are Politico and The Hill biased towards Iran Sanctions?

Pre-1945:

Sanctions were imposed by American since eighteenth century, Stamp Act, Townshend Act, etc. So it is unbreakable part of American traditions, in 1807, President Thomas Jefferson in order to

prevent war with Britain, France persuaded Congress to accept embargo act. From 1918 up to now, imposing economic sanctions deemed as a mean instead of starting war, it was exactly after First World War, so Article XVI is one of the consequences," this article provides for sanctions against any state which resorts to war before attempting to resolve its claims by peaceful means". Between the two wars (WWI and WWII), there are some cases of economic sanctions with fulfilled objectives during Second World War. In 1930s, the basis of international sanctions was international law enforcements, meaning League of Nations Sanctions.

Post-1945

It is after WWI, U.S. continued the strategy of sanctioning to keep peace at the region, so Charter of United Nations was signed, in which there is no word of "sanctions", but the word "measure" is the same rationale to implement sanctions, reflected in Article 41 of U.N charter. During 45 years, the Security Council imposed sanctions only twice. It was on December 1966 that financial, economic and diplomatic limitations were decided to be imposed towards the racist minority regime of Southern Rhodesia which followed by an arms embargo against South Africa in 1977. Both were pertinent to denial of human rights and domestic abuse of power rather than to counter the traditional threat to international peace and security issues(Alikhani,2000,Fayazmanesh, 2008,P 190).

Theoretical Framework

Entman's theory holds notion of framing in media, including priming, agenda setting, idea of media biased is deemed as tools of power, consisted of three categories: first, distorting the reality which is evident in news. Second, content biased pertinent to supporting and defending one side more than the other. Third, decision making biased that is pointing to writer's ideas to produce biased texts. In addition, media may observe biased criteria in favor of individualism, capitalism, consumerism, etc., thus government policies should be limited to these boundaries. Entman contends that news framing impacts on officials' power whether to be stronger or weaker. There are two goals to be followed. First, the biased text resulted in agenda setting, framing, and priming based on that bias. Second, it would be considered as guidance for scholars, and journalists for constructing more balanced news, moreover for the many citizens and activists, being victimized by biased media, mainstream media tended to lessen the pressure than elaborating on the truth, referring to some scandals will scattered fast and gain momentum, but the others not(Entman,2007).

In words of Entman(1993,2004),Framing is associated with the decision the author made to select specific topics, and certain aspect of that topic, also to aggrandize some information through some techniques such as placement, graphics, inclusion in leads (Aday,2010, p.147). Framing includes a communication source to address and define an issue, also communication is dynamic process, pointing to frame building and frame settings. Entman (1993) concurs that frames are considered to have many locations such as communicator, the text, the receiver, and the culture which are significant for process of framing, including frame-building, frame-setting and individual and societal level consequences of framing.Frame-building is associated with influential factors in regards to structural qualities of news frames, meaning how journalists adopt framing in regards to different issues which are acknowledged as internal factors. What are

deemed to be external factors to journalism refer to journalists and elites long term relations, and social movements. The reflections of frame building process are evident in the text itself.

Frame-setting refers to affinity between media frames and individuals' concepts, so it surely has an impact on learning, interpretations, evolutions if news and events, also this part of framing process has been noticed more and studied in great extent. The results of framing could be perceived on two levels of individual and societal. The individual level will alter people's attitudes based on certain frames. On the societal level, formation of social level processes such as political socialization, decision making, and collective actions are acknowledged as consequences. According to framing methodology, frames are deemed to be two types at the same time: First, independent variables and dependent variables. Dependent variable refers to the results of framing like organizational pressure. It also could be considered as independent variable which is pertinent to audiences' interpretations based on frames. Generally, it is referring to production and effects of framing.

In Entman's words, Gitlin (1980,P.7) notes frames are persistent patterns related to matters of cognition, interpretation, and presentation, of selection, emphasis and exclusion that are adopted to organize the discourse by symbol handlers, so it is a means for journalists to pack the information for the audiences. Entman(1993) notes that framing is involved in "selection and salience", meaning a frame select piece of reality and make it more salient in communication text. Why framing is significant relies on framing's referred highlights of the reality which make audience interpret differently. Gamson and Modigliani (1989) consider framing as "interpretative package" that contribute meaning to an issue or a mean through understanding that issue.

