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Functional theory has been used internationally to study the content of political debates. Some scholars have critiqued the theory as being too culturally restricted. This study contends that values are inherent to human argumentation and uses the Aristotelian values of prudence, justice, fortitude, and temperance to expand the analytic power of functional theory. A qualitative content analysis was applied using functional theory with values on news outlet articles from 2013 – 2015 from Al Jazeera, BBC, USA Today, New York Times, and Washington Post. The articles concerned the Iran Deal of 2015 and were accessed online. Themes generated include: knowledge, understanding, wisdom, productivity, safety, trust, benefits, concessions, fairness, rights, hope, faith, power, and patience. Using values with functional theory was found to expand the latter’s analytic power cross culturally and across fields.
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CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

This study will examine the rhetorical claims made by proponents and opponents of the 2015 Iran-Nuclear Deal in various texts using Functional Theory. A summary of the Deal will first be offered focusing upon its alleged details as reported to the public in various news outlets. This will be followed by a short foray into the historical context of the relationship between the parties negotiating the Deal to shed light on the potential value of it in its current historical context. This study holds to the definition of rhetoric as the use of words and symbols to achieve a goal. Previous scholarship as to how value pertains to rhetoric and argument will be introduced. Value will be noted as fundamental to rhetorical claims thus giving a foundational abstraction by which to examine rhetorical-value claims. Functional theory will then be explained as the theoretical lens by which the rhetorical value-claims of both proponents and opponents of the Deal will be examined.

The “Deal”

The so-called Iran-Nuclear Deal of 2015 between Iran and the United States has drawn the attention of both proponents and opponents of the Obama administration. According to numerous news outlets the Obama administration is attempting to reach an agreement with Iran along with a number of other countries such as Great Britain, Germany, China, Russia, and France. The Deal alleges to reduce economic sanctions against Iran by these countries in exchange for a promise from Iran that they will not pursue development of a nuclear weapon. The details of the Deal stipulate that Iran will be somehow required to reduce its number of centrifuges and supply of enriched uranium, both of which are needed to produce a nuclear weapon. Apparently, this pact has been in the works for a number of years but is only now coming to fruition. Normally, any treaty ratifications between the United States and foreign
powers must be ratified through Congress, but this agreement has not officially been designated a treaty. So, in order to have some say in the Deal, Congress passed a law requiring that President Obama submit the final version of the Deal for critique. Congress then has final say as to whether or not the Deal will be passed and thus honored. Further complicating the issue are the alleged "side Deals" which handle questions about past work done by Iran on things like the testing of nuclear detonators and access to specific Iranian military sites. The Obama administration argues that these Deals do not come under the jurisdiction of Congress. Republicans, for the most part, argue that they do.

The Deal, it could be argued, is not necessarily aimed at achieving a final peace in the Middle East but rather simply to delay the production of a nuclear weapon by Iran for up to ten years. Of course, those against the Deal argue that by lifting sanctions more money will be available for Iran to not only achieve the production of a nuclear weapon but also to continue to fund terrorist activities all over the world, thus making peace less, rather than more likely. Proponents of the Deal argue that, short of war, it was the only way to halt a potentially nuclear Iran. Although they also argue that the possibility of the choice to go to war is not off the table as a last resort even if the Deal is signed. In terms of the coming presidential election of 2016, support is divided along party lines and thus the Deal has become a major point of argument potentially affecting debate between candidates and the election itself.

**Relational History & Value**

The tumultuous history between the United States and Iran goes back decades, perhaps beginning when in the early 1950's the former helped to overthrow the democratically elected government of the latter and installed a leadership that ended up being corrupt. Then in the late 1970's an Islamic revolution which overthrew the corrupt leadership also took American
hostages and used them to make demands upon the United States government. Since then, along with a few other countries, Iran has been considered by the United States as a state that sponsors terrorism. Financial links have been alleged between Iran and militant groups, including Palestinian terror groups, with elements all over the world who have made the United States and its allies targets.

As previously stated, at first there appeared to be a mix from both sides of the political spectrum who either supported the Deal or were against it. As of this writing, support is divided mainly along party lines with most Democrats in support and most Republicans against the Deal. Arguments from supporters and detractors have arisen in the various types of media outlets including television, radio, and the internet. Supporters argue that the Deal brings value to the audience whereas detractors argue that the Deal does not bring value but harm. Giving the benefit of the doubt in terms of good intention to both sides, the issue being argued among supporters and detractors may not be as simple as whether or not the Iran-Nuclear Deal brings value to the audience, the American people, but rather what are the characteristics of the value-hierarchies that are competing with one another? What are the arguments being put forth in order to position those hierarchies as the best alternatives?

Of interest is the rhetorical content of these arguments that are being used as value-statements and claims. Rowland and Womack note that while rhetoric as a tool is amoral, its product they suggest, is either moral or immoral (Rowland & Womack, 1985). In other words, rhetoric speaks to or argues about values. Some rhetoric occurs only as a matter of techne or craftsmanship and is absent ethical concerns such as when carpenters are debating about the best technique(s) to use on a project. Both types of situations involve value-persuasion but only one is concerned with moral values. Thus, all rhetoric is value-laden, not all rhetoric is morally
value-laden but all rhetoric is value-laden. The value-laden rhetoric that is inherent in the process of negotiating an agreement, generally speaking, is aimed at persuading an audience of the value or lack thereof that acceptance of that agreement will gain them. Further, value-laden rhetoric is used by representatives to persuade constituent audiences that an agreement does or does not have value to them. The latter seems to be the situation in which the rhetoric in question for this study is taking place. There are a number of representatives on both sides who are trying to convince their respective publics about the value that the Deal may or may not be bringing them.

Values & Argument

The work of the following scholars helps to establish the necessary nature of the link between value-claims and rhetorical-claims. As previously stated, this study holds to the definition of rhetoric as the use of words and symbols to achieve a goal. “Claims” as such, are argumentative by nature but may pertain to such subcategories as morality, politics, and social relations. According to William Frankena, value-claims are oriented toward what “ought to be” rather than “what was, is, or will be.” Frankena suggests that therefore value-claims do not pertain to facts (Frankena, 1967). To the contrary, that which is perceived as valuable to a person is so because it is perceived by them as factually good for them. Whether or not a thing is truly good for one seems rather to be a matter of objective fact whether or not we are aware of it. Such is the endeavor of both ethics and medical science, determining what is truly good for

---

1 “[Philosophical] questions belong to the same family, since they are all concerned with value or what ought to be, not with fact or what is, was, or will be.” p. 637
human beings. Thus, such things can be and are argued about in medical and ethics journals rather than merely subjectively accepted.

As beings that belong to the same species we have the same general physiological and psychological needs such as food, water, shelter, friendship, love, etc. Thus, viewpoints and actions about values are shared perspectives within communities about what is normal and abnormal in terms of those values. A system of values always references a contextual hierarchy of those values and can be categorized. Milton Rokeach used "instrumental" and "terminal" to designate values where the former pertain to "courses of conduct" or policies and the latter pertain to "desirable conditions," (Rokeach, 1973). Scholars such as Donald Walhout differentiate between socio-political values such as liberty which tend to be more abstract, and personal values such as health, which may have more immediate or concrete meaning to constituents, (Walhout, 1978). Further, some have differentiated between abstract and concrete values where the latter is treated as a "unique entity" in particular circumstances whereas examples of the former tend to "transcend particular circumstances," (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1969). These two scholars suggest that because abstract values are more general in nature they are more useful to "change the established order." Important to consider is that Chaim Perelman and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca also argue that "[v]alues enter into every argument." No matter the field, "values intervene as a basis for argument" at all stages. Malcolm Sillars and Patricia Ganer posit that values are not merely to be reduced to a type of claim but that values are “strategically significant” in argumentation, (Sillars & Ganer, 1982). Therefore, understanding the values in play, public or private, are crucial to understanding the rhetorical moves being made in discourse. They go on to argue that values can be seen to fit into the argument analysis schema of Stephen Toulmin wherein values always play the part of a
warrant for a claim, (Toulmin, 1958). In a deductive argument, the warrant or value-claim always holds the place of the major premise because it is a general statement or claim accepted as given. The minor premise(s) then serve as the data linking the value-claim to the main claim of the argument. Major premises or value-claims will always appeal to a hierarchy of goods where “good” is defined as what is beneficial to the parties involved according to the contextual realities of the perceived relationship therein. Relationships imply obligations which restrict and make demands upon behavior. Some relationships are bound by cultural contexts such as some religious relationships while others seem to be contextualized by human nature such as parent-child relationships. In the end, rhetoric always makes an appeal to a hierarchical good, a set of standards, even if implicit and not stated in any part of the argument made.

Edward Inch and Barbara Warnick posit that the process involved, evaluation, in all argumentation “reveals certain standard or stock issues,” (Inch & Warnick, 1998). In other words, rhetorical argument always involves values that are standard or part of a hierarchical relationship. Hence, arguments reference and make appeals to a norm. According to these scholars there are five pillars to the framework which help to contextualize values. They need to be (1) defined according to their (2) argument field (Toulmin) which helps to establish the perspective (3) hierarchy. The latter of which may in and of itself be the point of contention for the argument. Hence, (4) field-dependent criteria are needed in order to facilitate evaluation. These steps are akin to defining terms at the beginning of any argument including a piece of scholarly research. Such a process helps to avoid ambiguities and vagueness during discourse. Another point of disputation may be (5) application of policies resulting from establishment of value hierarchies. When attempting to establish, clarify, or capsize a hierarchy of values, Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca suggest the use of certain “loci” such as "quantity" where more
or less of a certain value might be deemed preferable. "Order" as a locus can refer to chronological value, one way or the other, along the time scale. So, understanding values as fundamental to the terminology and foundation of argument is paramount. In other words, rhetorical argument functions as an appeal to values which are meant to serve as norms, such as to those which are appealed by both sides of the debate on the “deal.”

**Functional Theory**

Functional theory has traditionally been used to analyze and quantify the effects of political rhetoric on candidate choice in the political arena. Scholars such as William L. Benoit, Jayne R. Henson, Leigh A. Sudbrock, and others have focused upon the rhetoric-laden media produced by candidates in such races. These rhetorical messages are analyzed by such scholars to show that their function is to persuade voters to choose one candidate over the other(s). A number of different categories, the details of which will be delved into later, are used to further subdivide these messages. Statements are analyzed and categorized and the data are then quantified. An interpretation is generally put forth about what the calculations mean in terms of the rhetorical strategies of the candidates. Benoit and other scholars who have used functional theory do not focus upon nonverbal rhetoric but rather tend to limit their research to transcripts. They also do not attempt to examine every characteristic of verbal rhetoric but rather only those characteristics which most likely seem to fit within their predetermined categories. Further, no research has been done on the function of value statements or how the categories devised by the previously mentioned scholars might be more fundamentally represented by value categories. Such research may help to transcend political boundaries by reorienting political rhetoric to statements about values which may be easier with which to identify for constituents and non-logicians.
This study will contend, using functional theory to assess the role of value statements, that all of the arguments raised by both sides use value-laden rhetoric and pertain to an unspoken-standard of values. Such an agreement might especially have political influence considering that Iran and the United States have considered each other enemies for a long period of time. Functional theory as defined by William L. Benoit and Jayne R. Henson (Benoit & Henson, 2009), is that political campaign messages are functional and “constitute a means to accomplish a goal.” In the case of the study just quoted the goal was to “obtain election to public office by receiving a winning margin of votes from citizens.” Benoit argues that “candidates solicit support from voters by attempting to persuade them that they are preferable to opponents” based upon the most important or pertinent criteria. In other words, rhetoric is used to convince constituents that the choice of one over the other is “preferable” or will bring more value to those making that choice. Benoit goes on to suggest that there are three possible functions that can persuade constituents that one choice is better than the others. “Acclaims, or self-praise,” identify and focus upon the positive aspects or values of a choice. “Attacks, or criticisms” of alternate choices, identify and focus upon the negative aspects or values of the opposing selection. And lastly, “defenses, which are responses to attacks [and] refute the purported weakness” in value or lack thereof concerning a choice. Part of the aforementioned goal of this study is to show that these three functions can be utilized to analyze value-statements in much the same way as Benoit used them to analyze political rhetoric. All that is required is a change in terms or a re-focus from human political candidates to value-candidates or choices about values. Benoit argues that “these three functions work as an informal variant of cost-benefit analysis: acclaims increase benefits, attacks increase an opponent’s costs, and defenses reduce a candidate’s alleged costs.” The analysis being done in this study will re-focus concern about
consequences toward value-candidates thus shifting these costs and benefits onto those making the choices about the values that allegedly pertain to the decision being made. Benoit goes on to explain that one need not assume that “constituents are actually quantifying costs and benefits or combining them mathematically.” Rather, what is important is to realize the persuasive power of the rhetoric involved. If a constituent identifies with an acclaim then the perceived value involved will increase the potential for it to be a motivating factor. Similarly, if a constituent identifies with a value being attacked, that too might become a motivating factor regarding the choice to be made. If a constituent perceives a defense to be effective then the apparent value-cost is reduced.

Benoit also frames functional theory into two topics: policy, and character. Policy is further subdivided into past deeds, future plans, and general goals. Character is subdivided into qualities, abilities, and Ideals. This study will keep the overall meaning of the terms in functional theory but their foci will be re-oriented toward the more fundamental idea of value. As discussed earlier, value-persuasion is fundamental to the use of rhetoric and thus understanding the values to which argumentation is oriented is paramount. For the purposes of this study, policy and its subdivisions will be treated and referred to as value-praxis. Policy is defined as the “adoption of a definite course of action.” The reasons for a course of action are based upon the balancing, maintenance, or reaching of a value-standard, even if that standard is left unspoken. Policy subdivisions concerning past deeds, future plans, and general goals are themselves oriented towards the practice of reaching, balancing, or the maintenance of values. Where policy is a reflection of the character of one who holds those policies, character and its subdivisions are reflections of the values that the person in question holds. Thus, the character of a policy entails the qualities, abilities, and ideals to which it is implemented in order to balance, maintain, or
achieve value. Ideal is just another word for value and *character* denotes the aggregate of value-features of a person or thing. So, the word *character* will suffice as an acceptable term for this study in that it already focuses upon the aggregate of value-features of a person or thing.

The use of functional theory, particularly by Benoit, up to this point has been as a quantitative measure of the qualitative effect of rhetorical persuasion. This study will not be quantitative in nature but rather qualitative. After a review of the pertinent literature, this study will utilize a close content analysis of the values to which the texts and media involved point. In other words, where argument is presented by both or either side whether in print or other media, this study will examine the claims being made and specifically the hierarchy of values to which they appeal, latent or explicit. Particular notice will be taken wherein inductive arguments seem to make deductive claims (where perhaps the latent deductive claim is enthymemic). Where available, analysis will be done on print, radio spots, and television advertisements. It is difficult to differentiate exactly when journalists specifically began covering what is now known as the “Iran Deal” and the events that led up to it but select stories from a variety of media available online beginning around September of 2013 up to and including submission of this study will be examined. Textual, aural, and visual rhetoric will be considered where applicable. This study will attempt to expand the use of Functional theory by using it to determine underlying values as well as draw more attention to the fundamental role of values in claims to answer the research question: What kind of values can be determined from the function of rhetoric and how does determining value build on functional theory? Lastly, a discussion of the findings will be included.
Conclusion

This introductory chapter first detailed the “deal” between the governments of the United States and Iran, along with a very brief history of the relationship between these two parties to provide a context for the “deal.” Next, the work of various scholars was introduced in order to help establish the necessary link between rhetoric and value-claims. Finally, Functional theory was explained as the lens by which the rhetorical-value claims pertaining to the “deal” will be analyzed. The following chapters will examine pertinent literature in order to further the framework of this study, examine the actual rhetorical-value claim language as published in various texts of the deal, and conclude with findings of the overall study, respectively.

The next chapter, the literature review, examines functional theory in more detail as well as challenges to it. Then, functional theory as modified by value will be discussed. The relationship between rhetorical claims and values will be scrutinized followed by a brief history of U.S. – Iranian relations. The chapter will then conclude with a discussion of language of the Deal in terms of its investigation by scholars.
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CHAPTER II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Firstly, an explanation of functional theory and its theoretical underpinnings. This will include a review of some studies that have used the theory as well as some that have challenged its claims. Secondly, a more thorough review of the scholarship concerning the relationship between values and rhetorical claims is in order. This will also include, as an answer to the challenges against functional theory, arguments for using values as a more basic category for the rhetorical claims found in the categories suggested by these theories as a whole. So, thirdly, a review of some scholarship which attempts to shine light upon the history behind the current relationship of the West and the Islamic East, particularly Iran, that has led to the Deal. Finally, a review of the available scholarship focusing on the language of how the Deal is presented to the public. As mentioned in the previous section, an important precursor to studying functional language in any setting is to understand the values that motivate such language-in-action and how those values might be imbedded in claims. As Ruth Wodak argues, interactions between media, politics, and people are so multifaceted, an interdisciplinary approach to scholarship is called for in uncovering such nuances (Wodak, 2001).

Functional Theory

It is probably best to explain functional theory by turning first to the scholar originally accredited with its use, William L. Benoit. In Benoit’s piece entitled “Functional Theory of Political Discourse” (Benoit, 2006b), the author touches on the fact that many if not most countries have political campaigns for elective office. Many of those countries broadcast political television advertisements. Although these countries differ in political systems in many ways, the commonalities of these countries include the attempt by candidates to convince voters
via their campaign discourse to select a candidate or a party. Benoit argues that these attempts are therefore “functional” in that they are efforts to deliver specific messages about a candidate with the overall goal of making the candidate appear to be the best choice for voters. Thus, “[f]unctional Theory can help understand the messages from viable candidates for office” (p. 11). Benoit then elucidates upon what he refers to as “axioms” or “assumptions” pertaining to Functional Theory. They are six in number and include the following: Voting Is a Comparative Act; Candidates Must Distinguish Themselves from Opponents; Political Campaign Messages Are Important Vehicles for Distinguishing between Candidates; Candidates Establish Preferability Through Acclaiming, Attacking, and Defending; Campaign Discourse Occurs on Two Topics: Policy and Character; and A Candidate Must Win a Majority (or a Plurality) of the Votes Cast in an Election.

The first axiom is relatively straightforward; voting is a comparative act. Benoit points out that there is usually a choice to be made between two or more candidates and it is thus a comparative judgment. He also notes that no candidate is perfect. They will have good and bad points. “So, each person is essentially deciding which candidate (or party) seems to be preferable on whatever factor[s] matters the most to that person.”

Benoit asserts that the first axiom entails the second, that Candidates Must Distinguish Themselves from Opponents. “Because voting is a comparative action, candidates must tell voters how they differ from other candidates. If a citizen does not see any difference between two candidates, he or she has no reason to prefer one candidate over the other.” He notes that this doesn’t necessarily mean that candidates must differ on each and every issue but rather on issues that are deemed important to the voter and on such issues the difference must be significant.
The third axiom that Political Campaign Messages Are Important Vehicles for Distinguishing between Candidates is a result of the first two axioms. Such messages can be delivered directly via live or televised speeches and debates, political pamphlets, and webpages. Some are received second-hand via news media and other organizations as well as from other citizens. Importantly, Benoit cites the research of several scholars who concluded that “news organizations enact a gate-keeping function, deciding which ideas from the candidates to pass along to voters and which to ignore; the news media has the opportunity to provide commentary on the candidates’ ideas, evaluating the candidates positively or negatively; and the news has a strong tendency to focus on horse race issues (who is ahead, campaign strategy, and campaign events) rather than the candidates’ policy positions or qualifications for office” ((p. 12) (see also: (Farnsworth & Lichter, 2003; Patterson, 1980; Robinson & Sheehan, 1983)).

Benoit’s fourth axiom that Candidates Establish Preferability Through Acclaiming, Attacking, and Defending, is more descriptive in terms of function. The first of these functions, acclaims, “tell voters about [the candidates] good points” in an attempt to make them seem preferable. (Benoit, 1997) The second function, attacks, serve to criticize the opponent(s). “Identifying an opponent’s weaknesses or disadvantages is likely to make that candidate appear less enticing to voters (again, particularly with voters who believe the topic of the attack is important)” (p. 14). Benoit cites the research of Karen Johnson-Cartee and Gary Copeland who found that “voters tend to consider policy attacks more acceptable than character attacks” (Johnson-Cartee & Copeland, 1989). Thus, Benoit posits that “some attacks might be more likely to backfire than others.” In other words, voters may begin to dislike the candidate who attacks the character of their opponent should it be perceived as unwarranted. He also points to research that suggests that “positive advertisements are just as persuasive as negative ones” (See: (Allen
& Burrell, 2002; Lau, Sigelman, Heldman, & Babbitt, 1999)). The third function Benoit posits is that of defense which attempts to refute an attack (Benoit, 1995). He argues that “[a] timely and suitable defense has the potential to prevent further damage from an attack and it may help restore a candidate’s preferability from damage caused by an attack.” He goes on to say that they do have disadvantages, however. They could make a candidate appear to be “on the defensive” or “reactive” rather than “pro-active.” They may also distract a candidate from the message upon which they would rather focus. Lastly, a defense may lend credence to the attack or remind voters of an issue that the candidate would rather be placed behind them. Benoit cites research which points to these functions in action wherein politicians recognize their purpose and make recommendations guided by their usefulness ((Popkin, Gorman, Smith, & Phillips, 1976)(p. 15)).