Goffman (1974) as one of integral figure who developed concept of framing, notes that frames are helpful for people to organize what is going on at everyday life. He also considered frames as "schemata of interpretation", being framework for make meaning out of events.

News framing approach

Inductive approach is pertinent to analysis of news stories so frames are created from the process of analysis. This approach is criticized for two reasons: first, it would be difficult to reproduce and replicate. Second, its reliance on too small a sample is criticized.

Deductive approach is pertinent to the investigated frames that are recognized and defined before investigation and research. Specific frames are associated with certain topics or events that are called issue-specific frames. Another type is identified with different topics, and some are pertinent to time and cultural contexts so called generic frames (De Vreese, C.H. 2005,P 54, Borah, P,2011).

METHODOLOGY

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) differs from linguistics in case that it focuses on how languages are utilized for social purposes, "social maintenance and change", so it is purposeful role of discourse therefore the approach is pertinent to human relations in regards to ideological perspectives. It is critical about "hegemonic discourses and genres", influencing "inequalities, injustices and oppression in contemporary society". CDA is of interest of many scholars whose

field study is interdisciplinary “with contributions both to theory and practice”(Rasti,2012,P.2;Given , Prakash,2008).

It is originated from European linguists’ analysis in 1980s like Teun van Dijk or Ruth Wodak, but James Paul Gee made a fundamental progress in U.S. Politics, considered as one of area of CDA research, many researchers use this method of analysis to scrutinize the data that could be texts, speeches, documents etc. adopting the method, researcher needs to get familiar with formal linguistics, also this is the basis for the researchers to have different approaches in the analysis of text. Moreover full analysis of the text will be impossible as there is many relevant discourses(Given). Klotz proposed a toolkit for CDA, the first is carver, carving the text. Second is equalizer, considering phenomena for analysis in the texts. Third is grouping phenomena, and fourth would be a “slicer” to cut the issue into diverse perspectives of same issue. Fifth one is “optic device” to represent the meaning of analysis (Prakash, 2008, P.75).

There is connection between data and linguistic analysis, as the type of data defines linguistic approach of analysis. The vital aim is opposing injustice in social arena so the subject of analysis will be dealing with an issue that has discursive aspects, in addition to involve in matter of “marginalization or oppression” of strands of society or specific group. Researcher could analyze the data based on ideological shaping that refers to “how are certain people or events represented discursively?”

Fourth, grammatical analysis is another way through analysis of CDA like how people are named or passive or active voice are used in the sentence regarding the issue. Third, “types of process”, related to specific people or events. The “patterned differences” would be investigated for instance: who is depicted as “agent of activities with negative connotations?” the forth way through examination would be analysis of arguments and rhetorical aspects. This would focus on connectors of sentences like contrasts, causal, etc. the last but not the least, “source of legitimization” is “author uses to support points and claims”, in another words , are they facts or opinions or possibilities in regards to the subject(Given).

A Critical Discourse Analysis Approach:

This paper is aimed atexamining the Hill and Politico’s editorials regarding the subject of Iran’ssanctions, therefore, the texts that are carefully selected are analyzed based on CDA principles that were initially explained above, as well as being in accordance to the theoretical framework explained by Entman. Based on the search of the key word “Iran Sanctions” the data were investigated and examined, respectively.

The Hill Editorials:

The EDT entitled: “Cotton challenges Iranian’s courage”, Cotton declared his opposition on Iran-U.S. agreement, this is kind of virtual debate through tweeter between Zarif and Cotton, but this is portrayed in negative perspective toward Iran. As the title suggests: “Iranian courage is challenged”, this is not a respectful title and text on Iran, and Iranian Foreign Minister, Zarif by a senator that is referred to Cotton as “Freshman Senator”. This text noted that Zarif has insulted Cotton by telling that the sanctions will be lifted at the same time the agreement reaches, whether Cotton wants it or not, based on the context of agreement and factsheets, this is true, it is not an insult, but writer portray Zarif ‘s statements as insult, also used the word “mock” that referred to Cotton mocked Zarif, so the writer is drawing sense of humiliation, also based on lexical aspects,

“Iran’s leadership has promised...” or “President Obama announced a framework pact with Iran over...” , usage of these sentences that portray Iran as passive side of negotiation and U.S. as active and superior side to make decision for Iran, also negotiation is imposed to Iran because of sanctions (Hensch,2015a).

It is entitled “The Gates praises Clinton as 'a good secretary of State’”. Roberts Gates is praising Hillary Clinton as Secretary of State. “Gates pointed to tougher economic sanctions on Iran, troop surges in Afghanistan and Iraq and diplomatic relations with Egypt as some of Clinton’s signature achievements at State”. So the words “tougher” and “sanctions on Iran” is negative approach toward Iran, also based on the context that is U.S. and Iran are tending to negotiate and reach to agreement, Secretary of Defense, Robert Gates praising Hillary for imposing sanctions, also Iran expects U.S. to lift these sanctions. In addition to all, this discourse toward Iran influence audience’s mind to draw conclusion in a way which imposed sanctions push Iran to negotiate, also Iran’s aims and objectives were or will be having atomic bomb, therefore it was U.S. strategy of sanctions to force Iran to stop. It was Hillary Clinton’s smartness in this matter and in a way Robert Gates is advertising for Clinton to be elected as President next term (Hensch, 2015b).

Its title is “Gulf leaders want cyber assurances from Obama”, it is about cyber security cooperation between U.S. and Arabic countries, negotiating in Camp David, “The request is part of a broader security guarantee U.S. Gulf allies are seeking as they warily eye the rise of extremist threats in the region and the near-complete nuclear talks with Iran that would lift sanctions on the country”. This report deals with Camp David negotiations on security matters in gulf countries based on the threats of ISIS, also its impacts on cyber space by imposing fear. This decision would lead to new developments in cyber space for Iran, also “I think it will actually speed their adoption of cyber operations, cyber warfare activities, and cyber experts believe Tehran would likely to use its heightened destructive cyber prowess on its Middle Eastern neighbors, not the U.S.” generally this part is referring to fear of Iran to use cyber to retaliate failure of nuclear talks. Also it refers to another EDT, “Nuclear deal could help Iran fund cyber war” by same writer, Cory Bennett, experts believe that Tehran might misuse the agreement in order to improve its cyber program, “which has already infiltrated critical networks in over a dozen countries, including the U.S.” so these are negative discourse against Iran and will influence the agreement, also it is assumed that after agreement, U.S. suspects Iran based on the other issues like cyber space, so how could Iran make sure about the agreement and lifting the sanctions? if U.S. claimed controlling Iran cyber space after lifting sanctions based on Iran nuclear program(Bennett,2015), additionally the text is imposing Iran’s fear to the reader .

The next one is titled as “How long would it take Iran to develop nukes? No one knows the answer for sure”, experts are doubtful about Iran nuclear weapons, also Congress would review Iran’s deal. The discourse again is negative and skeptical about Iran, it proposed that “How far along is Iran in weaponization process?” interestingly it is mentioned that Iran needs two or three months to reach nuclear weapon by Obama administration, but Obama believes it takes one year, also according to Arian Tabatabai, it is a long way for Iran to reach nuclear weapon, but based on Bibi Netanyahu’s speech, it is over a year and six months for getting enough fissile materials. There are two dimensions one getting material, second reaching a bomb. “We need to know how far along Iran progressed in their weaponization so that we can understand those consequences as it relates to other breakout time issues,” Sen. Bob Menendez (D-N.J.), co-sponsor of the Iran bill,

said Thursday, at end Von Hippel commented on it by telling the worst case about Iran that is Iran will reach it as soon as it gets “enough weapons-grade uranium”, so nobody knows , based on the political context U.S. and Iran are two countries negotiating with each other, but this is a text proposing idea of Iran’s disloyalties, dishonesty, distrust worthy . Iran’s portrayed as liar when claiming about it is not aimed to have an atomic bomb, moreover matter of sanctions is tool for U.S. to force Iran to negotiate and it will humiliate Iran. (Wong, 2015).