The fifth axiom, that campaign discourse occurs on the topics of policy and character, Benoit says can also be seen as “image” and “stances” (on “issues”). He asserts that these are the substantial ways that candidates can “distinguish themselves from their opponents.” Character can include things such as leadership ability, honesty, and compassion. Policy can include such things as past accomplishments, education, jobs, national defense, and crime. As previously noted, some research has shown that voters tend to think that policy is more important than character. Patterson and McClure note that “of all the information voters obtain through the mass media during a presidential campaign, knowledge about where the candidates stand on the issues is among the most vital” ((Patterson & McClure, 1976)(p. 49)). In addition, C. Richard Hofstetter concluded that “[i]ssue preferences are the key elements in the preferences of most, if not all, voters” ((Hofstetter, 1976) (p. 77)). Benoit’s own research also determined that “[p]ublic opinion poll data from 1976 through 2000 indicate that more American voters report that the most important determinant of their vote for president is issues rather than character,” and that
“presidential candidates who won, as a group, discussed policy more and character less in their campaign messages” (Benoit, 2003). He goes on to note that this data does not suggest that character is unimportant because “a substantial number of voters do believe that character is the most important factor in their presidential vote choice” (p. 16).

The sixth and final axiom, that a candidate must win a majority (or a plurality) of the votes cast in an election, Benoit says may seem obvious but carries with it the implication that a candidate need not persuade every one of their preferability over opponents. Such an endeavor, he says, would be “impractical.” Some positions, he states, will automatically attract and repel voters, such as “abortion” for example. Benoit also argues that “the only citizens who matter in an election are those who actually vote.” “So, a candidate does not need the support of most citizens, but of most citizens who actually vote.” He also points out that American elections are unique in that a candidate “need only to persuade enough voters to gain 270 electoral votes.” Candidates such as Al Gore in the 2000 presidential election won the popular vote by a substantial majority but lost to George Bush who gained 270. Benoit acknowledges that rules for governments with parliaments are different and that although he uses a quantitative measuring system in his research he knows that “voters [do not] assign numerical values to acclaims or attacks or that they perform mathematical operations to make a vote choice.” Benoit posits that his axioms tend to be repeated by a candidate throughout a campaign to serve as reinforcement for those voters who “pay attention” and notification for those who do so less often.

Benoit argues that functional theory has advantages over other theories in that it can “make predictions about the nature of campaign messages.” He explains that television advertisements are the most studied form of campaign messages and thus begins there in terms of explaining advantages of functional theory. He goes on to posit that while other research looks
at attacks and acclaims, only functional theory recognizes a third component in such
advertisements, defense. Thus, he notes, functional theory offers a more “comprehensive
understanding of political campaign messages.” He also differentiates his approach from some
other approaches by noting that many campaign messages are a mix of acclaim, attack, and
defense and that the mix is not always balanced. Thus, in this sense, functional theory is more
accurate. Benoit acknowledges that some researchers do recognize a third category
(comparative) but he argues that his category is more precise. The problem of mixed messages in
terms of policy and character also enters in to functional approach whereas other methods only
look at the “dominant theme” of an advertisement. Further, where other theories stop at labeling
advertisements as policy or character themed, Benoit supplements these categories with
subdivisions. He divides policy into past deeds, future plans, and general goals; and he divides
character into personal qualities, leadership qualities, and ideals. Another advantage of functional
theory that Benoit touts is the fact that campaign attacks may have different targets such as the
incumbent, another political party, competitors from one’s own party, or the establishment
(status quo). Benoit charges that other theories tend to ignore these differences. Lastly, functional
theory combines all of the above in its approach across multiple media types while other
theories, many of which are designed only for specific media types, tend to stay with only one
topic. Media types include television, debates, talk radio, web pages, speeches, and news
coverage (Benoit, 2006a). Benoit suggests that “[m]ost political campaign research focuses on
television spots and debates – and predominantly on general election campaign spots and debates
– or on Keynote Speeches and Acceptance Addresses.” Thus, functional theory has the
advantage of being able to be applied to a variety of message forms. Functional theory has also
been applied to non-presidential campaign messages (see: (Airne & Benoit, 2005a, 2005b;
Benoit argues that functional theory is “systemic” and thus allows for comparisons across media types (p. 21).

Benoit then begins to explain the predictions that might be made using functional theory. He reminds the reader that, according to functional theory, acclaims have no drawbacks, attacks potentially have one, and defenses have potentially three. Thus, he claims, that candidates will use acclaims more frequently than attacks and attacks more frequently than defenses. In order to substantiate this prediction, he provides tables of data which appear to verify his forecast. He also provides tables which show this relationship to hold true in non-presidential television advertisements, and political campaigns in other countries as well (p. 22). As noted earlier, Benoit says that voters prefer campaign messages about policy rather than those about character. Thus, his second prediction is that candidates will discuss policy more than character. Again, he provides tables of data to substantiate his prediction and these seem to verify his account in American presidential campaigns, non-presidential campaigns, and in other countries. However, he does note that emphasis on policy over character may be different in other countries and so results relying on this relationship may vary in that regard. Benoit notes that his research has shown that candidates who are ahead in polls tend to receive more attacks than opponents do (Benoit et al., 2002).

As a rule, Benoit finds, Democrats tend to advocate governmental solutions to policy issues and thus talk more about policy than do Republicans who tend to argue for smaller government. Functional theory research has also begun to contrast messages from candidates with those given by journalists. The research has found that coverage tends to be more negative than the messages themselves (see: (Benoit, Hansen, & Stein, 2004; Benoit, Stein, & Hansen,
2005)). In the context of political campaigns particularly that of primaries, Benoit notes that there are fewer attacks and more acclaims as compared with general elections. Benoit provides a table showing analysis of television advertisements, debates, and brochures which illustrate these findings. His conjecture is that during primaries, opponents would tend to have more common ground in terms of policy because they usually come from the same political party. Also, the candidate who might win at the primary level will then want to have the endorsement and support of those same opponents and their supporters. Thus, primaries tend to emphasize character more than policy and also function as a way for lesser known candidates to introduce themselves to potential voters. Benoit further explains that this does not mean that character is not a focus of general campaigns but rather character is even “more” of a focus in such contests. Another contextual consideration raised by Benoit is incumbency. Although incumbency is not a possibility in those countries which limit terms of service to one, there are many that allow for at least a second term. American Vice Presidents will often seek the office of president after having already served two terms as Vice President. In such situations, Benoit notes, incumbents usually acclaim more and attack less as well. Opponents in these situations usually attack more and acclaim less (p. 26). Interestingly, Benoit also points out that “Presidential debates have more defenses than any other medium studied.” Benoit suggests that this is because only two of the three potential drawbacks to defense as defined by functional theory pertain to a live debate situation. As a reminder, the drawbacks of using defenses are that they could make a candidate appear to be “on the defensive” or “reactive” rather than “pro-active;” they may also distract a candidate from the message upon which they would rather focus; and a defense may lend credence to the attack or remind voters of an issue that the candidate would rather be placed behind them. During a live debate, listeners may have just heard an attack, thus the concern that
defending against that attack will remind potential voters of a possibly damaging issue is not pertinent. Rather, if a candidate side-steps an attack or ignores it, voters might think that there is no defense for it. Benoit argues that this finding “suggests that there can be differences between messages given in different media” (p. 26).

At this point it might be helpful to analyze a study using functional theory to see how it is applied and how it can elucidate the study at hand where the object(s) include not only persons (candidates and officials) but also policies, particularly the Iran Deal. Most if not all the persons pertinent to the study at hand have already won their positions in their respective offices. So, the dynamic in terms of attacks, acclaims, and defenses may be altered in that regard. There are many studies that utilize functional theory in their analysis including many studies that focus upon political campaigns of other countries besides the United States. Since the purpose of the study at hand focuses upon an issue between America and Iran it might be more helpful to look at an analysis which has as its primary concern an American issue, policy, or campaign.

Jayne Henson and William Benoit conducted a study of television advertising from three types of campaigns: presidential general elections from 1952-2004; primaries from 1952-2008; and gubernatorial, Senate, and House from 2002 (Henson & Benoit, 2010). The aim of their study was an attempt to “understand the use of evidence (statements for which sources are provided) in such campaign messages.” Dividing their focus into themes, they found that only 8% identified a source for their claims. Sifting through the information available starting from 1952, they concluded that citing sources was a rare occurrence until around 1990. While most of the appeals (70%) were deemed to be positive (acclaims); the bulk (65%) of the evidence used was employed to support attacks. The most prevalent source(s) cited by the candidates in this study were newspapers followed by governmental reports, and statements from opponents and
their voting records. Henson and Benoit cite Kak Yoon, Bruce Pinkleton, and Wonjun Ko in noting that vote intention can be predicted by connoted higher credibility of a candidate (Yoon, Pinkleton, & Ko, 2005). Further, referring to Daniel O’Keefe’s intensive study of the effects of the use of evidence in messages suggests that such usage increases the credibility of the source and the persuasiveness of the message (O’Keefe, 1998). The definition of “evidence” however, remains in contention. Some researchers, such as John Geer, have used statistics, statements with references, and quotations and found them to be most utilized for attacks and to support policy rather than character (Geer, 2006). Others, such as David Levasseur and Kevin Dean, use James McCroskey’s (McCroskey, 1967) definition of evidence where factual information is distinguished from statements for which sources are given (Levasseur & Dean, 1996). Henson and Benoit note that “when researchers account for differences in definitions of evidence, significant effects can be demonstrated [. . .] testimonial evidence, the type used in this investigation, has been shown to have a significant effect on attitude” (p. 3).

Citing Benoit’s own work on functional theory in regards to campaign discourse, Henson and Benoit posit that “in order to win elections, candidates seek to appear preferable to other candidates” (Benoit, 2006b). They revisit defining acclaims, attacks and their weaknesses, and defenses which has already been done in this overall study. So, it will not be repeated again here. They also return to the idea that two types of messages, policy and character, are what are contained in candidate’s advertisements. Policy can mean “governmental action” and is sometimes referred to as “issues.” Character is sometimes referred to as “image” but Benoit notes that the latter is less important to voters than the former and that winners of elections tend to have addressed policy more than character (Benoit, 2003). The researchers then introduce four research questions: What percentage of ad themes contained supporting evidence?; What
functions are supported with evidence?; What topics are supported with evidence?; and What types of sources were used most frequently for supporting evidence? Benoit and Henson describe their coding method as a four-step process. First, using functional theory, ads were categorized into themes such as claim, utterance, argument, or statement. Second, each theme was categorized by function: acclaim, attack, or defense. Third, themes were further categorized by main campaign topic introduced earlier, either policy or character. Lastly, those with evidence were categorized and the source of the evidence was noted. These categories were listed earlier. Henson and Benoit considered evidence to be “direct quotations or paraphrases” which “may or may not include statistics.” They differentiate their study from John Geer (noted earlier) in that unlike with Geer’s study, Henson and Benoit did not count as evidence statistics that were given without a source.

The results of Benoit and Henson’s study concerning the first research question about television spots that used evidence, according to their definition, found that 8% cited sources (such as providing a newspaper headline on the screen). The second research question pertained to functions that were supported by evidence. Although 70% of the advertisements were deemed positive (acclaims), 65% of the material which utilized evidence was considered negative (attacks), again citing mainly newspaper headlines. The third research question related to “utterances” which employed evidence. The researchers claim that in regard to this question “no pattern emerged.” Although, true to previous studies given here, presidential advertisements with evidence tended to be about policy rather than character. Senate advertisements with evidence, however, tended to be about character rather than policy. All other contests examined, primaries, gubernatorial, and house showed “no difference” in terms of evidence. The fourth research question looked at the type of evidence used. Approximately 61% of the evidence came from
newspapers, 11% came from government reports and opponents, 9% from voting records, and 8% from other various sources.

To conclude their study, Benoit and Henson note that the use of evidence in television campaign advertisements changed particularly in 1992 during Bill Clinton’s campaign. During Clinton’s campaign, evidence was utilized far more than it had been in the past. The researchers speculate that this was the case perhaps as a response to the prominence of character attacks against Clinton. They also suggest the prominence of evidence could be due to the fact that Clinton may have had a better command of policy than his competition or of past candidates. Also interesting to note is that even though more acclaims were used than attacks, the latter utilized evidence more prominently. This appears to coincide with John Geer’s findings (see Geer’s study mentioned previously). Benoit and Henson found too few usages of defenses to include them in their statistical analysis but did note that when defense was used it included evidence more times than not. Since potential voters do not like attacks in general, again citing John Geer, the researchers posit that “criticism requires more evidence to succeed, because viewers are going to be skeptical without documentation.” Further, paraphrasing Yoon, et al., “candidates with higher perceived credibility are more successful with attacks. Thus, it makes sense for candidates to employ evidence more to support attacks than acclaims.” Further, as noted previously in Benoit’s study conducted with Brazeal, character tends to be considered more important in congressional races than in presidential ones.

Benoit and Henson posit that the types of evidence used might be due to two factors. Newspapers may be seen to be “relatively objective and familiar” sources as compared with others. Citing research such as that conducted by James Avery (Avery, 2009), the researchers note that readers of newspaper political advertisements tend to have increased political trust.
Secondly, potential voters tend to be more familiar with newspapers rather than voting records as they are more accessible.

Functional theory has not come through unscathed however. There are those who present research that they believe shows the theory to be lacking in terms of capturing essential cultural characteristics needed for proper classification and understanding of the situation and the rhetoric employed.

Challenges to Functional Theory

Since the advent of Functional theory, as with all theories it seems, there have emerged challenges to its claims. Particularly, its claim to cross-cultural application. Some scholars claim functional theory does not take into account important cultural differences when attempting to use it to analyze political speech in countries other than the United States. Some scholars have suggested expanding or modifying it in such a way as to include essential cultural characteristics.

Pekka Isotalus and Eeva Aarnio (Isotalus & Aarnio, 2006) opened the door to questioning the use of functional theory across cultures with their work on Finnish televised political debates. They begin by talking about the importance of television in terms of the addition of visual information to the textual. They also mention that most of the analyses that had been done up to that point were American as were the objects of the analyses. Further, most of the analyses have concentrated on two-party type systems and most of the previous research has focused upon the effects of the debates (p. 62). Although less popular, content analysis has taken place on the visual and/or verbal communication contained in these debates. Various single features have been the main focus of studies including the moderator, and camera work. Isolatus and Aarnio also posit that the general goal of these studies was not to provide a “general view.” They therefore suggest that there is a lack of research “seeking to describe the main elements of
debates or create a theoretical perspective for content analysis of a televised debate,” as well as account for the “political situation” and communicative features. The researchers also contend that political “discussions” are different from “debates” and therefore propose the use of the former word as a replacement for the latter.

To justify the word change from “debate” to “discussion,” Isotalus and Aarnio say that they are attempting to “develop a theoretical model of the main elements of the televised election discussion in the Finnish culture combining elements of communication, culture, and political situation.” Examining the discourse from a couple of elections, the researchers attempt to identify elements that stay the same and those that change as the political situation changes (p. 63). They then turn to an explanation of the most prevalently used theory for such research, functional theory. Isotalus and Aarnio argue that functional theory depends upon political situations in which the character of the candidate is “crucial” because of its categorization of discourse into the themes of acclaim, attack, or defense. They suggest that Finnish politics rarely contains attacks and thus rarely contains defenses. They contend that if a debate mainly consists of attacks and defenses then the Finnish version should not be called a “debate” but rather a “discussion.” Thus, to them, functional theory seems unsuitable for analysis of Finnish discussions. Further, the researchers contend, debates between only two parties are “rare” in multi-party systems. They claim that on average about ten politicians participate in Finnish televised debates. They suggest that the “number of debaters alone” further defines the event as a discussion rather than a debate. Unless some meaning is lost in translation, this last point is questionable at best. The first entry under the definition of “debate” is “a discussion, as of a public question in an assembly, involving opposing viewpoints.” The assembly does not have a number requirement. So, there needs to be more to support that notion. I believe the researchers
are confused about the traditional kind of formal debate and how debates have evolved in the United States. Although they are still formal in the sense that a certain decorum is expected; they are not as formal as they used to be where perhaps arguments were expected to take exact syllogistic forms. The definition of debate also includes public discussion and can involve contradictory, contrary, or similar opinions. The opinions expressed do not necessarily have to be diametrically opposed in order for there to be a debate (p. 64).

Isolatus and Aarnio also attempt to differentiate Finnish and American political discussion by suggesting that since there are multiple parties sharing power in government, any potential candidate must come into office having no hindrances in place for cooperative relationships among those parties. They refer to this as a “consensus policy.” A similar argument could be made that this is the situation in the American system, although perhaps to a lesser degree. The researchers argue that the consensus policy is why there are so “few” confrontations. They suggest that each candidate wants to appeal to a majority of voters who may be members in any of the parties involved. Thus, they say, the motivation is to create harmony rather than division. Important to note, Isotalus and Aarnio point out that “a close bond exists in Finnish culture between the speaker and the message; there is little distinction between a speaker and his or her opinion. In practice this means that attacking opponent’s opinion in a debate is attacking the opponent as a person” (p. 65). The researchers characterize Finnish disagreement as “less aggressive” and therefore suggest that this means Finnish debates are significantly different. This appears to be a semantic difference however. Labeling speech as “disagreement,” “debate,” or “less aggressive” does not necessitate that opinions are not being attacked, even if to a lesser degree of aggressiveness. Nevertheless, Isotalus and Aarnio posit that a better set of categories with which to describe the Finnish political situation include “agreement” and “disagreement,”
and “discussion” rather than “debate.” Again, these appear to be semantic differences based upon the level of “aggressiveness” with which candidates differ. They suggest that such language, wherein a candidate disagrees “indirectly” avoids “politicization” of issues. Isotalus and Aarnio do admit that such a tact may make it more “difficult” for the voters to recognize the difference between candidates in which case candidates “naturally increases expressions of disagreement.” Rather than use functional theory’s category of “acclaim,” The researchers prefer “agreement” saying that such a designation expresses “harmony” and makes candidates and their parties seem “less extreme.” This too appears to be a semantic disagreement with functional theory, particularly in light of the fact that, as previously noted, candidates and their opinions are so closely linked. If a candidate agrees with say, an incumbent’s opinion of a policy, it could be argued that they are acclaiming the opposition’s decision to implement or leave in place said policy (p. 66).

Isotalus and Aarnio suggest that the ruling party(s) tend to express more agreement with one another than with challenging parties. Also, they argue that “personal relationship” affects the “communication style” of officials. If they are on “good terms” or bad terms with one another, this will be reflected in “how they address one another.” Again, this does not appear, on the face of it, to be a significant difference as compared to the American political situation. Isotalus and Aarnio also emphasize what they call “political memory” which is the ability to remember who did what when in terms of policy. It also involves the ability to find “dispute” where there might not be any considered to be apparent. They suggest that having this ability advantages certain candidates over others. This also appears to not to be significantly different from the American situation although it might be referred to differently such as political savvy (p. 67).
Isotalus and Aarnio also mention that Finnish political “discussions” include “consecutive monologues” designed to promote the speaker’s political positions. These would inherently contain agreements and disagreements and do not appear to be significantly different from opening and closing statements, and much in between, of American candidates (p. 68).

There seems to be no doubt that Finnish politics are different from American politics in many ways but the core question is whether or not they are significantly different enough to justify abandoning functional theory over such cultural concerns. This does not appear to be the case at this point.

In other research, Pekka Isotalus (Isotalus, 2010) argues that functional theory is really only good for analyzing political speech in a two-party system and difficult to use in a multi-party system. As noted, he has devised a replacement for functional theory. He again explains that while there are televised “debates” and they are called “debates” in Finland, they are quite different in terms of interactional form than “traditional debates” or American presidential debates (p. 1). Therefore, Isotalus posits that a “cultural perspective” is required. He notes research that identifies various cultural phenomena concerning political communication such as “Americanization, globalization, mediatization, modernization, professionalization, emotionalization and personalization.” Consequently, he suggests that theories specific to cultural concerns will be most “valid.” Isotalus acknowledges the prevalence of functional theory in the United States and its growing international use but he still argues that such research focuses mainly on two-party systems. In this particular study, Isotalus compares the analytical results of functional theory with that of his own design (p. 3).

Isotalus begins with an explanation of functional theory and five of its six axioms. He leaves out the axiom that claims that candidates need to win a plurality of votes. Isotalus focuses
mostly on the fourth and fifth axioms of functional theory which claim that political discourse consists of acclaims, attacks, and defense; and that these items center around policy and character. He also includes functional theory’s idea that policy entails past deeds, future plans, and general goals. Isotalus also points out that functional theory makes differential predictions about incumbents and challengers. Namely, the former tend to acclaim more whereas the latter tend to attack more. The former defend more. The latter discuss character more … as well as several other of Benoit’s predictions to which Isotalus refers. He notes that results from studies done on presidential debates in the United States are compared to results of studies done in other countries. Further, Isotalus explains that while similarities between results in the United States and other countries were found, there were also cultural differences. (p. 4) Isotalus admits to the success of functional theory in many respects.

Where functional theory lacks, according to Isotalus and Eeva Aarnio (Isotalus & Aarnio, 2005, 2006) is in situations where character is not as important such as in parliamentary debates. Also, they claim that defining a clear winner, which seems to be a necessity for functional theory, is not so clear cut in a parliamentary system. Lastly, they claim that attack and defense are not basic forms of communication in Finnish political campaigns. Isotalus and Aarnio’s model is designed to identify the main elements and their interrelationships in a multiparty system. They contend that the system and the culture that exist in a nation have a “decisive effect on the nature of political discussion” (p. 5). The researchers argue that Finnish debates are really more discussions that debates and therefore attacks and defenses are “extremely rare.” Rather, the Finnish model is based upon agreement and disagreement which can be expressed directly or indirectly and verbally and non-verbally (p. 6). This appears to be no different than the second axiom of Benoit’s model wherein candidates must distinguish themselves from other candidates.
There might be more outward agreement in the Finnish system but without differentiation there is no choice to be made … unless character comes into play which Isotalus assures us, does not. Thus, if the focus is upon only policy, candidates are establishing difference and preferability via agreement and disagreement which could be viewed as a slight modification of axiom four. However, agreement and disagreement could also be seen as versions of acclaim and attack even though the focus might be purely upon policy. Further, a defense might occur in the guise of a secondary statement (rebuttal?) that expresses deeper agreement on a policy and/or provides more information so support one’s original statement. So, in other words, acclaims may take the form of agreement, attacks may take the form of disagreement and defense may be covertly expressed as further-substantiation (p. 6).

Isotalus explains that in a Finnish presidential election, if no one candidate receives more than half the votes, then a second round of votes are cast between the top two vote receivers to determine the winner. He also explains that even though candidates are “more free to comment informally and interrupt one another” and “turn taking is not so structured.” Yet, Isotalus claims, that moderators “take a more prominent role than on American television.” This seems contradictory. If candidates have less structure and more freedom to interrupt, would that not mean that moderators play less of a role? In either case, candidates are going through a process of differentiating themselves from one another despite the form that it might take (p. 8).

Isotalus describes his goals as three: trying to see to what extent these models can be applied to the Finnish context, comparison of results of each theory, and which statements do not seem to fit any category as proposed by either model. The object of focus for analysis was a debate from the second round of the 2006 Finnish presidential campaign. Isotalus explains that this “debate” was chosen because it “contained more disagreements” (p. 9). In analysis using
both functional theory and the Finnish model, “utterances” which could not be classified by
categories used in either theory were put into their own grouping.

Isolatus describes the results of using functional theory as being able to code most of the
utterances heard. However, Isolatus claims that 21% of the utterances could not be categorized
using the main categories of functional theory including some policy subcategories such as past
deeds, future plans, or general goals. Also, some of the predictions that are considered the norm
for functional theory were different in the Finnish context, such as the amount of acclaims,
attacks, and defenses for incumbents and challengers. Predictions concerning how often policy
and character were brought up were also found to be opposite of predictions generally made by
functional theory. There were also some other categorical usage predictions made by functional
theory that were found to be different in the Finnish context (p. 11).

Concerning the claim made by Isolatus that there were utterances made by the candidates
that could not be included in any of the categories as defined by functional theory, he argues that
these were “analyses” of situations in Finnish society or “answers” to a moderator’s questions
which were “not directed toward” the other candidate. As an example, Isolatus provides the text
of an answer by one of the candidates about a question asked by the moderator about the
negative Finnish general attitude toward the European Union. To blend Isolatus’ and functional
theory’s categories, depending upon the general position of the other candidate, this could also
be viewed as an indirect attack or acclaim, depending upon whether or not the other candidate
and their policies shows disagreement or agreement, respectively, with the statement. Isolatus
also categorizes some utterances in this regard as merely “agreements […] ice-breakers [or] short
facts about an issue addressed.” In regards to those utterances categorized as policy but which
Isolatus argues cannot be subdivided as per the dictates of functional theory into the categories of
past deeds, future plans, or general goals; he argues rather, that they merely “address the current
situation.” As an example, Isolatus provides the utterance "the security review is already being
renewed little by little," which he categorizes as a defense without a subcategory designation. It
seems though that if this utterance is truly a defense then it would reflect not only future plans
but perhaps also general goals of the candidate who is making the defense. Another example
provided by Isolatus, he categorizes as an attack without a subcategory designation, "many
pensioners are clearly in difficulties.” Again, depending upon the position of the opposing
candidate and their policies, this attack could very well reflect their lack of effort to address the
issue in terms of policy which might suggest that their past deeds have neglected it, their future
plans do not include addressing it, and that in turn might reflect their general goals. Unless these
utterances have lost meaning in translation, it seems simple enough to be able to categorize them
as functional theory dictates (p. 13).

Isolatus then introduces his model of analysis which he terms the “Finnish” model. This
model purports to use as its categories of analysis, agreement or disagreement, as the case may
be. As an example of agreement, Isolatus provides the following excerpt: "Well, perhaps we
share the opinion about that, you also know as the ex-Minister of Finance, that the president does
not actually decide about the budget or legislation.” To categorize this as simply agreement
seems incomplete. Whether or not the speaker intends it, rhetorically speaking, agreement with a
competing candidate might be seen as an acclaim, particularly when the contextual framework is
inherently political. Similarly, an excerpt provided by Isolatus which he leaves uncategorized has
an interviewer ask a candidate, "How about church? What does religion mean for you?" and the
candidate answers: "Religion more than church. Especially in difficult situations, it does indeed
come to mind." Again, even where there may be no direct intent on the part of the speaker to
acclaim, attack, or defend a statement like this could be taken as such by the audience anyway. The context is political, the aim of the candidate is differentiation, especially on things deemed negative by them and their party. If the competing candidate(s) is not religious then this statement could be seen as an attack. If the competing candidate(s) is also religious then this statement could be seen as an acclaim. If the competing candidate(s) had previously made a generally negative statement about “church” then this could even be interpreted as a defense (p. 14). Isolatus may have a point in terms of predictions about the number of attacks, defenses, or acclaims that can be made using functional theory but this may also be due to the way in which he categorizes the utterances. Further, predictions about how many attacks, acclaims, and defenses are made seem to serve no real purpose other than their enumeration. What seems more fundamental is the substance of the categories and why or what motivates such rhetorical moves. This overall study will contend that the answer lay in values that express more fundamental human needs. Isolatus further reasons that the categories of functional theory need to be defined more “broadly.” Specifically, Isolatus argues, “direct attacks are difficult to find” in Finnish debates. Therefore, functional theory should include indirect attacks. Isolatus may have a point here but it might also be said that functional theory did contain the concept of indirect attacks but perhaps connotatively. In the end, Isolatus claims that functional theory and the Finnish model “complement” each other in the sense that the latter might be used to complete the former. This is certainly a possibility in terms of more descriptive language that might be incorporated in analysis. In his discussion of findings, Isolatus defines disagreement and attack as “[oppose] or resist another candidate” but in following functional theory the goal may simply be differentiation. The fact that one is running a political race suggests that any other candidate is
automatically in opposition and will resist them and policies of theirs with which they disagree (p. 17).

As part of Isolatus’ research (Isolatus, 2011), he has conducted further studies utilizing functional theory on Finnish debates. As with the previous study reviewed, Isolatus goal is to use functional theory to analyze a Finnish debate and then qualitatively critique it in terms of its cross-cultural ability to fulfill its claims. Isolatus repeats his claims that functional theory is only suited to a two-party system in which character is a top concern. In applying functional theory to a Finnish debate, Isolatus hopes to show that the theory does not fully encompass or describe what is really going on. Then he hopes to suggest modifications to the theory in order to make it more complete in terms of its application as far as Finnish cultural contexts are concerned (p. 34-35).

Isolatus then attempts to describe a Finnish Presidential debate. A Finnish President, according to their constitution, may be elected for no more than two consecutive, six-year terms. They are elected by a “direct” (pure majority) vote in two rounds if necessary. Isolatus then repeats his claims made in the last study reviewed that attacks and defenses are rare in Finnish debates. He also repeats that the word “debate” is not as accurate as the word “discussion” in describing what happens in these political exchanges. Since the object matter of this study is similar to that of the last study by this same scholar, the results are similar enough not to go into detail here. The same critiques emerge as to the applicability of functional theory as a “good” place to start but that modifications must be made in order to compensate for cultural nuances for which the theory is unable to account (p. 41). However, the claim by Isolatus that Finnish discourse contains too many “neutral” utterances for functional theory to be productive was
already called into question in the review of the last piece.\(^2\) Further, as has been noted, non-American scholars have used functional theory to their own satisfaction in such places as Korea, Ukraine, Taiwan, Canada, Australia, Poland, and the prime ministerial debates in Israel. This suggests that the cultural concerns raised by Isolatus et al may not be shared widely by other scholars. Nevertheless, perhaps concerns about cultural characteristics can be allayed by something more fundamental than the categories used thus far.

**Functional Theory Modified by Value**

The studies examined in this review should provide a working frame from which to introduce the method that this overall study will utilize to scrutinize the connection between values and claims as they are found in the language of the Deal. What follows is a more in-depth treatment of functional theory as a method honed for this particular purpose.

Benoit stated earlier, “[f]unctional Theory can help understand the messages from viable candidates for office” (Benoit 2006, p. 11). If such messages are political in nature in that they pertain to how human beings should interact with one another whether it be via common, everyday interaction or via an institution like government then perhaps functional theory can help decipher language being used in the Deal since it is fundamentally about how humans should interact albeit cross-culturally in many instances. As previously noted Benoit refers to six

\(^2\) For a different study that works from Benoit, and Isotalus and Aarnio’s categories see:

axioms inherent to functional theory. These axioms as they stand will have to be modified in order to focus more properly on the Deal rather than specifically voting or political candidates.

The first axiom that voting is a comparative act does not need much modification but rather a refocusing. Although there is no real public vote per se about the Deal, deciding between the perspectives involved about the Deal still involves a “comparative judgement.” Benoit posits that “no candidate is perfect” therefore they will have good and bad points. Perfection here lacks specific definition but perhaps it refers to qualifications for the office for which one is running. One wants to pick the best candidate for the job. But best and perfect are interchangeable in this regard and probably refer to the candidate who will look out for my, as a voter, best interests, ultimately. This would explain why when candidates speak of themselves they tend to positively emphasize traits or characteristics that they associate with being pertinent to the office for which they are running. Similarly, perhaps no decision about the Deal can be perfect or the best for any one group involved. Functional theory, in regards to this first axiom, should help to uncover motivations behind language of the Deal that is self-aggrandizing in an attempt to build credibility with stakeholders such as the general public who influence lawmakers and the lawmakers themselves.

Benoit argues that the second axiom is entailed by the first in that candidates must differentiate themselves from one another. Since decision making is a comparative judgment, one must come to know how the various significant decisions and their potential outcomes differ from one another and ultimately how they might affect one as a stakeholder. Thus, differences must be deemed significant or they will be ignored. Demonization is often times an attempt to make something significant that would otherwise not be considered so. If language about the Deal demonizes one side over the other, functional theory can help shine light on motivations
behind such rhetorical moves. Perhaps the reciprocal of demonization is omission. If advocates seem to consistently omit or side-step issues, that could be an indication of their importance in a negative sense as well.

The third axiom, that “Political Campaign Messages are Important Vehicles for Distinguishing between Candidates” is also in need of refocusing. Like political campaign messages, language about the Deal can and has been delivered via multiple media formats. It is also still equally applicable that news organizations enact a gate-keeping function in terms of deciding what information and when to pass that information along to stakeholders in an attempt to shape opinion and thus policy about the Deal. News media personalities and editorialists also have the opportunity to comment and evaluate any messages or messengers of the Deal to which they have access. So, in that sense language about the Deal should include the language of news media personalities and editorialists. News media personalities can shape the information that is disseminated merely by the questions that they ask and the way that they ask them. Another way to think of this is that they can decide what information is circulated by choosing the framework of issues that that they will allow to be discussed for the public to see. Therefore, their language is pertinent.

The fourth axiom spotlights the next logical move for a candidate after they have differentiated themselves from their opponents. The first axiom recognizes that there is a decision to be made. The second axiom justifies that decision by attempting to differentiate the choices. The third axiom recognizes the medium for connecting with stakeholders, namely, political messages. The fourth axiom examines the attempt to establish preferability among choices through acclaiming oneself, attacking the other choices, and defending against attacks from those who disagree with one’s choice. Acclaiming was referred to previously as “self-
aggrandizing” but the latter may be too strong of a word choice. One need not exaggerate one’s good points in order to be misleading. One need only to emphasize good points to the exclusion of bad points. In other words, deception by omission can be employed. As part of that type of emphasis and omission, defense can include a downplaying of potential issues or faults that might be attached to the candidate or policy. Such an approach, according to Benoit, is an effort to make oneself or the policy for which one is advocating seem preferable. Direct defense, wherein one attempts to refute an attack, whether it be an attack on character or policy, if “timely” and “suitable,” can be effective to prevent further damage from the attack and they can also have a restorative effect on character and/or policy. However, lacking timeliness and suitability, defenses can make the speaker seem reactive or volatile in a way that might lend credence to the attack. Defenses against character attacks can also distract attention away from issues upon which speakers would rather focus or that actually matter. Attacks, on the other hand, are an attempt to make the other choices less preferable by emphasizing or over-emphasizing weaknesses or disadvantages. Important to note is Benoit’s inclusion of research that shows that attacks on policy tend to be considered more preferable to attacks on character. Thus, in the case of the Deal, functional theory might help to clarify language that has been clouded by character attacks by differentiating them from actual policy attacks. This is not to say that character attacks are never to be considered. Character attacks can have import when their veracity actually does affect the credibility of those advocating one policy or candidate over another. As previously shown, Benoit says as much when referring to research that shows that for a substantial number of stakeholders, character is the most important factor in their comparative judgments. This might become especially important when considering the complexity of issues such as the Deal. Many stakeholders may not have the time, ability, or
wherewithal to delve into the official documentation available for review that contains the details of a policy or law. Since stakeholders cannot themselves become experts in the complexities that may be involved in such decisions they must fall back on trusting those who are recognized experts or who have been elected to positions where such expertise is expected of their office. Then credibility is paramount. Also important to consider is that character attacks can “backfire” on the one who makes them. So, in differentiating character attacks from policy attacks, functional theory can help to distinguish between those attacks that simply demonize or over-exaggerate opponents and those that might actually make a valid point in terms of credibility.

Attacks can have different targets, as otherwise noted in functional theory. Aside from direct policy attacks, character attacks can be directed towards advocates or detractors themselves or to their group affiliation or even more indirectly to an advocate’s representative which in turn chips away at the character of the advocate themselves.

The fifth axiom points out that policy and character are the messages of significance in terms of policy, their advocates, and their opponents. Benoit points to research that shows that these are the items that matter most to stakeholders in how comparative judgment is made. Character, as it pertains to credibility, includes experience and reliability as well as compassion. Policy for Benoit’s purposes is connected to past accomplishments, education, jobs, national defense, and crime. But for our purposes policy simply refers to the Deal or those things which can be linked to the Deal in a substantial or meaningful way. Further, as displayed previously, Benoit mentions research that shows that candidates who were most likely to win were those who spoke mostly of issues rather than character. If that is any indication as to swaying power of advocates of policy then functional theory when applied to language of the Deal may help direct
stakeholders in terms of an appropriate filter in order to get at the heart of the matter rather than focus on what might be extraneous.

The sixth and last axiom points to the fact that advocates need to win over a majority of stakeholders in order to see their candidate or policy move forward. This means that not every stakeholder needs to be persuaded. Thus, not all stakeholders who are affected by policies are significant but only those who actually have power in terms of ratifying a decision. For Benoit, such advocates would be voters directly but in the case of the Deal they would be lawmakers and indirectly voters (those who can put them in office or remove them). Benoit notes in his research that although parliamentary systems are different than the American system of government in this regard, the axioms of functional theory tend to be “repeated” in such systems. That suggests that using functional theory to analyze the language of the Deal is not dependent upon advocate nationality or governmental system in order to be efficacious. Benoit’s research has been implemented upon non-presidential campaigns, campaign messages in other countries and across multiple media types. This makes functional theory ideal for use on the language of the Deal which will involve multiple media types, and political messages from multiple nationalities.

In regards to policy, functional theory further subdivides it into past deeds, future plans, and general goals. For the purpose of analyzing language of the Deal these categories can be useful in terms of contextual considerations about the relationship between the negotiating parties. Shaping current and future policies should take into consideration effects of previous pertinent policies, potential future policies, and the overall goals that such policies are or should be aimed at achieving.

Character or credibility considerations in terms of advocates, Benoit divides into personal qualities, leadership qualities, and ideals. For our purposes, character will focus upon public
credibility or credibility in terms of one’s office. Public credibility will entail expertise and reliability; the latter of which includes honesty or trustworthiness in relation to past deeds, future plans, and general goals. One will note then that policy and character have as their object of investigation the same items. Policy can be measured in terms of laws that have been advocated by and or passed by a supporter but they can also be evaluated in terms of language used by a supporter or detractor in situations where law has yet to be decided. Character however, is more difficult to measure since it pertains to how an advocate thinks. Thus, the actions of an advocate may be the best way, indeed the only way, to measure a person’s character. Since political policies pertain to how people will end up treating one another (or the environment), those policies for which an advocate has campaigned are the best indicator of character. For our purposes, we will set aside any actions that may indicate personal character (such as misdemeanors) that cannot be directly connected to the public language of a policy (such as perhaps federal offences). The goal here is to avoid personal infractions (such as traffic tickets) that may not have any bearing on the Deal itself.

The predictions that Benoit suggests that functional theory can make are still applicable. Benoit posits that since acclaims have no drawbacks, attacks have potentially one, and defense has potentially three; acclaims will be used more often than attacks or defense and the latter least of all. Benoit provides data to support that these predictions hold true for campaign messages of various types including non-presidential and foreign political messages. So, these predictions should hold true for messages about the Deal as well. As noted earlier, research shows that most stakeholders tend to prefer messages about policy rather than character but when polling results show someone to be in the lead, they tend to be recipients of character attacks more than opponents. So, Benoit also predicts that advocates will discuss policy more than character and by
implication he predicts that advocates whose ideas tend to be the most favored by stakeholders will receive more attacks on character.

The study by Jayne Henson and William Benoit that was just reviewed attempted to use functional theory to “understand the use of evidence (statements for which sources are provided) in [. . .] campaign messages.” The study found that citing sources in these types of messages was a rarity until about 1990. Among other possibilities, this could have been an attempt to simplify messages designed for the general public or such citations could have been deemed unnecessary from someone already holding a position of trust as perceived by the public. In other words, in regards to the latter, perhaps the general public was perceived as not needing citations in order to believe what a politician was saying. Regardless, political figures do tend to cite their sources of information more frequently now and the language of the Deal does contain such information. Functional theory can help in this regard as well. Henson and Benoit found that while most of the appeals made were acclaims, the bulk of the citations were used to support attacks. Attackers tended to use newspaper reports followed by governmental studies, and statements from opponents and their voting records. Functional theory may help one to find corollaries in the area as well as far as the language of the Deal is concerned. These types of attacks were used against policies as well as character in Henson and Benoit’s findings. The use of citations was found to “increase the credibility” of the speaker and thus the persuasiveness of the message. This is perhaps due to the general shift in public attitude towards politicians wherein there is a general distrust of politicians rather than a latent trust. With general access to studies via the internet and the ability for the public to double-check what political figures are arguing, the mention of “studies,” “research” or “science” tends to quell such reservations whether or not anyone will bother to verify information. In many cases, it seems like public figures rely on the public not to
verify but to be satiated with the mention of such *power* words. Henson and Benoit cite research that shows that there is a debate concerning just what constitutes “evidence” in this regard and note that “significant” differences are demonstrated depending upon which definition is used. Although the scope of this overall study does not allow for an in-depth treatment of all of the evidence that may be in play with the language of the Deal, the type of evidence used and why it is used will be considered. In some cases, language of the Deal may include personal testimony from public figures who have been deeply involved with the contextual considerations involving the Deal. They may include lawmakers who are directly involved with policy formation and its language as well as those who have been on location, so to speak, and dealt with the parties involved or those involved in terms of the negotiating process. As noted earlier, Henson and Benoit concluded that testimonial evidence can have a “significant” effect on public attitude.