“Interpreting foreign policy” is EDT in the Hill. David Adams mentioned some points about U.S. foreign policies toward Iran, sanctions, etc. She is praising Clinton as being smart politician. He mentioned: “He has a certain amount of latitude,” he said. “There are certain sanctions he can remove by executive order. But there’s a fair amount in place by law that won’t be removed if Congress doesn’t agree to everything on the table”, he also consider Congress confirmation of Iran sanctions as one of his accomplishment in 2010. So the discourse about sanctions is truly negative about Iran, it is portrayed as a fundamental strategy, but in reality sanctions against a country without any basis of negating civil rights would be illegal.

“Iran’s supreme leader threatens nuclear talks walkout” is referring to Ayatollah Ali Khamenei talked about U.S. threatening Iran while the negotiations, so is it a real negotiation? Also proposed they should “observe redlines, Tehran does not need the economic relief the U.S. is offering in a potential deal over its nuclear arms research”. The editorials suggested “The pact would lift sanctions on Iran in return for greater restrictions on its nuclear programs”. In this sentence Iran portrays as passive actor that is weak and there is no way out of these sanctions except restrictions in nuclear program, so based on what has been drawn from Khamenei’s speeches, it stated literally, but there is less reference to what has been proposed by U.S., also the agenda of U.S. on lifting the sanctions and the threat from U.S, the text deals with what Ayatollah Khamenei has mentioned just, also the word “threaten” is biased, as leaving the negotiations in this context would not base on the fearing U.S, but because of U.S. claims and threats(Hensch,2015c).

Trump consider Iran deal as a bad, one sided deal, also deemed it as embarrassment to the U.S. He urged the Congress to amend INARA which was passed during Obama’s administration in 2015.

At the time of Tehran’s terrorist attack, Bernie Sanders has stated that this is not a right time to impose sanction regarding Iran’s support of terrorism and human rights violations (Naga Siu, 2017).Trump insisted on sanctioning Iran, and considered Iran’s supreme leader to own a business empire, proposing to sanction Iran regarding anti-terroristic arenas (Taleblu and Ghaseminejad, 2017).

Rex Tillerson , Secretary pf State, deemed Iran deal as the best interest of United States, proposing that the U.S. can address Iran deal’s flaws throughout collaboration with country’s allies, and in the same time staying within the deal, so might lead to secondary agreement, but Trump considered it out of the US national interests, accusing Iran of being out of spirit of the deal (Savransky, 2017).

Nikki Haley also surmised Trump’s attempts in regards to Iran as the best message for North Korea, commenting that the U.S. could not continue the deal without any new amendments, but

Trump did not cancel the deal, or asking the Congress to impose any nuclear sanctions on Iran (Shelbourne, 2017).

Sen. Al Franken (D-Minn) has said if the U.S. cancels Iran deal, it will influence the leadership role of the U.S. in the world. He considered the deal good one, as it prevents Iran from getting nuclear weapon (Beavers, 2017).

Macron warned Trump not to withdraw Iran deal, due to North Korea's plan in this regard. Trump would better not to cancel the deal, but asking the Congress to pass new benchmark regarding Iran's nuclear weapons. Trump has been criticized by his allies such as Angela Merkel, Theresa May, the British Prime Minister, who proposed that preserving the deal is their shared interest, too (Carter, 2017), Bernie Sanders also deemed Trump's comments "a lot of bluster", as it will make the problems harder and tougher.

Iranian President, Hassan Rouhani, mentioned that Iran would not stop its missile production, this was an official announcement that has been made some days after U.S. Congress's vote regarding Iran's new sanctions (Greenwood, 2017).

As Maryam Rajavi, the president of the National Council of Resistance of Iran, mentioned that all individuals, entities etc, should be sanctioned who are affiliated with the IRGC (Cantwell, 2017).

The House has passed a bill to ratify sanctions on Iran regarding ballistic missile development, and support for Hezbollah. Iran is deemed as one of the countries which was included in the State Department's list of the countries which are supporter of Hezbollah, Sudan and Syria is the other two. Royce (R-Calif.) proposed that enforcing the deal is better than canceling the deal (Marcos, 2017).

Panetta, the former Secretary of Defense, expressed his concern regarding countries' mistrust to the United States, due to Trump's announcement regarding Iran nuclear deal, as failure to stick on your words will send message of being untrustworthy to the other countries (Mitchell, 2017).

According to the recent poll, a number of Democratic voters should renegotiate Iran deal, also there is strong support for having a new deal that could be ratified by the Congress (Easley, 2017).