Unlike Henson and Benoit’s research, this will not be a quantitative study. However, functional theory can be helpful in relation to determining the underlying values that motivate the language in use about the Deal. Henson and Benoit’s goals included differentiating between acclaims, attacks and defenses. These were further divided into topics wherein the focus was on policy or character. Whether concerning policy or character, this overall study about the language of the Deal contends that the objects of these acclaims, attacks, and defenses are the same: past actions, future plans, and general goals. The reason why, this study also posits, is that underlying all these linguistic items are values to which each speaker is appealing in terms of ethical considerations. Ethical considerations include how people think they should be treated.

Nevertheless, the reasoning behind challenges to functional theory, in that some think it does not capture the essence or all the essential characteristics of the objects in question, may be more fundamental. The next section will introduce the nature of rhetorical claims and their
potential relationship with values as perhaps a more fundamental approach than functional theory by itself or additions made by its challengers.

**Rhetorical Claims and Values**

The term *values* has gotten what could be called a lot of political attention in the last few decades. The phrase *family values* was frequently used during the Bush/Quayle years. A differentiation was made between values and *facts* in an attempt to differentiate candidates running for office. In the United States, Republicans attempted to claim the title of *protector* of family values but the Democrats claimed that their own definition of family values was simply different and more inclusive than that of the Republicans. As usual, both charged each other with hypocrisy. Setting that aside, the relationship between facts and values is at hand. Some consider the two ideas to be mutually exclusive in that facts are objective and values are subjective and never shall they meet. Immanuel Kant, in his work *The Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysics of Morals*, ((I. Kant, & Abbott, T. K., 1949)(p. 4)) basically argues that it is not sense experience (science) which *tells* human beings to be certain about something or to call it a fact. Rather, certainty is a product of the mind which gathers the *data* of sense experience and then makes a judgment. This might explain why human beings are so often deceived by their own senses. “Seeing is believing” as the saying goes but perhaps not. The goal here is not to expound upon or represent the entirety of the history of science or its philosophy but there is much debate among philosophers and scientists about the epistemology of science and how human beings come to know or believe anything. Thomas Kuhn, in his seminal work, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, (Kuhn, 1962) attempts to address a contentious issue seen in science wherein long held scientific beliefs, facts, are overturned by new data and therefore require new judgments which may even contradict previously held facts. Kuhn points out in his
work on paradigms and paradigm shifts, even argument in the hard sciences can leave one with a grossly false confidence about knowledge of a situation. For the most part, human beings have come to some sort of conclusion that only the five senses are reliable and that anything that is not repeatable or that cannot be tested using the five senses is beyond the scope of reliable knowledge. Yet we see, through Kuhn and others, that even if an event is repeatable and can be tested using the five senses the results are not always as definite as some might like them to be. So again, we fall back on argumentation and the use of “less reliable” means of understanding such as language and the internal interpretation of data based upon background knowledge, pattern recognition, inference, and analogy. In a practical sense, it seems to be true that scientific methods relying on the five senses have moved human beings forward in terms of comfort, safety, ease and speed of communication, and other such things. But the potential for interpretive problems seems still ever-present, hovering like a black cloud, making epistemologists wonder when we will discover that we were wrong about this or that major thing and now we must revise our fundamental beliefs once again.

The complexities involved with communicative or any other situations for that matter might not lend themselves easily to categorization. The endeavors up to this point to try to theorize about a communicative situation are still being debated. But it would seem, in order to more fully explain or theorize about such a situation, one must first determine the factors that might limit the investigation. The unique downfall of this particular endeavor is that if such a barrier or chasm exists then the investigator is in the middle of it. Analogously, it might be akin to asking if one can operate bias-free having made themselves fully aware of their own biases. Or it might be the case that one can only make themselves aware of one’s cage but one can never operate outside its confines. If the latter is true then human beings might never be able to
experience the world as it is in itself and thus cannot communicate such an experience to another. If the former is true then perhaps one might view it as a paradigmatic shift of sorts even if only temporary. Returning to Kuhn, we do see paradigmatic shifts and conversions happen all the time even if only on a small scale. This might suggest that it is possible to at least temporarily shift theoretical paradigms but the type of paradigm that we are investigating here might not be merely theoretical but rather ontological. If the paradigm is ontological then attempting to come at it from the outside, so to speak, may be akin to trying to understand the laws of physics from outside the laws of physics, which seems impossible. Perhaps this is how scientific and social progress is made, via imagination, which attempts to go beyond its own known limitations into the unknown. One then tries to provide evidence by arguing for such a conclusion and interpreting any data one may be able to provide to support one’s position albeit analogously (Kuhn, 1962). Some argue that values and facts (science) do intersect and influence one another. One school of thought suggests that values guide science in both individual and cultural aspects in terms of what is chosen for research, how research is conducted, and which theories reach consensus. Some also contend that values are a product of science and can influence multiple cultures in that form (Allchin, 1988). Perhaps the way in which human beings use language complicates the separate categories of judgment and description. John Pocock (Pocock, 1971) argues that when it comes to political speech “factual and evaluative statements [judgment] are inextricably combined” (p. 17). Richard Lanham (Lanham, 1993) takes this thought a step further when he posits that all “language is intrinsically value-laden [. . .] every ‘fact’ comes with values attached” (p. 171). Chaim Perelman and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1969) add that “[v]alues enter into every argument [. . .] In the fields of law, politics, and philosophy, values intervene as a basis for argument at all stages of
the developments” (p. 75). Malcolm Sillars and Patricia Ganer (Sillars & Ganer, 1982) contend that “in argumentation, values are strategically significant,” (p. 191) and “[a]ny argument involves reasoning, and any reasoning can be driven back to a value orientation.” Borrowing Stephen Toulmin’s (Toulmin, 1958) term, they posit that values often function as “warrants” or “backing” for a warrant (p. 195). Warrants, as defined by Toulmin, are justifications for moving from data to a claim. Although in common speech, values are often differentiated from motives, Wayne Brockriede and Douglas Ehninger (Brockriede & Ehninger, 1960) define motives as “some inner drive, value, desire, emotion or aspiration” that can serve as warrants in argument (p. 51). Ray Anderson and David Mortensen (R. L. Anderson & Mortensen, 1967) point out that warrants are often enthymememic in that they are not explicitly stated but rather assumed (p. 147). Thus, language in its context must be analyzed in order to tease out the values behind claims. Michael Leff (Leff, 1983) argues that Aristotle’s topics of invention are actually “propositions that express […] generally accepted beliefs and values” (p.26) and thus produce argumentative inferences (warrants), (p. 220). Using Aristotelian categories, all human beings seem to hold values and thus beliefs which they deem to be good in one way or another either for themselves or for others. A good can be a natural good such as the best tool for a task or a moral good such as preventing murder.

Therefore, value theory may help to shed light on the project at hand. Rowland and Womack note that while rhetoric as a tool is amoral its product, they suggest, is either moral or immoral (Rowland & Womack, 1985). But this appears only partially correct. Returning to Aristotelian terms, when rhetoric pertains to moral values or a moral value-laden situation then rhetoric’s morally dualistic nature is apparent, such as when politicians debate the ethical nature of an immigration policy. This overall study will argue that while not all rhetoric occurs in
moral value-laden situations, all rhetoric occurs in value-laden situations. Some rhetoric occurs only as a matter of techne or craftsmanship and is absent ethical concerns such as when carpenters are debating about the best way to go about a project. Both types of situations involve value-persuasion but only one is concerned with moral values.

The idea here is based upon the idea that all human beings deserve equal treatment because they share some sort of nature that makes them human. The fact that one can categorize something as essentially human dictates that all things in that category share something essential that makes them human. Otherwise they are not all equal in that sense. No matter the term used, human, people, persons, et cetera, the implication is that there is some essential thing(s) that puts them all in the same category. This leads to the idea that all forms of racism and discrimination based on accidental qualities such as sex, skin color, nationality, socio-economic status, and the like, are wrong . . . because they are inaccurate. In other words, any discrimination based upon accidental rather than essential qualities are not a real challenge to membership in the category of human being. There is much debate as to what these essential qualities are exactly. Some call them human universals that constitute a human nature such as Donald Brown (D. Brown, 1991) and Steven Pinker (Pinker, 2002) respectively. This seems to be a difficult task because it involves defining what a human being is. Human beings obviously differ in many ways in terms of accidentals but if such beings all belong in the same human category then they do not differ in ways that are essential to being human. The problem is defining those essential items. Part of the goals of this paper is to add to this argument in trying to determine essential values which reflect how human beings should be treated. If claims cannot help but express values then they are expressed in the language of the Deal. If language expresses human values inherently then perhaps drawing out those values for analyzation is a better way of bridging various human
needs and conflicts and in turn adding to the definition of humanity. The axioms of Functional theory can help to classify the types of claims that are being made concerning the values expressed in the exchange. Using values to further clarify functional claims in the language of the Deal might also serve to quell concerns made by critics of functional theory that it does not meet certain cultural needs. If values are inherent in language claims then this suggests that they might be ontological in the sense that they reflect a normative standard in terms of how human beings should be treated. Then values are a more fundamental approach than the axioms of functional theory or any cultural description that does not include essential human values.

History

Maysam Behravesh (Behravesh, 2011) attempts to give a constructivist explanation of the current relationship between the west and post-revolutionary Iran. His analysis involves not only historical factors but cultural, ideological, identity, and geo-strategic factors as well. More specifically his study examines issues of human rights, Iran’s nuclear program, Iranian-Israeli hostility, and wars in Iraq and Afghanistan led by the United States. All of these points of focus are pertinent to the current study in terms of their contribution to today’s setting. In the end Behravesh concludes that in order to reconcile tensions in the relationship between Iran and the United States, no less than a complete “structural overhaul” of each country’s respective ideologies and political practices is in order.

Behravesh’s study begins with an Iranian slogan commonly recited in the 1990’s where a leader, typically a teacher or supervisor of some sort, would begin by saying “[w]ho is tired?,’” and the students or workers would answer back “[t]he enemy!” The author suggests that this slogan perpetuates the thought that the enemy is tired because they are constantly working to undermine the Islamic system. The reciters of the slogan make themselves aware of this idea
and try to remember that they need only to stay awake longer and work harder than the enemy to survive and thrive. Behravesh suggests that this seems to be a constant theme present in top-down Iranian political discourse. And that most often the object of Iranian political derision is the United States and to a lesser degree the United Kingdom. These countries are infamously referred to as the “Great” and “Little Satan” respectively. Using John Tures’ diversionary theory of conflict (Tures, 2009), Behravesh suggests that Iranian President Ahmadinejad has been blaming the Great and Little Satans for Iranian problems, internal and external. Referencing a “hidden hand of global arrogance” in order to “surmount domestic failures by recourse to “foreign distractions’” (p. 328). Behravesh goes on to say that it is a “well-grounded argument” that by making reference to a pervasive enemy, ruling elites relegate detractors and augment their own standing by means of mobilizing the public concerning their ideological bent (p. 328). As the author says, this might seem reminiscent of the cold-war relations between the United States and the USSR but, following William Beeman (Beeman, 2005), the author denotes several important distinctions as they pertain to the West-Iranian tensions: threats are of “little or no substance;” neither side is any “immediate” danger to the other; demonization occurs not at the popular level but at an “abstract government level.” However, in both scenarios each side attempts to portray the other as an idealized picture of “enemy” (p. 329).

Behravesh then makes a foray into constructivist theory through which he will perform his analysis. Briefly, constructivism acknowledges the social nature of the framework of reality in which we live. According to Emanuel Adler (Adler, 2005) writing about constructionism, concepts of reality are shaped by a dynamic relationship between normative and epistemic interpretations of the material world (p. 90). The first scholar to use constructivism in international relations was Nicholas Greenwood Onuf in 1989 (Onuf, 1989). Important concepts
in applying this theory to international relations include “discourses,” “norms,” “identity,” and “socialization” (p. 329, also see: (Checkel, 2008)). Constructivism is between a purely interpretivist view of reality and a realist view, the latter of which assumes that rational choices made by actors pursuing interests to “maximize benefits and minimize losses” are determinants of reality. Constructivism argues that edifices of human relationships are “primarily cultural rather than material phenomena,” in terms of identity formation (Wendt, 1999). That reality is not merely a matter of “distribution of material capabilities” but also “shared knowledge, material resources, and practices.” Which is why constructivists emphasize “sociological rather than micro-economic” structures (Wendt, 1998). Although there are various types of constructionism, Behravesh confesses to mainly rely upon a form which allows for “materialist and individualist perspectives and endorses a scientific approach to social inquiry” to investigate “Iranian Westophobia” and “Western Iranophobia” (p. 331). Returning to William Beeman (Beeman, 2005), Behravesh refers to the “U.S. Foreign Policy Myth, which is an extremely powerful and pervasive American belief system about the nature of foreign policy.” This policy is said to be centered on the following five principles: centrality of nation-states in global affairs; dichotomous power struggles in world politics; importance of economic and military power in international relations; governance by small groups of elite individuals; and “normalcy” in the congruency of the preceding tenets (Beeman, p. 13-17). Any deviancy from the preceding tenets causes western leaders to pursue a balancing of the missing pieces by any means necessary including derogatory explanations of the objective country(s) and their leaders responsible for the abnormality, and military action (Beeman, p. 17). According to Mehran Kamrava (Kamrava, 2007), Middle-eastern countries tend not to fit into such a western model. There can be substantial splits within Iran wherein some support the government and others oppose it. These
rifts can extend into the ruling elite concerning foreign policy and thus appear as indecision to the west (Kamrava, p. 84). As an example, Behravesh references comments made at a meeting of United Kingdom Defense Secretaries in March 2010. One of the secretaries, Liam Fox stated that although they believed that adequate information about Iran’s military activities were available, they “didn’t really know who to talk to” in terms of official Iranian military activity representation, (House, 2010). This suggests that leadership in Iran is either more secretive than initially thought or non-existent.

Behravesh argues that the weightiest points of contact in terms of Iranian and Western relationship include British interference beginning in the 18th century through the mid-20th century and after. He believes this history has left a “deeply bitter feeling in the Iranian psyche” (p. 332). More specifically he refers to the US and UK “conspiracies” against nationalist and independence-seeking leadership resulting in coups to which are still referred by Iranian leadership as “proof” that the western powers are not really interested in similar freedoms for the people but only security for their own material interests. These include establishment of or the rebellion against a number of political leaders including Saddam Hussein in Iraq. Also, the West’s support of the establishment of and legitimization of the nation of Israel in the early part of the 20th century on what is considered to be Islamic territory which continues to fuel resentment toward the west. Paraphrasing Farhang Rajaee, (Rajaee, 2007) middle-eastern demonization of the west was comprised of mainly three parts: “artication of the other” in the form of demonizing the non-Islamic West; romanticization of the past by ideologizing the religion of Islam and heroicizing Islamic figures; discursive theorization of a counter-west “imagined community” through distinguishing between modernization and Westernization” (p. 333 (Rajaee, p.110)). According to Behravesh, these ideas were the basis from which Ayatollah
Khomeini and other middle-eastern leaders were able to promote the non-Islamic West as the chief enemy, Western practices and institutions as anti-Islamic as well as a dichotomous vision of oppressed/oppressor, haves/have-nots, and exploiters/victims (See also: (Abrahamian, 1993; Saikal, 2009)). Behravesh goes on to argue that the Islamic revolution of 1979 forged an approach to foreign policy that can best be described as “against the grain” as captured in the revolutionary slogans “[i]ndependence, [f]reedom, the Islamic Republic” and “[n]either East, nor West, but the Islamic Republic” which were later enshrined in the Iranian constitution. Following Ramazani (Ramazani, 2008), Behravesh suggests that such roots can be traced back to when Cyrus founded the “Iranian State” in 558-530 BC. This includes the language of the aforementioned constitution which suggests that the writers saw Islam as a “third way” and “straight[er]” alternative to capitalism and communism, both of which were rejected by the Iranian framers (See also: (B. Izadi, 2001; Khomeini, 2006)).

Behravesh argues that critical to expanding this ideology internationally is the Islamic concept of “invitation” (or Da’wah). This is the notion that all humanity is called to convert to Islam and “accept its righteousness.” Included in this invitation is “enjoining the good and admonishing against evil” where the parallel is posited that the former is the way of Islam and the latter is the Western way led by the United States. Central to Islamic foreign policy is the “export[ing] of [this] revolution” to change the historical structures of the predominantly Western international system (p. 334, see also: (Larijani, 1990; Rajaee, 1990; Ramazani, 1990)). Various interpretations of this movement can be seen. Whereas one could view the exportation of this revolution as an attempt to bring attention to the “spiritual side of life,” introduce “authentic” Islam to the world, and propagate Islamic norms and values. One could also view it as an attempt to export terrorism in order to destabilize regional and international order and
establish Islamic fundamentalism. Indeed, the campaign to export the revolution has been condemned by the West as well as the Iran’s foray into nuclear activities. The latter of which has been condemned by some regional Arab states as an attempt to seek “regional hegemony.”

So, what on one hand is considered a “religious duty” by Shiite Muslims, the spreading of their belief system, is considered fundamentalism and support of terrorism by others. Iran’s relationship with *Hizbullah* and Hamas have only fanned those flames. Behravesh calls these “mostly ill-grounded conspiracy theories produced by the Iranian political establishment” which produce what Behravesh calls “Westophobia” (p. 334). He goes on to suggest that Iran’s relationship with Britain is more complex than its relationship with the United States and therefore deserves special attention.

Behravesh continues by referring to a common saying in Iran that “wherever there is a trace of politics, there is a trace of the British.” Where “politics” connotes dishonesty. He argues that Iranian culture is “rife” with such xenophobic belief that the British are “duplicit” and “opportunistic.” The word “Inglis” which refers to England, connotes “political trickery, unreliability, unpredictability, and deception” in Iranian popular culture. This word is used in official capacity rather than “Britania” which refers to the British Empire, Behravesh says, in order to perpetuate the previously mentioned connotation. Using Fakhreddin Azimi for support, (Azimi, 2008) Behravesh posits that Iranian officials view any and all British policies from a “threat-based” perspective. He contends that a result of this perspective is the production of conspiracy theories about British involvement in any and all Iranian affairs and is exemplified by the Iranian book and television series *My Uncle Napoleon*. This series has as its storyline the idea that the British are involved in all things dastardly that occur. Behravesh even contends that there are a significant number of people in the general Iranian public who believe that the Islamic
Revolution itself was “masterminded by the Inglis” and that the ayatollahs are of British origin. Therefore, anything that goes on in government is just a concerted effort to rob the Iranian people of their country’s resources. Behravesh suggests that “Westophobia,” generated “anglophobia,” which in turn has produced a general “xenophobia” in Iran. Supported by Ahmad Naghibzadeh (Naghibzadeh, 2002), he also argues that at their core these phobias maintain a good versus evil mentality towards the object(s) of their fear (p. 335).

Thus, in terms of identity construction, whereas the United States and Great Britain represent “evil, Satan, unreliability, craftiness, suppression, and terror” those involving themselves in the revolution become “divine, reliable, honest, emancipatory, and reassuring” (p. 336).

Behravesh points out that many US and UK based, “liberal-democratic” human rights groups have condemned Iran for its application of the death penalty (including mass executions), imprisonment of oppositionists, use of torture, treatment of prisoners in general, repression of ethnic and religious minorities, and discrimination against women (See: (Abrahamian, 1999; Afshari, 2001; Amnesty International 1990 Report, 1990; Amnesty International 2001 Report, 2001; Amnesty International 2009 Report, 2009)). There is however a discrepancy between when these allegations were made and Iran’s protesting of the Declaration that condemns their actions. In 1948 when the so-called “Universal Declaration of Human Rights” was established, Iran protested its liberal-secular underpinnings as incompatible with Islamic teachings and thus “not universally applicable.” These protests were officially made at the United Nations General Assembly wherein Iran argued that the Declaration represented a “secular understanding of the Judeo-Christian tradition, could not be implemented by Muslims, and not [in] accord with the system of values recognized by the Islamic Republic of Iran ("UN Commission on Human
Rights," 2003). The Iranian foreign minister in 1998 argued that the Declaration should be revised to incorporate non-Western cultural values and moral norms, particularly those of Islam (R. Brown, 2006). The Declaration has been further criticized for focusing only on material needs and ignoring spiritual ones. According to Behravesh’s interpretation of Bhikhu Parekh, to be consistent, since the Declaration is based upon liberal principles, what constitutes humiliation or cruelty should vary from culture to culture (Parekh 2000). These later arguments, of course, rely on the common secular denial of human nature which in turn justifies varying approaches to human treatment whereas if there were a common nature attributable to all human beings then a stronger, non-culturally based argument could be made for universal equal treatment of all human beings. As it is the Iranian charge against the Declaration is that it claims multiculturalism but is inconsistently based upon only one interpretation of how human beings should be treated. Giving Iran further cause to protest is the apparent situation of Palestinians in the Gaza strip and West Bank which they believe is a result of the West-backed Israeli policies. Add to that the civilian casualties in Afghanistan and Iraq and the tendency for the West to look the other way when their allies violate the Declaration (p. 337). In the end, Behravesh argues that despite criticisms of the Declaration from Iran it would be difficult to hold the position that Iran would not be in violation of it were they to consider adopting it (p. 338).

Concerning Iran’s nuclear program, Behravesh begins by stating that it has become the “greatest Middle-East security concern” of the Western powers. Citing the International Atomic Energy Agency’s 2010 positive report about “consistent and credible” evidence that Iran has the capability to create a nuclear weapon. Top world officials, including Iran’s previously known ally Russia, passed more sanctions against Iran ("Implementation of the NPT safeguards agreement and relevant provisions of Security Council resolutions 1737 (2006), 1747 (2007),
In response, Behravesh points out, Iranian leaders have consistently stated that weapons of mass destruction are against Shiite ideology (see: "Speeches to the staff involved in building Jamaran naval destroyer," 2010). Further, the author refers to the National Council of Resistance of Iran which is an oppositional group to the Iranian regime based in Europe and has been exiled from Iran. He says that this group contends that Iran has been working on developing a nuclear weapon since around 1985 during the Iran-Iraq war (see: (Delpech, 2007; Jafarzadeh, 2007)). The author cites the secrecy of the program as enough to arouse suspicion of the West but even more important than the activity itself, from the Western perspective, is the ideology behind the activity. Behravesh notes that Iran is considered a “rogue state” and part of an “axis of evil” and that Ahmadinejad’s unpredictable stances and (non)diplomatic language [...] have even alarmed Russia,” and led them to support the latest round of sanctions. Aside from the possibility of destabilization of the area in terms of arms and deterrents there is also the argument that terrorist groups may have a better chance at getting nuclear weapons should Iran be allowed to do so. In terms of the Western ally Israel, the author refers to statements made by the Ayatollah Khomeini that “Israel must vanish” and “soon this stain of disgrace will be cleaned from the garment of the world of Islam” (E. D. Richter & Barnea, 2009). In other words, if there is a possibility that Iran may choose to strike Israel they may do so directly or through one of the groups they support such as Hizbullah or Hamas. Of course, Iran claims the same fear of Israel but Israel has not made the same kind of statements about Iran’s existence (p. 339). Further, the Iranian politician Ayatollah Rafsanjani is quoted as saying that if it should come to it, a nuclear exchange with Israel has the possibility of “annihilating” the Israelis but would only “damage” the Islamic world (Naji, 2008). These claims can be rationalized by considering that in their context they
were proposed for “domestic consumption” and that they therefore may not reflect official policy or action but as Behravesh states, they certainly promote Irano-phobia (p.340). Behravesh continues that since its establishment in 1979, Iran has refused to recognize Israel as a legitimate state and continues to call for its “termination” and the liberation of Palestine. The author points out that the Iranian passport states that the “holder of this passport is not entitled to travel to occupied Palestine” and that Iran directly trained the original guerrilla unit(s) that later became known as Hizbullah. Iran at first supported but then rejected the so-called two-state solution proposed by the West. (p. 341) Ahmadinejad has gone so far as to deny or at least question the authenticity of the event known as the Holocaust. Behravesh concludes that minus the aforementioned anti-Israeli rhetoric, Iran’s quest for civilian nuclear capabilities may have gone much more “smoothly” (p. 342). In 1998 after the Taliban in Afghanistan executed 10 Iranian representatives, Iran and the West did work together to overthrow the Taliban and put in place the Iranian-backed Hamid Karzai but in the eyes of President Bush after the attacks of September 11th this did not redeem them from being included in the “axis of evil” blacklist of states that sponsor terror. The West’s war on Iraq that followed further convinced Iran of the West’s determination to dominate the region (p. 242). Quoting an interview by Paul Mitchell (P. Mitchell, 2009), Behravesh suggests that these things paved the way for the hardliner Ahmadinejad to take the place of Khatami who wanted Iran to be viewed by the world as part of the solution rather than as part of the problem. Thus, according to Behravesh, perhaps due to strong Israeli influence in Western government (Mearsheimer & Stephen, 2007), the West “dramatically failed to appreciate Khatami’s true worth” to help solve the tensions between Iran and the West (p. 343).
Behravesh concludes his treatment by suggesting that both sides now seem to think that granting further concessions will only be met with a demand for more concessions. Thus, only a complete “overhaul” of “geo-political practices” and “ideological attitudes” by both sides has a possibility of solving the issue (p. 344).

While recommending a change in behavior, Behravesh’s treatment of these issues seems to suggest that the problems that exist between Iran and the West are merely ideological. But the treatment seems inconsistent in that it gives concrete examples for the reasons behind hardline ideologies taking the forefront in these respective nations. So, while one might agree with his overall conclusion that a change in behavior might be called for, the reason for the current attitudes and ideologies may be indeed justified based upon the reasons/examples given in his own study. Therefore, attitude and ideology may not change until there is no longer behavior that one might use to justify them. Behravesh’s study may however help to shed light upon the underlying values which fuel the ideological stances of each respective side which may better explain their actions. Thus an “overhaul” of practices, ideologies, or attitudes ultimately means a re-examination of the values which inspire them.

John Tures examines Iran’s internal politics and how they might be motivating Ahmadinejad to take the political stances that he has and to express himself the way in which he does. Tures notes that soon after Ahmadinejad won Iran’s election in 2005 he began a “war of words” with Israel. He critiques several attempted explanations for Ahmadinejad’s behavior including “ideological zeal, inexperience, international pressure, unifying regional regimes, and inciting war with Israel.” Tures utilizes the “diversionary theory of conflict” whereby administrators try to distract the populace from “domestic shortcomings” by refocusing attention to foreign issues and problems. The author lists the “sinking economy, loss of power, blocked
appointments, [and] criticism from even conservatives” as the domestic shortcomings of concern. Tures argues that Ahmadinejad’s goal may not include actual war, where this theory is usually implemented, but rather “verbal confrontation” and “subtle support for terror groups” in an attempt to achieve the same goal as in actual war, internal political unity. The author goes on to suggest that another possible outcome could be the enlistment of support from non-Iranians thus gaining himself and Iran “regional prestige.” Noting the diversity of political perspectives with which Ahmadinejad must work, Tures posits that rather than trying to gain the support of the entire country he may be trying to “outflank” his conservative opponents which include many from the clergy, legislature, and ruling elite who are “disenchanted” with his anti-corruption attempts, appointments, and policies. Tures suggests that Ahmadinejad’s success would pit Iran’s conservative majority against the moderate minority (Tures, 2009). Tures’ last suggestion seems to contradict the idea of “political unity” unless he is referring to unity under his own leadership despite their differences. A further analysis of Tures’ paper will hopefully clarify this inconsistency.

Tures begins his study with a more detailed litany of examples wherein Ahmadinejad publicly claims that Israel should be eliminated or that the holocaust is a myth. After such comments were made, they were immediately condemned by the United Nations Secretary General at the time, Ban Ki-Moon, as quoted by the Washington Post (p. 51). One leader in Israel, Benjamin Netanyahu, “promised” a return to the policies of former prime minister Menachem Begin who in 1981 bombed Iraq when Saddam Hussein made similar comments. Tures posits that Ahmadinejad is not trying to start an actual war but is rather trying to increase his own prestige in the Islamic world and thus his own country while gaining ground on his domestic rivals. As to the critique made by Thomas Omestad (Omostad, 2005) and others that
Ahmadinejad spoke as he did against Israel out of personal belief, want for war, or foreign policy ignorance, Tures claims that “these explanations [do] not conform to the existing evidence” (p. 52). Tures cites Ze’ev Maghen (Maghen, 2008) and Paul Hughes (Hughes, 2005) in suggesting that Ahmadinejad’s words were “clearly planned” and “not made by accident” but “deliberated and thought out.”

Having examined the historical backdrop of the question at hand we must move to the question itself, by analyzing texts that pertain to the Deal as they have appeared in various publications. Tures contends that if Ahmadinejad “really believes” these threats then he would have said something of the sort during his run for office or early in his term rather than several months after he was elected. Tures’ argument here is certainly a possibility but of course there could be other reasons why no record exists of such language from Ahmadinejad or why he may have perhaps chosen not to make such a belief public until he did. As to the critique that Ahmadinejad lacks experience in the political realm and thus made his statements out of ignorance, Tures reminds his readers that Ahmadinejad served as Mayor of Tehran and in the Revolutionary Guard. His latter service may have gained him experience in operations against Iraq and in dealing with the United States during the hostage crisis. Tures points out that supporters of Ahmadinejad note that his inflammatory words of June 3, 2007 were “mistranslated.” They claim that his reference was to Israel “vanishing from the pages of time” which connotes a natural, self-destruction rather than an attack from outside (Qarai, 2007). Thus, Tures posits that Ahmadinejad’s words were a careful play between those who want war and those who want peace so that he can have it both ways (p. 53).

In terms of the critique of international pressure as an explanation of Ahmadinejad’s words, as has been stated previously in this study, the pressure only increased after his words
whereas beforehand pressure from the international community was easing. So, as Tures
comments, “Ahmadinejad’s words created the pressure, not the other way around” (p. 53).

Tures moves to critique the explanation of Ahmadinejad’s words as an effort to unify the
Islamic world against a common enemy. Tures points out that many Islamic representatives such
as those from Omar, and the Gulf Cooperation Council condemned Ahmadinejad’s words stating
that “Israel is a country that exists and which is recognized by the United Nations. The
Palestinians are cooperating with it, the Arab countries are negotiating with it, and we have an
Arab League position in favor of achieving peace” ((Kandil & Hammond, 2005), p. 53). This
same report states that all the Council members are in agreement that they do not want a nuclear
Iran. Tures also notes that Ahmadinejad publicly stated that the only true and complete
messenger of Islam left is the Iranian nation which has created anger in the Sunni communities
(Hughes, 2005). Tures points out, as noted by Barry Rubin (Rubin, 2006), that some vocal Sunni
extremists such as Osama bin-Ladin have “gone so far as to label the Shi’i as agents of America,
even evildoers within the Islamic faith.” Ultimately, the author concludes, if Ahmadinejad was
trying to unify the Islamic world by using his inflammatory rhetoric then he has failed.

Tures now examines the idea that Ahmadinejad is merely trying to “provoke” Israel into
a war which might unite the Islamic world. The author notes that one could certainly interpret
any response from Israel as a “counter-attack.” But Tures says that in this too Ahmadinejad has
failed. Thus, the author posits that the only reasonable explanation for Ahmadinejad’s language
is revealed in the diversionary theory of conflict wherein Iran is refocused on a common enemy
and away from internal problems (p. 55).
Tures attempts to establish the long-standing use of this tactic as even a current “trend” in Middle-eastern countries from a “variety of […] governments, faiths, and cultures.” In application of this theory, Tures uses Lewis Coser (Coser, 1956) who notes that a “besieged” leader will often make appeals to nationalism by suggesting to the populace that an outsider is threatening their way of life, thus distracting them from his own failures or other internal issues for which they are being blamed. However, Tures applies this theory in a new way concerning the Middle-east in saying that these tactics are “more likely to occur among new leaders who struggle with their own legitimacy; [target a] familiar foe; are more likely to produce threats, displays, and low-level uses of force; and are less likely to generate war” (p.55). Tures supports his application of diversionary theory using his own research in the two previously cited works authored by him wherein he uses both qualitative and quantitative methods over two time periods. Tures states that previous studies seem to only focus on international relationships regarding this theory while ignoring “internal dynamics.” The author references Coser in saying that “groups with external struggles tend to become intolerant of any dissent at home” (p. 56). Thus, recognizing insurmountable internal conflicts, Ahmadinejad may be attempting to create a new societal group which finds its unity under him in aligning against a common foe. Tures explains why Ahmadinejad as president might need such a move considering the internal political structure of Iran. As the author states, the Supreme Leader, not the president, is the most powerful person in Iran. So, such a move might help him to gain internal political power among the populace, the other elected and unelected elite, and other sectarian groups of governmental influence (p. 58). During Ahmadinejad’s period of fiery language against Israel, the Supreme Leader effectively took away much of Ahmadinejad’s power and gave it to other governing

3 See (Tures, 1997) and (Tures, 2004)
bodies one of which is headed by Iran’s former president Rafsanjani thus circumventing
Ahmadinejad’s attempt to gain more power. Rafsanjani protested that vote fraud took place,
particularly among the Revolutionary Guard, claiming that “All means […] were used in an
organized and illegal way after to intervene in the election,” after his loss to Ahmadinejad ("Iran
loser blasts ‘illegal’ poll," 2005). This was just the pinnacle of a long struggle of disappointment
in his ineffectiveness between Ahmadinejad and his supporters on all sides, moderates and
conservatives. Ahmadinejad’s regime has led the country to “tough economic times” and the
populace is “fed up” with the “sputtering Islamist revolution” and a “mismanaged economy.”
Most of the economy is state-run according to the Economist ("Men of principle," 2007).
Returning to Paul Hughes (Hughes, 2005), Tures says that Ahmadinejad may have been put into
power by the lower class but he cites Iranian political analyst Alinejad who counters that “his
influence [is being] undermined by Iran’s complex political structure and factional rivalries,” and
thus is following the anti-Israeli line because he doesn’t really have any choice internally;
otherwise, he will be sidelined.” Tures also cites Iranian politician Mustafa Tajzedah who agrees
with Alinejad’s analysis that Ahmadinejad’s tactics are merely an attempt at
“distraction”(Siamdoust, 2005). Also in agreement with this analysis is The Christian Science
Monitor ("Being irate at Iran, but wisely," 2005), calling it “an attempt to appeal to the masses.”
In the end, Tures concludes that Ahmadinejad has failed to raise his poll numbers using such
tactics.

Rather, Tures argues that Ahmadinejad’s real goal is to pit Iran’s minority liberal faction
against its conservative majority. After his comments about Israel, moderates verbally attacked
him but some of the conservative elite, such as Assembly of Experts Chairman Ayatollah Ali
Meshkini, have excused his words by suggesting that they are “logical” and “what all Iranians
say” (p. 63). This show of support has put the former president on the defensive. Further, Ahmadinejad publicly proclaimed allegiance to a legendary Imam, Mahdi, who it is said will someday return after having disappeared in 873 C.E. thus effectively sidestepping the current Supreme Leader (p. 59). Ahmadinejad has been giving construction contracts to members and former members of the Revolutionary Guard who’s backing would further the power of anyone to whom they lent support. The Supreme Leader sidestepped the president after his remarks and sent one of his own delegates to smooth relations with the west. Ahmadinejad, however protested that such a move might give the impression that Iran is ready to negotiate when it is not and that such matters should only be handled by his administration (Haeri, 2007).

Along with Tures’ coverage of the general populace and their discontent with Ahmadinejad, the author also discusses the large population of Iran’s youth and the possibility that Ahmadinejad is trying to appeal to them in some way with his language towards Israel. But ends this short stint by noting that a recent poll from the Economist showed that nearly half of those who voted for Ahmadinejad previously would not do so again ("Who’s the boss?,” 2007).

Having mentioned the importance of the influence and power of the Revolutionary Guard previously, Tures returns to this group and notes that Ahmadinejad’s political moves have not only been an attempt to court the conservative majority but also the Guard. The clerics led by the Ayatollah, Tures states, have lost power since Ahmadinejad has been elected and have been moving to regain it. Some of those moves have put strains on their relationship with the Guard and so Ahmadinejad has attempted to capitalize on that situation with his anti-Israel rhetoric (p. 67). Ahmadinejad’s attempts at gaining support from the conservatives and the Guard, the fall of the Soviet Union, “spikes” in oil prices which have enriched Arab governments, regime change in Afghanistan and Iraq which has preoccupied the United States government and wearied its
people, Tures posits, could lead to an Iranian regional power that has since been unknown. Tures
goes on to argue that if verbal conflict is being used to replace actual war then Iran may be trying
to dominate regional politics first before it directly handles the issue of Israel. Even so, the
author contends, Iran may be choosing to “dispatch [Israel] indirectly through […] Hamas and
Hizballah. Tures suggests that this can be achieved more efficiently and effectively through
nuclear weapons than conventional capabilities. “Nuclear weapons are the poor man’s nuclear
weapons” (Rubin, 2006). If Europe and the United States is unable to stop Iran, Tures continues,
then Iran will be seen as a middle-eastern power that can stand up to the West (p. 69).

Even though, officially, many Arab groups and powers have spoken out against
Ahmadinejad and his words, Tures argues that the average Arab “on the street” is more likely to
sympathize with him. They may not be willing to convert to the Shi’I religion but most seem to
want change and are “lacking a heroic figure to stand up to the West” (Rubin, 2006). Tures cites
a recent international poll of those outside of Arab government that shows that support for
Ahmadinejad is rising. This poll shows that among 3,850 citizens of Egypt, Lebanon, Jordan,
Morocco, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates, Israel is seen as the greatest threat
followed by the United States. One of the furthest down the list is the government of Iran. Most
believe that Iran will produce a nuclear weapon but most are against stopping them from such
production (Kiernan, 2007).

Tures suggests that Ahmadinejad’s tactics might mean that Iran would not directly use
nuclear weapons to attack a more militarily dominant country such as those in Europe, or the
United States, or even those countries protected by the former powers such as Israel. But citing
Paul Rubin (Rubin, 2006), he argues that we have evidence to suggest that Iran might use
terrorist groups to do their work for them.
Tures summarizes his study with the conclusion that Ahmadinejad needed to deal with his domestic problems of economic instability and opposition from both moderates and conservatives. His solution was to generate anti-Israel propaganda and semi-covertly aid terrorist groups who were willing and able to take action against perceived enemies of Iran. The result of which seems to be the creation of support and popularity from the world’s Arab population. This in turn, Ahmadinejad believes, will create a foundation for more domestic support among the Iranian populace and thus pressure his political rivals to implement his policies (p. 71).

**The Language of the Deal**

As of this writing there have been no analyses using functional theory of the rhetorical claims used as presented by the media on the Deal. Nor have there been any analyses done on television news articles whether from live broadcast or reproduced in print. There are, however, some studies utilizing other methods of critical discourse analysis that have examined Deal language used in newspapers, interviews, and editorials in both American and British periodicals. These will be presented in turn. Although theories from western scholars are sometimes employed, interestingly, there seem to be no analyses of the language of the Deal from western scholars but rather only scholars from Iran or other middle-eastern countries. As previously stated, all of the following studies use some form of critical discourse analysis as part of their theoretical framework. The sources examined will start to become repetitive in terms of their addition of data towards the end of this section. As previously stated, the studies all use critical discourse analysis in order to establish an underlying theme which motivates the discourse. The following studies examine discourse from the Los Angeles Times, the Tehran Times, the New York Times, The Economist, the Guardian, the Daily Telegraph, the Times, the
Independent, BBC, ABC, CBS, NBC, FOX, CNN, the Washington Post and USA Today. These studies were chosen because they are timely and they cover a wide swath of perspectives and viewpoints from all over the western world. The drawback is that there is only one perspective from the middle-eastern world. Perhaps because most of these scholars are from the middle-east their focus tended to be outward rather than inward. Since there is no other significant connection between these studies as they pertain to this overall study, they will be presented in chronological order.