Trump has asked the Congress to check outline of a new Iran policy, proposing recognition of current Iran's government would be a priority regarding changing policies, also Iran is using end of sanction or the pause to improve its economy, nuclear capabilities, etc. (Huessy, 2017).

Generally, the Hill editorials are tempted to aggrandize the negative points and use the most negative words in the headings.

Politico Editorials:

"J Street poll: Jewish Americans favor Hillary over Jeb" American Jewish voters favor Clinton over Bush based on the survey also the vital criteria is favoring or opposing the Iran agreement and economic sanctions against Iran, moreover the Republican have conflict over these issues with Obama's administration. Moreover based on the context of U.S. elections and Iran sanction and agreement with U.S, Jewish American will vote for democrat than republican because of democrat party's stance toward Israel and Jews in U.S, so matter of Iran sanctions are not just vital for U.S. and Iran, but it is world politics and economics (Gass, 2015), also Iran sanctions and

the agreement is important for Israel as democrats are for making agreement, so by reaching the agreement national security of Israel will be safeguarded in Middle East.

“Deadline for nuclear talks with Iran may be softening” (Toosi, 2015a), proposing some critical views about the timeline of the agreement and the two countries’ approach based on the remaining time. June 30 is considered deadline for agreement, so Iran likes to delay and make negotiation lasts longer, and reach to the deadline without any agreement that is called delay tactics, also it is Obama’s a priority to reach agreement instead of starting war with Iran. The approach of the discourse is negative about Iran, also skeptical about even the time of agreement, “Iran is simply dragging out the talks with no intention of agreeing to severe restrictions on its nuclear program...“To the extent the Iranians try to use the deadline for bargaining leverage, we should ignore it.””, based on the other news by Hill, politicians predict the time for reaching Iran to nuclear weapons, so according to this negative concept toward Iran plus this news on Iran’s delay in agreement, the conclusion will be this delay is going to lead to atomic bomb, “Many of the provisions, aimed at keeping Iran from being able to race to build a bomb within a year, would expire after a decade”, so it shows that they are expecting Iran to make or reach atomic bomb, so logically it is concluded that Iran does not have bomb up to now, thus they should lift the sanctions against Iran as the base of imposing sanctions are this issue, but in reality it is not, otherwise they would find another reason to posing sanctions against Iran. Based on the text and lexical perspectives, the word usage and language of the discourse is biased and again Iran is portrayed as disloyal country that want to give “leverage in the high-stakes talk” the commenters are Jews like “Mark Fitzpatrick: said that Kerry’s hospitalization for a broken femur could provide a reason to extend a June 30 deadline he called “harmful to the western negotiating position”, he also considered it as western advantage to delay the negotiations and agreements, these commentators pose more negative approach toward Iran, as they used words intentionally negatively biased on Iran, it is seen more in Politico than the Hill.

“House easily passes Iran review bill”(French,2015) this bill is related to Iran deal with U.S. that Congress passed the law to gain influence over the agreement, also legislative branch can have idea along with executive branch. The congressman John Boehner expressed his worriedness about a bad deal with Iran. Stopping bad deal is a priority of Congress, then Obama signed it, too, it means that U.S. Congress is skeptical about Iran, based on the text the word “skeptical” is used, they want “assurance” in order for Congress to influence on final deal. This would be a matter in the process of negotiations as Kerry is going to present the agreement to Congress in order to get voted, so Kerry would be more careful than before as Ed Royce, the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, mentioned, “House conservatives had wanted to offer a series of amendments to the Iran measure that would force Tehran to recognize Israel as a Jewish state and require “reparations for all U.S. servicemen killed or harmed in Iraq due directly or indirectly to the involvement of any Iranian funded or supported groups.” So it is suggested by Corker on the issue of Israel’s existence, but based on the Israel lobby’s agenda and policies on Iran, reaching agreement is more preferable than military engagement with Iran that threaten Israel’s security in Middle East, it is common in Politico that every things are covered based on ideas about the issue better than the Hill.