Foad Izadi and Hakimeh Saghaye-Biri (F. Izadi & Saghaye-Biria, 2007) performed a critical discourse analysis of three American newspapers’ editorial coverage of Iran’s nuclear program. The editorials include those from The New York Times, The Washington Post, and The Wall Street Journal all from 1984-2004. They employed Edward Said’s notion of Orientalism (Said, 1978) and Teun van Dijk’s ideological square (Teun A. van Dijk, 2000) to derive six Orientalist themes of Islam and Muslims. Borrowing from John Hartley (Hartley, 2002), the researchers define “Orientalism” as an ideology that “involves a binary opposition that finds the West as central in modern, enlightened thought, and the Orient as the mysterious and often dangerous Other.” Wherein “ideologies” serve to “function as symbolic systems of thought to organize, maintain, and stabilize particular forms of power relations” as borrowed from Stuart Hall (Hall, 1996). As with some of the previous scholars, Izadi and Saghaye-Biri emphasize that the importance of focusing upon editorials is that they represent the “broader ideological stance of the newspaper’s owners and managers” as stated by Frances Henry and Carol Tator (Henry & Tator, 2002). Further, the researchers state that such pieces effect “how the public and policy makers perceive other peoples” and thus the “global political environment.” As mentioned previously, the researchers follow guidelines advanced by van Dijk (Teun A. van Dijk, 1988)
who sees three parts to textual analysis, including “the description of argumentative structures; the explication of presupposed (tacit) assumptions, norms and values; and an analysis of style and rhetorical features” (p. 126). These “argumentative structures,” the researchers posit, “promote a certain perspective on events, players or agents, and policy recommendations.” Further, “[t]he study of numerous argumentative fallacies has shown that powerful arguers may manipulate their audiences by making self-serving arguments more explicit and prominent, whereas other arguments may be left implicit” (p. 29) say the researchers quoting van Dijk (Teun A van Dijk, 1995).

Izadi and Saghaye-Biri ultimately want to investigate the following questions: “How are events, players, and policies about the Iranian nuclear program portrayed in these three U.S. elite newspapers [and] are Orientalist arguments used as premises for advancing policy recommendations?” (p. 141) The researchers then give a detailed expansion of how they see Orientalism playing a role in their research. In doing so they quote Ziauddin Sardar who describes the us versus them dichotomous language used to distinguish the West and East as “the life force of Western self-identification” (Sardar, 1999). Izadi and Saghaye-Biri quote Alexander Macfie to argue that “Orientalism has come to signify an ideology justifying and accounting for Western imperialism” (Macfie, 2000). The researchers continue to argue that the foundation for such distinctions is due to a structuralist view of all human language wherein binary oppositions play a defining role according to Ferdinand de Saussure (de Saussure 1959). Thus, objects are defined by comparison as to what they are not. Izadi and Saghaye-Biri argue that this is a restrictive mode of thought that rejects the possibility of numerous meanings. Further, the researchers argue along with Les Switzer, John McNamara, and Michael Ryan that “news narratives are primarily based on binary signs, reducing reality to “discrete, dichotomous ‘facts’”
and that such language provides the “sociocultural foundation of ideology” (Switzer, McNamara, & Ryan, 1999). Returning to Edward Said, Izadi and Saghaye-Biri contend that this binary opposition provides “maintenance” to every culture (Said, 1978). Besides East versus West, Elaine Baldwin, Brian Longhurst, Scott McCracken, Miles Ogborn, & Greg Smith propose that these oppositions include “despotism versus democracy, cruelty versus fair treatment, irrational versus rational, and cunning versus trust” (Baldwin, Longhurst, McCracken, Ogborn, & Smith, 2000). The researchers then lay out how van Dijk’s ideological square, as previously explained in this overall study, further simplifies their approach.

Izadi and Saghaye-Biri then briefly touch on the history of Iran as viewed through the lens of Orientalism. They touch on Iran’s struggle to regain control of their petroleum industry in the 1950’s and the subsequent overthrow and replacement of the Prime minister by the Shah, the latter of which was motivated by the British Petroleum Company. They also touch on media coverage of Iran after the 1979 hostage crisis and how these things helped to establish the dominant orientalist paradigm in the West. This is followed by a foray into the history of Iran’s nuclear program which has already been addressed in this overall study and so will not be included here. What then follows is an explanation as to why The Wall Street Journal, The New York Times, and The Washington Post were chosen as sources for this study. They are “among the largest media outlets in the United States, ranking second, third, and fifth, respectively, in terms of circulation.” The researchers say that USA Today is “first in circulation” but “last” among these in terms of international news coverage. They refer to these news sources as “elite” because according to Guy Golan they “serve an inter-media agenda setting function for other news sources, in particular with regard to the coverage of international events and issues.”
Next, the researchers further define their use of editorials upon which to focus their study. There are no real significant additions to add here from those previously mentioned in other studies included in this overall investigation. Then further clarification of van Dijk’s method, previously covered, is touched upon including “naming choices” such as “extreme formality such as using the complete unabbreviated title of an official” such as “President;” a “neutral naming choice” like “Mr.;” or a naming choice that “reflect the biases of the writer” such as “‘the mullahs’ or “the fundamentalist Islamic regime.’” Lexical choices, as with the previous studies, are also examined which reveal “different ideological affiliations” such as “freedom fighter versus terrorist.” These concepts are used by the researchers to help answer their first research question. For the second research question concerning Orientalism, Izadi and Saghaye-Biri use the same concepts including “argumentative features” but the editorials are examined to see if they are using the eight Orientalist themes (listed earlier) as presuppositions upon which they base their writing. Individual paragraphs were used as units of analysis. The eight Orientalist themes are further explained thusly, “untrustworthiness” suggests that all Orientals are “untruthful and therefore should not be trusted.” “Islam as a threat” asserts that all “Orientals are threatening because of their adherence to an Islamic ideology.” “Oriental inferiority” raises questions about the basic humanity of the Oriental as compared to Westerners. “Oriental backwardness” contrasts Oriental ways of life and ideas with those of the “advanced” West. “Oriental irrationality” attempts to point out the “mystical and irrational nature of the Oriental.” “Oriental submissiveness” posits the natural position of submissiveness of the Oriental. “Jews versus Arabs (or Muslims)” as a theme comes into play when a situation is defined in terms of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. “Oriental strangeness” emphasizes the “oddities” of the Oriental as contrasted with a “normal Western standard” (p. 150).
Izadi and Saghaye-Biri argue that all three newspapers use the first two Orientalist themes of “Oriental untrustworthiness” and “Islam as a threat” when addressing Iran’s nuclear program more often than any of the other themes. They suggest that terminology such as “the fundamentalist Islamic regime” (Post, 2003), “a hard-line Islamic regime” (Post, 2004b), and “Iran’s ruling mullahs” (Times, 2004b) reveal this bias. The researchers argue that The Wall Street Journal most often illustrates these biases by referring to Iran’s government as “the mullahs” and almost never by their neutral (“official”) titles. The researchers go on to argue that all three newspapers suggest that “such a government cannot be trusted with nuclear technology” (p. 150). In terms of the theme of “Iran as a threat,” the researchers quote an editorial from The Wall Street Journal which suggests that the overall goal against Iran gaining nuclear weapons is not to make the world safe from nuclear weapons but rather “preservation of the United State’s power in the Middle East” (Wall Street Journal, 2003) as framed by Iran’s “version of theocracy” which might spread. Izadi and Saghaye-Biri then give as reference a series of tables which show their findings. They show that 43 instances of Orientalist themes were found in 29 editorials (214 paragraphs). The Wall Street Journal was found to have at least one orientalist theme in 6 of 9 editorials or 51% of the total. The Washington Post was found to have at least one orientalist theme in 6 of 8 editorials or 26% of the total. The New York Times was found to have at least one orientalist theme in 5 of 12 editorials or 23% of the total. The researchers therefore conclude that “portrayals of Iran in both The Wall Street Journal and The Washington Post can be characterized as Orientalist in nature. And although The New York Times had 5 editorials with Orientalist themes, its overall portrayal cannot be characterized as Orientalist.” “Oriental untrustworthiness” occurred in “40%” (or 17 instances) of the editorials making it the most repeated theme. “Islam as a threat” had 11 instances or 26%, 7 instances of “Oriental
submissiveness” were found, 4 instances of “Oriental irrationality” were also found. “Oriental
inferiority” and “Jews versus Muslims” each had two instances but only appearing in *The Wall
Street Journal*. The researchers found no instances of “Oriental backwardness or strangeness”
(p.151).

Izadi and Saghaye-Biri continue with a treatment of the editorials in question using a
“West versus Islamic Iran” lens. They contend that this “demarcation” denotes the rhetorical
line between “us versus them” with special emphasis upon Islam even though the items being
investigated suggest that the Iran nuclear issue is of “global priority.” They provide as examples
reference to “mullahs” as a foil to the West in *The Wall Street Journal (Wall Street Journal, 2003)*, *The New York Times (Times, 2004d)*. The example given by the researchers from *The
Washington Post* (Post, 2004a) only makes reference to Iran’s “hard-liners.” The researchers
contend that the editorials suggest as “fact” that Iran is “undeserving of international trust […]
even under the most stringent international safeguards.” Thus, the theme of “Oriental
untrustworthiness” is seen at play here. As a foil to these editorials, the researchers offer a claim
made by the International Crisis Group who are quoted as saying that “there is nothing in ““scope
and variety of Iran’s nuclear program that is exclusively, or virtually exclusively, designed for
military use ("Dealing with Iran’s nuclear program ", 2003).”’ Izadi and Saghaye-Biri point out
that as reaction to this menace, *The Wall Street Journal* promotes “regime change through overt
and covert means” such as backing Iranian opposition groups and their effort to remove the
government of the “mullahs” as well as potential military intervention. They also point out that
*The Washington Post* and *The New York Times* “argue against the use of force and regime
change” due to “impracticality” but rather should use “multilateral incentives and threats” via
diplomacy (p. 152).
Izadi and Saghye-Biri move to speak of the nature of Iran’s nuclear program arguing that the editorial positions of the periodicals under their investigation claim to be using “official” sources of both the United States and Israel and seem to come to a certain conclusion. Yet, The New York Times reports that according to a presidential commission “American intelligence on Iran is inadequate to allow firm judgments about Iran’s weapons programs” (Jehl & Schmitt, 2005). This commission submitted their report to President Bush in March 2005 and claims to base their review on a 14-month investigation of “unrestricted access to the most senior people and the most sensitive documents of the intelligence agencies.” Of course, this only addresses one source that the president had to review. There could have been others to which only the president had access that led to his final decision on the issue. The researchers go on to draw a parallel between what Patricia Dunmire (Dumire, 1997), who studied the first Iraq war, referred to as a “projected event” wherein predicted events are dealt with as if they had already happened or are already happening. Thus, the object of this study, Iran’s nuclear weapons program, was treated as fact. The researchers contend that each of the periodicals in question assert not the likelihood of an Iranian nuclear weapons program but the reality of such an endeavor over and against the evidence counter to any such assertion. They assert that their argument is blatantly evidenced even in the titles chosen by the periodicals and offer as examples from The Wall Street Journal: “The Mullah’s Nukes” and “The Mullah’s Bomb;” from The Washington Post: “Iran’s Bomb;” and from The New York Times: “One More Round on Iran’s Nukes.” Thus, they conclude that “[t]he issue is not the possibility of an Iranian nuclear bomb but the timing of such an event in the near future.” Ultimately, the researchers conclude, that the periodicals operate under the assumption that the mere capability of Iran to make a nuclear weapon is evidence that they have produced or will produce such a device (p. 157). For example, the researchers point to
an article already referenced in our current study by *The Wall Street Journal* (Wall Street Journal, 2003) in which is stated “Iran’s long resistance to giving up uranium enrichment is highly suggestive of its weapons intentions.” Also, The New York Times (Times, 2003) is referenced as saying “The problem posed by Iran is particularly urgent because it is now widely assumed that Iranian scientists have already learned how to convert natural uranium into bomb fuel. That leaves only one sure way for Iran to persuade others to trust its repeated promises not to build nuclear weapons. It must not only suspend uranium enrichment, but also dismantle, with international verification, all of its enrichment plants.” Thus, again the researchers conclude that what is being asserted by the periodicals in question is not that there is evidence that Iran has a nuclear weapon but that they have the knowledge and capability to produce one and that Iran cannot be trusted with such knowledge as can the West.

Izadi and Saghaye-Biri then begin to analyze policy recommendations. They assert that *The Wall Street Journal* advocates a policy “congruent” with that of the United States government (at the time of the production of their study) which is against any sort of deal with the Iranian government for fear of “tighten[ing] the [Iranian] regime’s hold on power […]”("Dealing with Iran’s nuclear program ", 2003). The researchers quote Roger Howard (Howard, 2004) in describing those who support regime change including *The Wall Street Journal*, as falling for the “illusion of popular support” where the supposition is made that enemy governments of the United States are “oppressive” and therefore their populace would support change in governance because they are “sympathetic” to United States’ values. As further support, *The Wall Street Journal* ((Journal, 2004)(p.158)) is quoted as saying that the Iranian populace is “the most pro-American in the Muslim world and they despise the clique of clerics who have squelched democratic reform while presiding over a sinking economy.” In contrast, the
researchers note that *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post* posit that regime change is not a “practical” approach. They appear to argue that nothing short of an “all-out invasion” could stop Iran from producing a nuclear weapon and that even Iranian “democrats also want the bomb” (Post, 2004a). *The New York Times* (Times, 2004c) targets the idea of “unilateral American bullying” suggesting that such an approach may only lead to “rally flagging support for [the current Iranian government] among nationalistic Iranians.” Rather, *The New York Times* advocates “multilateral diplomacy” based upon “explicit incentives” and “explicit threats,” (Times, 2004d) so that Europeans would be “prepared to stand behind Washington with a credible threat of economic sanctions when they are justified” (Times, 2004a). The periodical argues that a military intervention would be a “catastrophic mistake” and that, at first, the diplomatic efforts of Britain, France, and Germany appeared to have been fruitful. Later, those results were deemed “not satisfying” but might still work to keep Iran from making its own fuel. *The Washington Post*, however, while agreeing with *The New York Times* that military action is not the answer (Post, 2004a), criticizes the unilateral approach as “fruitless diplomatic scrambling” (Post, 2004c) and “failed preemption” (Post, 2004b) and advocates involvement of the United Nations Security Council. At this point, Izadi and Saghaye-Biri note that *The Washington Post* (Post, 2004a) thinks that the United States should use “carrots” while the Europeans should use “sticks.” They go on to posit that the Europeans are more concerned with their economic interests in terms of competition with the United States and so their efforts will only go so far as long as those interests are not put in jeopardy (p. 159). Thus, “[o]nly the threat of Security Council or Western action has any chance of keeping the mullahs tethered to a serious inspections system. If the U.N. and Europe fail in Iran as they failed in Iraq, they have to
understand that the only other recourse for the U.S. or Israel will be the use of force” (Wall Street Journal, 2003).

Izadi and Saghaye-Biri summarize this treatment by arguing that the Bush Administration seeks to add another level to the Nuclear Proliferation Treaty by “denying uranium enrichment—needed for both nuclear power and weapons—to countries which don’t already have it” ("Administration agenda on Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.,” 2005). They charge the American periodicals with not criticizing the United States and the other nuclear powers for disobeying the Non-proliferation Treaty which they believe destroys the credibility of both the periodicals and the states that are going after Iran.

Izadi and Saghaye-Biri conclude their study by suggesting that their findings are in line with Karim H. Karim (Karim, 2000) and Melani McAlister (McAlister, 2001) in that “Orientalist depictions of Muslim countries and their political issues concentrate around the idea that Islam is a source of threat.” They charged the American periodicals under investigation with not challenging underlying suppositions that Iran has a secret nuclear weapons program, that Islamic governments are a threat, and they such governments cannot be trusted with such technology (p. 162).

Scholar Jason Jones (Jones, 2010) analyzes a series of interviews with then Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice concerning the relationship of Iran and the United States and the foremost issue of Iran’s nuclear program. Jones scrutinizes opening questions, topic shifts, relationship of scope and topic and Rice’s portrayals of both the United States and Iran during the interviews. Jones posits that Rice used the interviews to suggest the image of Iran’s nuclear program as focused on weapons creation but without evidence. The author also argues that in many cases the interviewers were complicit in her attempt to create this image of Iran as a
“rogue state.” While suggesting this negative image of Iran, the author also argues that Rice endeavors to “rebuild” a positive image of the United States and its current administration.

Jones begins his argument by suggesting that President Obama is continuing the rhetoric of President Bush and that analysis on that rhetoric may promote better understanding about the messages being put forth. As a “mouthpiece” for the Bush administration, Jones argues that during her interviews, Rice echoes President Bush by continually shifting the topic of conversation to the actions of Iraq rather than the actions of the United States. Jones refers to President Bush’s state of the union addresses wherein Bush reiterates his concern for Iran’s pursuit of nuclear weapons, tyrannical regime, and support of terrorism while suggesting that the United States would unilaterally support the people of Iran in opposing their own government. Jones faults President Bush for not using the incomplete investigations of the International Atomic Energy Agency who suggested that more examinations were needed to determine a final conclusion as to the nature and intent of Iran’s nuclear program. Rather, Jones says, Bush operated without such evidence. It could also be the case the Bush administration had access to other intelligence that he could not share publicly but Jones does not consider this. Agreeing with Scott Ritter ((Ritter, 2006)(p. 129)), Jones argues that President Bush was “exploiting the ignorance of the American people about nuclear energy technology and nuclear weapons.”

Jones goes on to argue that the way in which President Bush was able to push for such a view without hard evidence was to categorize Iran as a “rogue” nation and part of an “axis of evil” that “ignored human rights,” and supported terrorism. Thus, the argument that Iran would pursue nuclear weapons, despite their having signed a nuclear non-proliferation treaty, would be a natural next step. Having replaced Colin Powell, Jones states, Condoleezza Rice, whose
approval rating never dropped below 50% in her first year, was used by President Bush to push his agenda in the media.

Citing Timothy Cook (Cook, 1998), Jones notes the need for certain moves by organizations, including governments, in order to get the media to include something that they might deem newsworthy. In other words, there is a narrative power struggle between such organizations and the media. Jones goes on to note that such power struggles can be gleaned from interviews even if not presented in their entirety and that the appearance of agreement or disagreement between the interviewer and interviewee will influence the viewer’s decision about the veracity of the information being discussed. In the interviews that Jones analyzes, he argues that interviewers appear to agree with Secretary Rice, even if they disagree off camera, and thus the information being discussed is at least presented as true to the viewer, perhaps making them more receptive to it.

The importance of the opening “sequence” of questions, Jones argues along with Steve Clayman (Clayman, 1991), sets the narrative for the rest of the interview. The opening questions, Clayman says, identify the interviewee and the newsworthiness of the information. In other words, the ethos of the interviewee is created as a “participant and/or observer of an event,” a “certified expert,” and as a person with a justifiable position on the issue(s) at hand. Following Lloyd Bitzer (Bitzer, 1968), Jones adds that determining whether or not something is newsworthy also determines its “exigence” or “urgency.” Such tactics can effectively eliminate potential topics and perspectives as well (p. 130).

Jones also uses the parameters of topic and scope in his analysis. Quoting Norman Fairclough (Fairclough, 1992), Jones states that topics are “introduced and changed only by the dominant participant,” both participants, however, “negotiate” the scope in which a topic is
discussed. A number of different things can occur. Shoshana Blum-Kulka (Blum-Kulka, 1983), Jones notes, says that an interviewer can ask “broad or narrow questions on a topic but in addition to not answering at all an interviewee can answer broadly or narrowly.” If the limits of scope are not breached then the interviewee is likely avoiding the question with jeopardizing scope. Interviewers can ask “follow-up questions” to prompt interviewee(s) to narrow their response(s). Thus, notion of scope allows an interviewee to maneuver around in a topic and yet avoid potentially self-damaging questions.

Jones also examines Secretary Rice’s attempts to portray the United States positively while demonizing Iran. Jones lists several studies, which analyze American political discourse that attempts to do the latter. Jones reiterates the author’s categorization of such attempts as being grounded in “orientalist stereotypes” lacking in concrete evidence. Jones notes the study by William Beeman in which he characterizes the situation as “mutual demonization.” But Jones argues that any such negative action from Iran toward the United States is incomparable to such actions going the other way (p. 131).

Jones uses interviews from television, radio, print, and one online all from the beginning and end of 2005. The interviewers include George Stephanopoulos and Peter Jennings on ABC’s This Week, Andrea Mitchell of NBC News, Jonathan Karl of ABC News, Bob Schieffer and Doyle McManus on CBS’s Face the Nation, Bill O’Reilly on the O’Reilly Factor, Andrea Koppel of CNN, Barbara Slavin and Ray Locker of USA Today, the National Conference of Editorial Writers, and the Sean Hannity Radio Show.

Jones categorizes the opening of each interview in one of four ways concerning the topic of Iran’s nuclear program: either a “direct characterization of the program as a weapons program; indirect characterization of the program as a weapons program; direct characterization of the
program as a civilian program; [or] an ambiguous characterization.” Jones notes two exceptions to these distinctions, those being the Andrea Mitchell and Jonathan Karl interviews in which the topic was raised by Secretary Rice rather than the interviewers, respectively. Jones states that the O’Reilly, Schieffer and McManus, and Hannity interviews all directly categorized Iran’s nuclear program as a weapons program. Jones gives as an example part of an opening statement made by Doyle McManus (Schieffer & McManus, 2005) wherein he says “They’re still working on nuclear weapons so time is not on our side.” As an example of an indirect characterization, Jones quotes National Conference of Editorial Writers ("Remarks to the National Conference of Editorial Writers," 2005) attendee Herb Field whose opening statement includes “[I]f Pakistan has a nuclear program and India have a nuclear program and they’re not supposed to have nuclear programs, why can’t Iran […].” As an example of direct characterization of Iran’s nuclear program as civilian, Jones offers part of a quote from Barbara Slavin (Slavin & Locker, 2005) in which she states “But certainly if you look at positions on civilian nuclear power, there’s an acknowledgement that North Korea can have it at some point, and Iran there’s been quite a substantial shift.” Jones categorizes the Koppel, and Stephanopoulos and Jennings interviews as opening with ambiguous characterizations of Iran’s nuclear program but offers no examples at this point in his study (p. 133).

In investigating the foundations of the arguments being made in these interviews, Jones quotes Chaim Perelman and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1969) who note the importance of the acceptance of definitions and claims built from those definitions at the start of an argumentative exchange. Such acceptance, whether explicit or implicit, serves to validate said definitions and allows the exchange to proceed based upon them. “When a speaker selects and puts forward the premises that are to serve as foundation for his argument, he relies
on his hearers’ adherence to the propositions from which he will start.” Jones goes on to argue that if an interviewee “rejects a premise” or definition that the discussion will begin with an exchange about said definitions and premises rather than move forward on the topic. However, if the premises and definitions are accepted then discussants will move forward on the topic without such an exchange. Jones states that “excluding the Slavin and Locker interview, Secretary Rice, in the other eight interviews, proceeded to discuss Iran’s nuclear research in terms of nuclear weapons” (p. 133). In the interview conducted by Stephanopoulos and Jennings (Stephanopoulos & Jennings, 2005) where the opening question(s) were ambiguous about Iran’s nuclear program, Secretary Rice steers the discussion by implicitly offering further definition of said program by stating “[T]he world understands that there has to unity in getting the Iranians to see that they cannot be part of the international system and pursue a nuclear weapon at the same time.” Jones notes that the interviewers did not “ask Rice to elaborate […] on how she and the Bush administration had come to understand Iran as pursuing nuclear weapons or […] why the Islamic Republic would try to achieve such a goal […]” but rather they proceeded the exchange based upon the definitions and claims that Secretary Rice proffered. Jones claims that this amounts to tacit validation of Iran’s nuclear program as a weapons program.

The interview conducted by Slavin (Slavin & Locker, 2005) opened with an implicit claim by the interviewer that Iran’s nuclear program was civilian. However, Secretary Rice answered that such a claim was unsubstantiated as Iran has a “credibility problem with the international community as to the fuel cycle.” Jones notes that this corresponds to the position of the International Atomic Energy Commission who have called for “greater transparency” from Iran concerning these matters. If one accepts the findings of the Commission, then any claim
about the intent of Iran concerning its nuclear ambitions might remain unsubstantiated including that made by the interviewer (p. 133).

Returning to the interview with the National Conference of Editorial Writers, Jones refocuses to look at scope. During the interview, Field asked Rice about Iran’s nuclear program as compared to Pakistan and India’s nuclear programs, respectively. Jones accuses Rice of purposefully limiting the scope of her response in order to avoid “falling into a web of contradiction.” Rice replied, “We would have preferred that the NPT had constrained other states as well, but because you weren’t able to constrain states in the past doesn’t mean that you have to stop trying to constrain states in the future, particularly one like Iran that has a very long history and rap sheet when it comes to terrorism. This is, after all, probably the most important supplier – important supporter of terrorist rejectionist organizations […]” (“Remarks to the National Conference of Editorial Writers,” 2005). Jones charges the United States with hypocrisy in not treating Iran the same as it did Pakistan and India. The author suggests that Rice tries to deflect responsibility away from the United States and onto the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Jones is not clear if he means to suggest that Pakistan and India are also charged with sponsoring terrorism. He just posits that such charges against Iran must not be true if he is not shown evidence. As was mentioned before such evidence might not exist or it might be such that it is of a sensitive nature and cannot be revealed publicly. If such evidence does exist, then Jones’ argument in this matter is moot because it would establish justification for treating Iran differently than Pakistan and India. Jones then charges Rice with implicitly arguing that actions and policies of the United States should not be questioned but rather only Iran’s should. But this is the purpose of the interview, to question the actions and policies of the United States toward Iran. Jones’ main crux seems to be the United States not offering any evidence but speaking as if
there were and the interviewers accepting such premises and forging ahead with the interview. This seems to be a justified concern but for Jones to argue on such basis that there therefore is no evidence is the fallacy of argument from ignorance (p. 134).

Concerning scope in the Slavin interview, Slavin asked Rice about the potential for “blanket sanctions” to negatively affect the Iranian people and asked of more “targeted sanctions” weren’t a better way to proceed. Rice’s response, “Well, obviously nobody has a desire to isolate the Iranian people. That’s not the point. The problem is that the Iranian Government is one that pursues policies that are antithetical to the interests of the United States and interests of a stable Middle East” (Slavin & Locker, 2005). Jones charges Rice with avoiding the question by this answer and by bringing up other actions of the Iranian government. In one instance Jones seems to be complaining that Rice is not offering evidence for her responses and in the next he’s complaining that the evidence she offers is merely a diversionary tactic. It could very well be that what Rice is saying about the responsibility of the condition of Iran’s people economically falls squarely on the shoulders of the Iranian government. It could also be that such “blanket sanctions” would indeed make the Iranian people feel the pressure and in turn put pressure on their government to take actions that would end their economic woes. So, wherever Slavin asked about actions of the United States, Rice refocused the scope to actions of Iran. Jones is correct that such actions can indeed be diversionary tactics but they don’t have to be. They could also be accurate.

Part of Jones accusations include critique of the phrase “international obligations” which Rice used to refer to responsibilities that she charged Iran with shirking. Jones asks why no interviewer ever explicitly asked just what those obligations are. Here Jones turns to the 2004 November 29th IAEA Board Resolution which suggests that Iran be more “transparent” in its
nuclear activities and halt any enrichment. Jones notes that these were all voluntary stipulations. He also points to a part of the Treaty which states that all signatories have “the inalienable right […] to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination.” While it is true that interviewers did not ask for this information and Rice did not offer it, it is also true that any authority that the United Nations obligations may have over a country is purely voluntary and if that country decides that following the UN is not in their best interest or if UN measures do not go far enough then said countries may pursue their own interests in their own way without the oversight of the UN. Some may not think this ideal but it is certainly reality. Jones goes on to argue that while Rice and the Bush administration were positing that Iran was developing nuclear weapons, the IAEA merely cited Iran with not reporting fully about their nuclear activities and nothing more. Jones is suggesting that the United States is jumping the gun without evidence … at least none that he’s seen (p. 135).

During the interview with the Editorial Writers, Rice offers an argument to suggest that Iran has no need of civilian nuclear energy because it is rich in oil. Jones counters that Iran does not have the technology to refine oil for its own use and therefore imports most of its oil that it uses for energy. Both of these arguments are dependent upon how much each of these respective technologies cost. They are also dependent upon how readily available and renewable the resources are for creating such energy for each of these choices. The question then becomes: is pursuing nuclear energy less expensive than refining oil? Which could be categorized as more “renewable?” These answers are beyond the scope of this study (p. 136).

Jones then moves to critique the interviews in question concerning the idea that Secretary Rice seeks to use them to (re)build a positive American image while denigrating that of Iran. This attempt, Jones claims, is based upon President Bush’s categorization of Iran as part of an
“axis of evil.” The United States is portrayed as a “multilateral, diplomatic” state while Iran is presented as a “rogue” nation. During the interview conducted by Andrea Koppel (Koppel, 2005), Rice was asked if she agreed with Ambassador John Bolton that if Iran were to acquire nuclear weapons that they would then make such weaponry available to terrorists. Rice, of course, agrees. Jones continues that such an assertion is still yet to be evidenced. During the interview conducted by Sean Hannity (Hannity, 2005), Rice references statements made by Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad in which he claimed that Iran would “wipe Israel off the map” and that the Holocaust was a “myth,” among others, to justify the American position about Iran pursuing nuclear weapons to accomplish the task. Jones points out that there has been some debate about the translation of Ahmadinejad’s statements but that these discussions are left unpursued. Rather, they are capitalized upon by Rice and those who agree with her to bolster their position on Iran. During the interview conducted by Andrea Mitchell (A. Mitchell, 2005), Rice was asked why Iran was criticized for its human rights abuses while American “allies” such as Egypt and Saudi Arabia are not. Rice replied that much is expected of all of the United States’ allies but that Iran is unique because of their alleged connection to terrorism and their seeming willingness to extend such abuses to include the use of weapons of mass destruction. Jones argues using the words of Edward Said (Said, 1978) that the “Orient […] is corrected, even penalized, for lying outside the boundaries of European society, ‘our’ world.” In other words, Jones claims that the West is attempting to punish Iran for simply being different in their approach to world affairs. When asked during the interview conducted by Doyle McManus why the Iranians rejected an offer made by the United States, Germany, Britain, and France Secretary Rice focused upon a supposed Iranian effort to divide those nations but failed to do so (Schieffer & McManus, 2005). Jones proffers the idea that perhaps there was actually something in the
offer that Iran did not find acceptable but that such a line of reasoning was not pursued during the interview (p. 138).

Jones concludes his critique by reiterating the charges he made at the outset that news agencies have been complicit with Secretary Rice and the administration which she represents in presenting Iran negatively as a “rogue” state that is pursuing nuclear weapons while at the same time portraying the United States positively as representing the world in trying to stop Iran from acquiring such weapons. Jones then argues that news agencies “should provide communicative environments in which statespersons justify their positions, not serve as spaces in which political leaders can present debatable assumptions as truth and repeatedly reinforce that ‘truth’ with the help of their interviewers.” Jones ends with the statement “[w]hen the places we turn to for information construct knowledge in a way that is void of reconsideration or rethinking, they have failed in educating the public in a way that enables Americans to realize their potential to check the power of their leaders” (p. 139). Jones’ critique focuses upon the power of language and the way it may shape knowledge. Setting aside the claims of lack of evidence, such studies should help the current study in shedding light upon the values that underlie such claims both from the researcher and their object(s) of study. These matters will be taken up in the analysis section of this work.

Alireza Rasti and Rahman Sahragard (Rasti & Sahragard, 2012) provide a critical analysis of twenty-three articles published between 2007 and 2010 in the widely-circulated British newspaper, *The Economist*. At the start of their study, the researchers borrowing from Van Leeuwen (T. Van Leeuwen, 2009), denote that the purpose of any critical discourse analysis, including their own, is to “deconstruct hegemonic discourses” that “effect inequalities, injustices, and oppression.” Justifying the analysis of media, the researchers argue that it is
“ubiquitous” and despite “claims of objectivity and fairness” it “create[s] its own version of reality and make[s] the masses and some elite groups see that reality through their eyes. Media reports cannot be inexorably innocent and value-free” (p. 730). In other words, scholars who utilize Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) do so in order to identify language that they feel is antithetical to what they believe to be socially just. After identification, actions are usually recommended that counteract the original language deemed unjust. The oft-cited *Economist* was chosen because it is a “western quality” paper; and has large, global distribution (p. 733). The authors posit that since the paper is western it will fit the pre-conceived categories of trying to convince its readership of the illegitimacy of Iran’s nuclear ambitions and arguing for harsher sanctions. Thus, the authors group the object of their study with things that reproduce and legitimize hegemonic discourse. As with previous research analyzed and referenced here, Rasti and Sahragard rely upon the scholarship and actor-analysis, as well as categories of (de)legitimation and strategies of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation of Van Leeuwen and Wodak respectively. The study then does a brief foray into the history of Iran’s nuclear program which has already been sufficiently covered here.

Rasti and Sahragard next spend time identifying whom they believe to be the most important actors being included or excluded in the articles they analyze. They argue that Iran is mostly represented in the actions and words of President Ahmadinejad. The “West” is realized via its institutions, the United States, and or the latter’s major European partners. Russia is presented as a “meddler in Iran’s affairs or as an opportunist” but when associated positively with more sanctions, Russia is portrayed as an ally. China is most closely associated with Russia and therefore is seen as an “opportunist or economic parasite.” “Mediative” countries such as Brazil and Turkey are presented as saboteurs that help Iran out of tougher sanctions. Israel is
practically excluded from the articles but when they are mentioned they say they will only act (one assumes militarily) if faced with an Iranian threat. The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and its inspectors are portrayed positively except when not making themselves a roadblock to Iran. The researchers also posit that the editorial staff of the *Economist* makes its voice heard in the overall argument(s) being employed in the articles which use the above actors. They suggest that the staff argues for tougher sanctions on Iran with the end in mind that they will abandon their nuclear ambitions. Minor actors defined by their association with Iran or the West include: Hizbullah which is represented as a terrorist puppet organization of Iran; Hamas, also a terrorist puppet organization of Iran; Iranian people, “marginally alluded to” as the “youth;” the Middle East in general, shown damagingly as a volatile region; and Iran’s Revolutionary Guard which is in place to “protect the regime” (p. 734).

Rasti and Sahragard employed the five discursive strategies of Wodak (2001) wherein construction of those considered insiders or outsiders are developed via naming, qualities attributed to their actions, argumentative strategies deployed by or against them, how they are perceived in relation to a certain aspect of reality, and how action is allayed or intensified depending upon the standpoint taken towards it. But the researchers fuse these five Categories down to three which are expressed by their research questions: How are the social actors involved in Iran’s nuclear case nominated and/or evaluated in a typical Western paper (*The Economist*)? Which party(s) will the patterns of nomination or prediction (dis)favor? How are the actions and/or reactions thereof – in this particular regard, the act of Iran’s seeking to avail itself of nuclear installations – delegitimized? How are the actions of the major agents “perspectivated?” In what ways is their “perspectivation” mitigated or intensified (p. 731)?
As with previously examined research, Rasti and Sahragard also argue that the excerpts from the *Economist* work to present the West in a positive way while presenting Iran in a negative way. This case is also argued to describe those from the West who do not support the overall argument of tougher sanctions against Iran. Thus an “us vs. them” dichotomy is presented. The researchers point to frequent use of “hit” verbs such as “slap” in reference to administering sanctions on Iran (p. 736). Further, the researchers point to the use of conceptual metaphors to “accentuate” this dichotomy. Quoting Andrew Goatly (Goatly, 1997), the authors describe this use of metaphors as “not a mere reflection of […] objective reality but a construction of reality through a categorization entailing the selection of some features as critical and others as non-critical … metaphors can consciously be used to construct … reality.”

The researchers list the following as the more frequently used metaphors: metaphors of dilution in reference to China and Russia and their attempt to “water down” sanctions on Iran thus disassociating themselves from the West; metaphors of trade wherein groups involved in this case are described as “haggling” or “bargaining” and for Iran’s part there is a “high cost” incurred; metaphors of legality which add to the image of Iran acting illicitly (“suspect,” “rule-breaking”) and deserving of punishment from the IAEA under whose “custody” they are; metaphors of pressure which imply a “squeeze” being applied to Iran which should be “tighter;” parasite metaphors particularly showing Russia and China and their relationship with Iran; metaphors of pain, violence, and attack which represent sanctions as “hurting” or “biting;” (p. 737) animalizing metaphors which depict Iran as the “weaker” animal contrasted with the West as the “stronger” animal, the IEAE depicted as the UN’s “watchdog” and Iran as a cat to be chased, the president of Iran is said to be “cocky;” metaphors of age wherein Iran’s oil installations and revolution are shown to be “decrepit and in need of rejuvenation;” gaming
metaphors where groups involved are depicted as playing “chess” or “billiards” and at which President Obama is painted as “fumbling;” double-dealing metaphors which show Iran “fixing” elections and involved in the black-market; body-part metaphors which show President Ahmadinejad as “clench-fisted” evoking “head-scratching;” time metaphors which depict Iran as “killing time” in negotiations in order to expedite their bomb making progress; building and gate metaphors depicting Iran as a closed property with perhaps one “window” open for negotiations and as a nuclear “gate-crasher;” racing metaphors which show Iran speeding to the finish line as a world nuclear power; and lastly, fire metaphors which portray Iran as having a “fiery” president and working in a “combustible Caucasian region” (p. 738).

Rasti and Sahragard then go into more detail about the use of such metaphors and how they bolster the Iran-West dichotomy presented by the *Economist*. The researchers return to the issue of the Iranian public not being included in these articles by showing them reacting dramatically in response to the actions of their government. They are presented as acting homogenously rejecting the actions of President Ahmadinejad and his regime. The negative ascriptions given to Iran are listed as follows: friendlessness due to Iran being complicit in acts of terrorism, failing to comply with the wishes of the rest of the world, and the xenophobia of President Ahmadinejad; indifferent to its own people; has the goal to build and use a nuclear weapon thus causing world nuclear warfare; egotistical about its own capacities and potentials; corrupt national elections; provokes other countries; seeking to “wipe Israel off the map” and harm American interests all over the world; uncooperative with IAEA inspectors; funding Hamas and Hizbullah; neglectful of its own ailing economy; life in Iran is on edge, unstable; human rights abuses (p. 740).
In contrast the following positive ascriptions are made about the west and its allies: Israel and America will/may take pre-emptive military action if faced with a threat from Iran; the west is portrayed as trying to build confidence in nuclear negotiations; the west is depicted as patient toward Iran and President Obama as “stretching out his hand” to them; the west is shown to react positively to other countries’ peaceful nuclear programs (p. 741).

In analysis of the argumentative strategies at play concerning the articles upon which Rasti and Sahragard focus, the researchers say “[a]ny argumentative strategy serves a legitimatory or delegitimatory purpose” (p. 741). That is to say that any argument either endorses or invalidates a course of action. On page 742 of their study the researchers use an excerpt to show how the Economist in one of its articles attempts to draw a parallel between Iran and the former communist Russian regime the USSR. Both Iran and the USSR made threats to the west and now the latter is no more. These re-interpretations of the words of these leaders are categorized by the researchers as “fragmented speech,” a theory borrowed from Alla Smirnova (Smirnova, 2009) which suggests that arguments are sometimes constructed from quotes and texts taken out of context. Many of the excerpts utilize what Van Leeuwen refers to as “time-summons legitimation” whereby the author attempts to instill in the reader a sense of urgency (T Van Leeuwen, 1996). This urgency can manifest itself in the potential action of the reader to place pressure on their representatives and elected officials to act in the way that the author sees fit. In this case the urgency appears as a threat of nuclear war on the horizon. Further, the idea that Iran is attempting to draw-out negotiations for as long as possible in order to buy time to complete its nuclear ambitions is also part of this “time-summons” to action. Other such warrants (borrowing from Wodak, 2001) are inferred by the researchers from the articles which were the focus of their research (p. 743). These include: uselessness/disadvantage wherein a
nuclear Iran is seen to be the antithesis of a homogenous world set against the idea; definition and/or name interpretation wherein a ‘tag’ is given to the name of that which is to be reinterpreted such as “nuclear Iran” or “least safe region in the world” which lends to the argument that the addition of nuclear capabilities in such a region would only add to its instability; danger (“the most frequent warrant”) which is reminiscent of a hot stove that needs to be handled cautiously; justice wherein the idea of Iran using nuclear technology for peaceful purposes (those which benefit civilians) is posited as acceptable; responsibility, particularly of the IEAE in investigating and punishing Iran; burdening wherein the government of Iran is portrayed as burdening further a public which is already over-burdened due to a weak economy; finances wherein economic pressures will increase for Iran from the rest of the world unless it cooperates; reality which in this case emphasizes the better possibility of economic sanctions rather than military action thus sustaining the author’s/paper’s stance on the issue; numbers of which the most frequent use posited by the researchers is the amount of enriched uranium that Iran has and how much more they need in order to produce a nuclear weapon; law wherein Iran is said to have broken international law; authority wherein authorities representing the west are legitimimized and those allied with Iran are delegitimized; history wherein Iran’s nuclear ambitions are “juxtaposed with those of other nuclear pariahs”; abuse wherein Iran is depicted as being guilty of human rights abuses toward their own citizens therefore they cannot be trusted with a nuclear program (p. 745).

Rasti and Sahragard then move to analyze strategies of perspectivization and intensification/mitigation. For example, use of “obscure agency” or “agentless passive voice” enables potential attacks on a subject to be viewed apart from their attacker thus giving the impression that the chaos caused by such attacks are the fault of the victim. The researchers
posit that reference to “mayhem in Iraq” is such a mitigation (p. 745). The researchers argue that “Iran’s leaders have been referred to as ‘ayatollah’s’; a ‘religionym’ (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001) that suggests that Iran is not run by unbiased, objective minds but by “religious figures who are ideologically oriented” (p. 746). Also, the use of indeterminate adverbs such as “widely” to describe those in opposition to Iran adds to the intensification of the west’s perspective without holding oneself responsible to name specific names.