“Great unwinding’ of sanctions on Iran poses risks” this editorial deal with matter of time of lifting sanctions again, it shows that they are not sure what to do with the agreement, to reach or not to reach? “The Obama administration insists sanctions will be rolled back in phases based on

Iran meeting certain benchmarks, and that they will be snapped back in place if Iran violates the deal". So as text suggest lifting sanctions is kind of risk as they are susceptible about Iran, so after agreement would it continue? Thus what is the consequence of reaching an agreement? "Great unwinding" is lifting Iran sanctions is vociferous and essential task to do, not easy one. Iran is not just dealing with U.S. sanctions, but the other countries throughout U.N. sanctions. In this economic condition, Iran needs international business and trade, but sanctions are the obstacles. Also after the agreement, just the sanctions that deal with nuclear program will be lifted, not the others that will be dealing with ballistic missile program, human rights abuses, "while businesses based elsewhere will tread cautiously, knowing they risk their relationship with the United States (and massive fines) if they run afoul of what will still remain a complex sanctions architecture.", also Iranian expect fundamental economic improvement of the country. Based on Jerusalem annual conference in New York, Treasury secretary Jack Lew announced that Iranian economic recovery immediately after reaching agreement is a "myth". Another point mentioned by the reporter is Iran's economic relief would be humongous fear based on two main reasons. One is Iran's financial help to Iraq and Syria, second refers to resuming nuclear program. These fear is permanent in any time the agreement will be reached, "if the U.S. and its international partners stick to their pledges to include a strong "snapback" mechanism to re-impose sanctions if Iran violates the nuclear deal, one benefit of that is an Iran that is more willing to give the sanctions relief a realistic amount of time to take effect". The situation would be harder after the agreement, also it is mentioned directly that Obama is not obviously clarifying the way sanctions are going to be lifted, "Sens. Robert Menendez (D-N.J.) and Mark Kirk (R-Ill.) recently proposed legislation that would extend by 10 years a 1996 Iran sanctions law that includes nuclear-related provisions, which was supposed to expire next year". I think Politico is less biased than the Hill, also took the neutral position, moreover ,it is interesting that in most of editorials there is comment or idea from Jewish American or Israel government(Toosi,2015b).

"Is U.S. about to lose its best shot at freeing Americans in Iran?"(Toosi, 2015c), it is about prisoners like Amir Hekmati, Rezaian, Abedini, and Levinson (FBI and CIA agent). The writer is suggesting the agreement as opportunity for U.S. to release them, also the writer tended to describe and illustrate the sensibilities, emotions, problems of their families, also their request to use this agreement for freeing these people, "In an interview, Sarah Hekmati stressed that she is grateful to U.S. officials trying to work for her brother's release, but that "3 1/2 years into this, I want to know more than just that Amir's case is being raised on the sidelines of the nuclear talks. We just want to see the light at the end of the tunnel." Based on the text and its language and word usage, it is somehow critical of U.S. in a way, also Iran sanctions are vital for the other groups, also for U.S. in different perspectives. The writer's heading is challenging question to make reader think of U.S. officials' duty, interestingly the writer did not mention that it is against human rights or civil right abuses to refer to Iran and these cases. The writer is trying to draw the reality in a sense.

Before Trump's presidency, he was asked about the deal, responded he would not quit it, but renegotiate it. In his words in the AIPAC, dismantling the deal is his a-priority (Hounshell, 2016).

Pallone has described that Iran is not honest, has desire to achieve nuclear capability, tries to lift sanctions,also he added, Iran deal was not aim at changing any relations between Iran and U.S,

also US tries to stiffen the bounds with allies in order to restrict US influence, so he supports Iran deal (Freidman, 2015).

The U.S. levies sanction on individuals and entities that are supporting Iran, Senator Bob Corker expressed his support sanctions and considered sanctions that supporters of Iran's nuclear missile program, etc.(Lahut, 2017).Gary Peters asked Obama to force IAEA to stop Iran's nuclear programs (Everett, 2016).

President Rouhani was asked about his preference on whether to choose Clinton or Obama, responded that it is international deal which is based on the United Security Council, and nobody can reject it. Trump has stated to tear it apart, but Clinton will continue the deal (Saba, 2016).

White House has condemned Iran's activities in supporting Yemen, although Iranian President hasnot taken any responsibilities in this regards, White House condemned Iran for violation UN resolutions by transferring arms to Houthi rebellions (Nelson, 2017).

Menendez said economic sanctions relief is not a proper mean without nuclear program stiff verification, as Iranian negotiators are tough in this regards, and he attempts to override the deal, in case of the Congress' rejection (Giambusso, 2015).

Sen. Rand Paul proposed the U.S. maintenance in agreement with Iran. Schumer previously opposed the deal, said: "I thought the agreement is bad", but now as Iran is following up with terms, "let's not violate the deal" (Min Kim, 2017).

Steven Mnuchin said imposing sanctions on Iran shows U.S. concern in the regards to Iran'sactivities (AP, 2017). Imposition of sanctions would lead Iranian officials to violate the spirit. According to state department annual report, U.S. sanctions would target Iran's human abuses, and according to the deal, no nuclear sanctions could be kept waived. Tillerson, Secretary of State also noted that Iran's following the terms based on the deal, but Iran's activities in regards to terrorism and other "malign activities" are under focused. Trump imposed non-nuclear related sanctions on Iran, but it does not mean the deal goes null and void (Toosi, 2017).

CONCLUSION:

As media frames the issues due to some reasons, but it could be mentioned that it is liberal and not in the same sense, as it can portray the issue in a sense, but as there are some gatekeepers they cannot be that much liberal. According to Politico and the Hill, the case of Iran sanctions are portrayed and covered, but the approach is different. Politico is more liberal than the Hill in a sense, as Politico portrays the other involved factors like Jewish thinkers, etc. as there is at least one reference to them in most of the texts. Moreover Politico tried to mention positive and negative thinkers' opinions, but the Hill tried to have biased headings and the issue is illustrated in negative approach against Iran, moreover imposed the sense of weak, passive country about Iran, but Politico is using more neutral headings than the Hill, and it uses the issue to improve domestic policies in a way, but the Hill focused on foreign policies. Politico's perspectives are more critical than the Hill. Finally, the proposed theory of Entman is confirmed based on the data.

Also the idea that United States foreign policy is shifting in face of any administration's change would be important for both the U.S. enemies and allies, there are containing some messages to North Korea in regards to its nuclear program and the deal that they would not keep their words in regards to any negotiations with foreign government. The U.S. is not as much capable as past to choose military option in regards to Iran, so they would like to change the spirit at first, and show that the deal is null and void, but in reality Trump had not done anything in contrast nuclear Iran deal. The objective and aim behind their policy is renegotiations to enforce Iran, to meet the objective, the U.S. could enforce Iran through sanctions-related to human rights abuse, and support of terrorism. They would push Iran to the negotiating table, also revise and amend previous deal, too. But what is important is that Rouhani's shift in discourse from ameliorating tone to harsher ones.

REFERENCES

- i. Aday, S. 2010. Chasing the bad news: An analysis of 2005 Iraq and Afghanistan war coverage on NBC and Fox News Channel. *Journal of Communication*, 60(1), 144-164.
- ii. Alikhani, H. 2000. *Sanctioning Iran: anatomy of a failed policy*. IB Tauris.
- iii. Associated Press. 2017. U.S. hits Iran with more sanctions in response to space launch. Politico.
- iv. Beavers, Olivia. 2017. Al Franken: Trump's Iran decision 'undercuts our leadership'. The Hill
- v. Bennett, Cory. 2015. Nuclear deal could help Iran fund cyber war. The Hill.
- vi. Borah, P. 2011. Conceptual issues in framing theory: A systematic examination of a decade's literature. *Journal of communication*, 61(2), 246-263.
- vii. Cantwell, Tom. 2017. Revolutionary Guards a necessary first step. The Hill.
- viii. Carter, Brandon. 2017. Macron says he warned Trump not to scrap Iran deal, The Hill.
- ix. De Vreese, C. H. 2005. News framing: Theory and typology. *Information design journal+ document design*, 13(1), 51-62.
- x. Everett, Burgess. 2016. Senate Dems call for more transparency on Iran nuclear inspections. Politico.
- xi. Easley, Jonathan. 2017. Poll finds broad support for renegotiating nuclear deal with Iran. The Hill.
- xii. Fayazmanesh, S. 2008. *The United States and Iran: sanctions, wars and the policy of dual containment*. Routledge.
- xiii. Freidman Matt, 2015. Pallone announces support for Iran nuclear deal. Politico.
- xiv. French, Lauren. 2015). House easily passes Iran review bill. Politico.
- xv. Gass, Nick. 2015. J Street poll: Jewish American Favors Hillary over Jeb. Politico.
- xvi. Giambasso, David. (2015. Menendez rejects Iran deal, proposes an alternative. Politico.
- xvii. Given, L. M. 2008). *The SAGE encyclopedia of qualitative methods (Vol. 2)*.

-
- xviii. Greenwood, Max. 2017). Iranian president: No letup in missile production. The Hill.
- xix. Huessy, Peter. 2017). The nuclear deal plays directly into the Iranian way of war. The Hill.
- xx. Lahut, Jake. 2017. U.S. levies new Iran-related sanctions. Politico.
- xxi. Lott Jr, J. R., & Hassett, K. A. (2014). Is newspaper coverage of economic events politically biased?. *Public Choice*, 160(1-2), 65-108.
- xxii. Hensch, Mark. 2015a. Cotton challenges Iranian's courage. U.S.: The Hill.
- xxiii. Hensch, Mark. 2015b. Gates praises Clinton as 'a good secretary of State'. The Hill.
- xxiv. Hensch, Mark. 2015c. Iran's supreme leader threatens nuclear talk's walkout. The Hill.
- xxv. Hounshell, Blake. 2016. 11 questions for President-elect Donald Trump. Politico.
- xxvi. Izadi, F., & Saghaye-Biria, H. 2007. A discourse analysis of elite American newspaper editorials: The case of Iran's nuclear program. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 31(2), 140-165.
- xxvii. J Street poll: Jewish Americans favor Hillary over Jeb.
- xxviii. Nelson, Louis. 2017. White House blames Iran for missile attack on Saudis. Politico.
- xxix. Marcos, Cristina. 2017. House votes to impose non-nuclear sanctions on Iran. The Hill.
- xxx. Min Kim, Seung. 2017. Rand Paul: Don't blow up Iran deal. Politico.
- xxxi. Mitchell, Ellen. 2017. Panetta: Countries won't trust US if Iran deal is broken. The Hill.
- xxxii. Naga Siu, Diamond. 2017. Sanders, Feinstein call for delay in Iran sanctions vote after Tehran attack. Politico.
- xxxiii. Peksen, Dursun. 2010. "Coercive Diplomacy and Press Freedom: An Empirical Assessment of the Impact of Economic Sanctions on Media Openness." *International Political Science Review*.
- xxxiv. Prakash, Audie Klotz and Deepa. 2008. "Qualitative Methods in International Relations".
- xxxv. Rashidi, N., & Rasti, A. 2012. Doing (in) Justice to Iran's Nuke Activities? A Critical Discourse Analysis of News Reports of Four Western Quality Newspapers. *American Journal of Linguistics*, 1(1), 1-9.
- xxxvi. Saba, Yousef. 2016. Rouhani: Iran deal able to weather the election. Politico.
- xxxvii. Sauer, Navid Hassibi and Tom. 2013. "Easing sanctions on Iran might someday be necessary but it won't be easy." *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*.
- xxxviii. Savransky, Rebecca. 2017. Tillerson: Staying in the Iran deal in best interest of the US. The Hill.
- xxxix. Shelbourne, Mallory. 2017. Haley: Trump move on Iran sends 'perfect message' to North Korea. The Hill.
-

-
- xl. Taleblu, Behnam Ben; Ghaseminejad, Saeed. 2017. Iran's supreme leader has a business empire — the US must sanction it. The Hill.
 - xli. Toosi, Michael Crowley and Nahal. 2015a. Deadline for nuclear talks with Iran may be softening. Politico.
 - xlii. Toosi, Nahal. 2015b. 'Great unwinding' of sanctions on Iran poses risks. Politico.
 - xliii. Toosi, Nahal. 2015c. Is U.S. about to lose its best shot at freeing Americans in Iran? : Politico.
 - xliv. Wong, Kristina. 2015. How long would it take Iran to develop nukes? No one knows the answer for sure. Politico.
 - xlv. Toosi, Nahal. 2016. Trump keeps waiving nuclear sanctions on Iran, but imposes new penalties over missiles. Politico.

www.ijahms.com