Rasti and Sahragard’s work concludes with a few points: the overall argumentation strategies involved in the articles analyzed push for more sanctions against Iran; Iran is given the image of a “rogue regime” thus perpetuating a “polarized world”; discussions of other nuclear nations who have promised to reduce and even eliminate nuclear weapons was not included by any author suggesting such a topic is irrelevant; the Iranian public seems to be excluded from the articles in question in terms of their opinion on the matter; Israel is seen as a legitimate country which has the right to defend itself; metaphor is used as a tool to further the author’s/paper’s opinion; (p. 746) the Economist seems to paint as dark a picture it can of Iran.

Mahmood Reza Atai and Mohammad Amin Mozaheb conducted a descriptive-analytic method (see: (Teun A. van Dijk, 2000)) of critique of forty British newspaper editorials about Iran’s nuclear program from 2007-2010. Note that the end or President Bush’s terms and the beginning of President Obama’s terms are included. The editorials were published in the following newspapers: the Guardian, the Daily Telegraph, the Times, the Independent, and BBC. These sources were used due to their “popularity in releasing news in the UK and at the international scale” and their “widespread use in […] learning and instruction as sources of authentic materials by learners, materials writers, and instructors.” Atai and Mozaheb examined their objects at “two levels:” headlines (topics) and full text stories (lexical choice). Further,
investigation was done in regards to “nominalization, passivization, overcompleteness, and voice.” The researchers also attempted to overcome any potential bias in their study by utilizing a third researcher as an “inter-coder” and to provide another perspective. They claim that about 25% of the material pertained to President Bush’s administration while 75% of the material pertained to President Obama’s administration. As with the other studies, Atai and Mozaheb, the researchers, begin with a “quick historical background of Iran’s nuclear program.” Since this history has been previously supplied in this study from several angles it will not be included here. The researchers open with the following questions: “Are there any explicit ideological stances behind linguistic patterns in reports of the British newspapers and news agencies about Iran’s nuclear program from August 2007 (the Bush’s administration) to August 2010 (the Obama’s administration)? Are the actors engaged in the clash on Iran’s nuclear program portrayed positively or negatively in the British editorials? Is there any voice of change in the U.S. policies about Iran’s nuclear program in the British newspapers and broadcast editorials, after the US presidential election in November 4, 2008?”

The researchers begin by reiterating what has been said before in this study by van Dijk about the importance of headlines in bringing certain topics to the front of the readers’ attention. They can act as summaries of what, to the journalist, is the most important aspect of a story and thus frame the knowledge that may be gleaned from the article by the reader. As to the importance of lexical choices, the researchers quote John Richardson in saying “words transmit the mental images of society; they convey two sorts of meanings, connoted as well as denoted meanings. […] nouns, adjectives, verbs, and adverbs carry connoted in addition to denoted meanings” (Richardson, 2007). The researchers then present a table of newspaper headlines and offer the critique that they present the “insider” positively while presenting the “outsider”
negatively all while sharing theme of violence towards Iran. The researchers suggest that the headlines portray Iran as going its “own way” and that any military consequence(s) will be a result of such behavior. One particular headline from the *Independent*, “UN Inspectors to investigate ‘new Iranian nuclear plants’” is called into question by the researchers because of its use of the word “investigate.” They charge that such a word “connotes a close examination in order to find something which is hidden.” In other words, the word connotes suspicious activity by the Iranians. The researchers don’t offer an alternative word and one wonders what such a word might be. It could be the case that Atai and Mozaheb think that the very nature of there being inspections to begin with calls into question the aims of the Iranians and thus there would be no word that would make such inspections seem innocuous. Another headline from the same newspaper uses the word “outcry” in categorizing responses to a message from the “Iranian leader.” Such a word, the researchers argue, “alludes to a sense of animosity” and thus leads the reader into the article already having that perspective. *The Daily Telegraph* uses the phrase “industrial scale” when referring to Iran’s uranium enrichment. This, the researchers conclude, alludes to non-civilian use of nuclear power and the word “industrial” has a certain sense of threat that it carries toward nature and human life. Even phrases that appear to show Iran’s side of the story such as “Iranian leader accuses US of plotting against Iran” from the *BBC* is suspect to Atai and Mozeheb. They say the word “accuses,” “implies that the ‘plot of the U.S.’ against Iran is not true.” Which in turn, suggests that they believe the “plot” is or at least should be assumed to be true but they do not offer any reason as to why. Another example from the same source uses the phrase “come clean” in reference to Iran’s nuclear activities. The researchers suggest that such language make [President] Bush look like a “dictator.” They do not go on to explain how such language might give that connotation. *The Guardian* uses the phrase “evasive
blame game” to describe Iran’s language about their own nuclear activities. This suggests according to the researchers that the Iranians are hiding something.

In the next set of headlines, the researchers point out the “prevalent” use of words such as “warn” suggest a potential “military attack” if the Iranians do not heed the warnings. Also, the word “reject” is used, the researchers suggest, to “intimate that Iran is headstrong in its decision.” The word “threat” is used several times to describe how America and its allies view Iran and thus justify potential military action. One particular headline attempts to portray the United States as the “insider” willing to protect the Gulf States from Iran (p. 20). All these headlines, Atai and Mozaheb argue, portray Iran as nothing but an evil doer and the United States as the leader for world peace and stabilization.

The researchers move on to the next set of headlines which they say “stress the boastful nature of Iran's claims.” In one example from *The Times*, Atai and Mozaheb are critical of an Israeli general who disbelieves that Iran is a nuclear threat, thus making it seem that Iran is lying about their nuclear program. But this makes it seem like the researchers are trying to make both sides agree with their claim, even those that taken at face value clearly contradict it. On one hand the researchers are critical of those who are charging Iran with lying about having a nuclear weapons program and on the other they are critical of those who deny Iran’s claims about the advanced stage of their nuclear program. The researchers are also critical of the use of the word “claim.” They suggest that using such a word connotes a statement that should not be trusted. Given that the word in question is a commonly used word to denote a statement about truth or falsity, it would behoove the researchers to give more contextual evidence that backs up their statement that the word connotes what they say it does. Otherwise it looks like they are being overly critical by assigning meaning where there does not appear to be any.
Some headlines emphasize the “secrecy” of Iran’s maneuvers, say Atai and Mozaheb. The word, found in several given headlines, “implies that something is concealed illegally.” In addition, the researchers following van Dijk (Teun A. van Dijk, 2009), note that the word “Iran” is placed left-most in each of these headlines. This they say is called “thematization” wherein what is left-most is ideologically opposed to what is right-most in the headline. Thus, portraying the ideological dichotomy between “insiders” and “outsiders.”

Words such as “defiant” and those related to it are also critiqued as showing Iran as a “disobedient” country. Again, reference to “force” and “dangerous” suggest a legitimization of the use of force against a dangerous threat. Along these lines, Atai and Mozaheb point to a theme in the headlines wherein Iran is depicted as a threat to the existence of Israel. Iran is depicted as the main threat to Israel. Indirect reference is made to Iran creating another holocaust. The researchers critique the word “pledge” used in a headline from The Daily Telegraph because it implies that Iran is actually a threat to Israel.

Atai and Mozaheb claim that nine of the forty headlines they analyzed are taken directly from statements made by either President Bush or President Obama. These headlines, particularly those of President Bush, emphasize the threatening nature of the situation. Iran is depicted as being a threat and in turn they are threatened. Secretary Clinton of President Obama’s administration is shown in headlines saying that Iran is a threat to Gulf States and Russia and therefore gives warning. She also categorizes Iran’s alleged pursuit of a nuclear weapon and “hiding a nuclear facility” as “futile” and “absurd.” All of these articles end with the idea that stopping Iran with sanctions or military actions is the answer, say Atai and Mozaheb.

The researchers then move on to full textual analysis. To begin with, lexical choices and thematic patterns are critiqued because they can shape a reader’s “mental image” and thus
“manipulate the reader’s reaction to the content of the news.” They go on to conclude that “‘threat’ [and words related to it] is the most salient term […] associated with Iran” in these articles (p. 23). Reference is made to the United States creating a “defense umbrella” to protect Israel and the Gulf States. The researchers charge that a “careful analysis” of this reference in context suggests that the “defense umbrella” is only for Israel because Iran is Israel’s biggest threat. The researchers do not elaborate on how this phrase therefore applies only to Israel. Then the researchers reiterate that “positive deeds” are only attributed to the United States and its allies including Israel, and that “negative deeds” are only attributed to Iran (p. 24).

Utilizing Roger Fowler et al. (Fowler, Hodge, Kress, & Trew, 1979) Atai and Mozaheb note that “the tendency to prefer noun phrases over verbs in editorials is often ideologically charged.” This is called “nominalization” where a syntactic structure serves to “lead the readers toward a preferred mode of thinking about an event.” In these cases, the researchers posit, the “bad deeds” of the United States and its allies are “blurred” and thus “marginalized.” In turn, such tactics also “enlarge” positive deeds of the “ingroups” and emphasize negative deeds of the “outgroup” Iran. The goal of these nominalizing structures is to emphasize “threat” and “fear” about Iran. Atai and Mozeheb point to words found in The Daily Telegraph articles such as “revelation,” “threatening,” and those found in The Guardian articles such as “pursuing,” “sponsoring,” “defiant,” “binding,” and “warning.” They point to words in The Independent articles such as “condemnations.” The BBC articles contain such words as “concern,” “defiance,” “Iran’s attitude,” and “Iran’s secret construction.” The Times articles contain such words as “Iran’s nuclear trigger.” All of these references, the researchers argue, emphasize “fear” and “threat” posed by Iran.
Atai and Mozaheb then move to analyze passivization occurring in the articles in question. Passivization is a term borrowed from Roger Fowler (Fowler, 1991) wherein a writer can obscure the responsibility of the agent of an action by adjusting the use of noun phrases in such a way that their referent is blurred. Phrases analyzed from The Daily Telegraph articles include “a European official was quoted,” “there have been signs,” and “Iran has previously been caught.” None of these in context appear to have any identifiable referent. Articles from The Guardian include the following non-referent phrases “Iran is said,” and “Ahmadinejad is understood.” An article from The Independent uses the phrase “[i]t is presumed.” Articles in The Times use such phrases as “[t]he documents,” “Iran was forced,” “Iran will also be seized,” “could be seeking,” “was meant,” and “is determined.” None of which have referents. The BBC articles use these non-referent phrases “[t]he IAEA resolution” (supporters are omitted), and “Iran has been given” where again referents are missing.

The researchers then focus upon the tactic of “overcompleteness” in which “ingroups” or the United States and its allies in this case, are given a “positive stance” while the “outgroups” or Iran in this case, are given a negative one. Telltale of this ploy is to include information that may have to direct bearing upon the story at hand. This added information is merely used to help paint the picture, negative or positive, that the writer or editor wants the reader to have after reading the piece. Atai and Mozaheb use as their first examples phrases from The Daily Telegraph in which reference is made to “rents” skyrocketing. The researchers argue that this fact has nothing to do with Iran’s nuclear program other than they may be the result of sanctions. They further suggest the added information is meant to make Iran look like a “poor country.” A reference is also made from this same source to fifteen sailors who were captured by Iran. The researchers say that the article suggests that the sailors were innocent but they conclude that
those captured were “spying” and “obviously flouted international rules.” They do not give evidence for these conclusions (p. 28). The Guardian makes reference to Iran’s “unsettled political situation,” “Iran over unrest after the elections,” “hundreds of arrests,” and “the unrest of the Summer” which the researchers argue are included to show Iran in crisis even though they are not directly related to the nuclear issue.

Atai and Mozeheb then move on to the idea of “voice.” Voice in this sense refers to whether or not the implication given by an author suggests that an agent is being heard. Via their analysis, the researchers conclude that out of 199 instances of voice in their samples, the United States and its allies was heard 152 (76%) times while Iran is heard in 47 (24%) times. Further, the voice of the United States, the researchers posit, is always accompanied by the threat of military action against Iran due to ignorance of international law. As was shown previously, the researchers say that America and its allies are always shown positively and Iran negatively. A table and a graph then follow to show the distribution of samples and voice from the various sources already mentioned. No examples of voice are given in this study however; a discussion of the findings follows (p. 29).

Atai and Mozaheb conclude their study with a discussion verifying their original questions about van Dijk’s us vs. them dichotomy. The ingroup or us is identified with the United States and its allies in these articles and the outgroup or them is identified with Iran. They conclude that each article examined includes the concept of threat towards all us nations and puts Gulf States in “peril” as well. Also included in these articles is the sense that Iran is “rebellious” to the rest of the world and established international law which include concepts of “secrecy, boastfulness, defiance, and jeopardy to Israel.” They also conclude that the headlines project onto the reader the American viewpoint over and above the Iranian viewpoint the latter of which
lacks representation in their objects of study. Iran is presented as responsible for negative deeds while the United States and its allies are hailed as positive deed doers. “Irrelevant” information is included in order to further paint a picture of Iran as a backward, rebellious country (p. 31).

Of particular note is the study done by Moussa Ahmadian and Elham Farahani (Ahmadian & Farahani, 2014). These scholars have attempted to bridge a gap left by scholars who have only focused on American media. Ahmadian and Farahani focus their work on contrasting an American newspaper with an Iranian newspaper. Ahmadian and Farahani examined language of the Deal used in the Los Angeles Times contrasted with that of the Tehran Times to emphasize the “power of language in its ability to change minds.” These particular sources were used not only because they are based in the countries on opposite sides of the Deal, respectively, but also because the former had yet to be analyzed in regards to this subject. The latter is also published in English and in other countries. Both are easily accessible via the internet. The researchers chose a period of time in which to analyze reports about the Deal wherein two important events occurred: the signing of the Deal by Iran, Turkey, and Brazil; and the implementation of more sanctions against Iran by the United Nations. Ultimately, Ahmadian and Farahani analyzed fourteen reports, seven from each source.

The authors posit along with Danuta Reah (Reah, 2002) that “[i]n newspapers, the events are not usually (re)presented as they are in reality, but are represented in a way that the newspapers intend them to be.” Their study begins with an attempt to reinforce Robert Fowler’s idea (Fowler, 1991) that “[n]ews is not just a value-free reflection of facts. Anything that is said or written about the world is articulated from a particular ideological position.” In particular, Ahmadian and Farahani, quoting Chomsky and Herman (Herman & Chomsky, 1988), point to an American media that because they are profit-seeking businesses, are firmly entrenched in a
capitalist, anti-communist system that filters news in such a way that emphasizes the former and de-emphasizes the latter. In other words, the media are prone to propagandize the news. The authors also reference W. Lance Bennett’s theory of indexing (Bennett, 1990) which posits how journalists downgrade reports that seem to be antithetical to government policies with which journalists agree. The concept of news framing, as introduced by Holli Semetko, Patti Valkenburg (Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000), and Robert Entman, is also referenced whereby events are presented by the media in such a way as to make certain facets more striking therefore encouraging certain “problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation,” (Entman, 1993) and thus solutions.

Ahmadian and Farahani then describe a bit of the history of Iran’s nuclear program which will be included here in order to parallel what has been said in the previous chapter. In brief, they explain that prior to the Islamic Revolution of 1979, Iran and the United States had an unsigned cooperative nuclear agreement in which some technology was shared. After the fallout of 1979, Iran then turned to Russia for support. Iran and the West (United States, Great Britain, Russia, and Germany) continued to argue about the purpose of some nuclear facilities which Iran described as peaceful but that the West insisted where military in nature. The authors argue that no evidence was ever found that the facilities were for military purposes and yet the West implemented economic sanctions and boycotts. Around 2006 the then president of Iran made some threats to Israel and the West and announced plans for ten more facilities. The West threatened an attack and these strains continue currently ("World Nuclear Association," 2010).

Ahmadian and Farahani utilized the framework of Teun A. van Dijk (Teun A. van Dijk, 2000) to analyze seven stories from each of these periodicals. The framework consists of an ideological square whereby one party emphasizes positive aspects of themselves or their desires
while de-emphasizing the negative aspects. Concurrently, negative aspects of the other party or their desires are emphasized while positive aspects are de-emphasized. These groupings are presented as “ideological macro-strategies of positive self-presentation” and “negative other-presentation.” (p. 2116) Although the framework of Dijk is concerned with forty discursive strategies, Ahmadian and Farahani apply only eleven to support their macro-strategies of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation. The eleven include: consensus, hyperbole, disclaimer, distancing, history-as-lesson, humanitarianism, implication, illegality, national self-gloryfication, presupposition, and vagueness. A fuller description can be found in their actual study.

The first reports analyzed by Ahmadian and Farahani pertained to the deal signed by Iran, Turkey, and Brazil. In their first article of analysis from the Tehran Times ("Iran, Turkey, Brazil agree on nuclear deal," 2010), the authors point out that the language used: “constructive,” “great success,” “proved diplomacy could still work,” were examples of hyperbole to support positive self-presentation. The authors justify this classification by stating that “later on it proved to be not that much of a success” (p. 2117). They offer no other support for this judgment. In the same article, the researchers reference a section that seems to be ambiguous (my term). The author(s) of the article make use of a quotation in such a way that the reader may not be sure whether or not it belongs to the foreign minister or the author(s) of the article inserting their opinion into the sentence. The researchers posit that the latter is more likely the case without offering any other evidence. Ahmadian and Farahani then move to the parallel article from the Los Angeles Times (P. Richter & Parsons, 2010) where they point out, following a pattern established by Dijk, that the article is framed in such a way that information which expresses positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation tends to come first. The referenced
article begins with ten paragraphs which express “skepticism and indifference” on the part of US officials who are more concerned with “larger issues” concerning Iran’s nuclear program. Only after which is given details about the content of the deal itself. The researchers call this arrangement “highly ideological” (p. 2117). The researchers also note that disclaimers in the form of “apparent concession” (p. 2117) are used in the forefront of the article whereby the deal is acknowledged as a “positive step,” but since it is not as thorough as the deal previously offered by the United States but rejected by Iran it is not enough. Citing the article, the researchers state that “Iran is presented as a country that “does not live up to international obligations”” (p. 2117) and continues to try to develop nuclear weapons. As the researchers point out, these reports from the Tehran Times and the Los Angeles Times present the deal in opposing lights. The latter suggests that the deal is a “ploy” to buy time and prevent further sanctions” (p. 2117) using illegality and disclaimer as the authors’ modus operandi. Whereas, the researchers note, the former uses lexicalization, repetition, and hyperbole to present the deal as a move forward.

The next set of articles that Ahmadian and Farahani analyze pertain to the reaction of Russia after the then President of Iran gave a speech in which he criticized the decision of Russia to side with the US in taking a negative stance toward the Iranian, Brazilian, and Turkish deal. The researchers start with the lead sentence of the article in the Tehran Times itself, “On day after President Ahmadinejad severely criticized Russia for siding with the U.S. on the Tehran nuclear agreement, two top Russians (sic) officials announced that the Kremlin is ready to support the nuclear fuel swap deal signed between Iran, Turkey and Brazil.” ("Russia Supports Iran's Nuclear Fuel Pact," 2010) The “lexical choice[s]” (p. 2118) of the lead sentence, they suggest, prompts the reader to believe that the speech was so powerful that only one day after the speech was given the Russians are moved to change their stance on the deal. The researchers
argue that they cannot locate even one word which might convey a negative response to the speech. Contrastingly, the analogous article in the *Los Angeles Times* is headlined “Russia Lashes Out at Iran” (Stack, 2010). Using *lexicalization, illegality*, and *history-as-a-lesson* the researchers classify the article as fitting into their macro-strategies of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation. Numerous examples are given that exemplify such language from the article such as “dismiss,” “obstinately,” “emotional,” “frustration,” “potential enemy,” “unsatisfactory,” “outraged,” “political demagogy,” “impatience,” and “criticized” (p. 2118). Following the form that Dijk advances, the researchers note that only after all of this negative other-presentation is offered in the article are positive aspects of the Russian-Iranian relationship discussed thus de-emphasizing those aspects. Paraphrasing Dijk, Ahmadian and Farahani advance “[i]nformation that is favorable for or about the own group or unfavorable for the out-group will tend to be topical, important and explicit. Information that portrays us in a negative light will tend to remain implicit, not topicalized, hidden, vague and little detailed” (p. 2119).

The last set of articles that Ahmadian and Farahani analyze are written in response to a fourth round of sanctions implemented by the United Nations. Obviously, Iran voted against those sanctions but so did Turkey and Brazil. All of the western countries, who have the most power and influence at the United Nations, voted in favor of new sanctions. The analysis begins with the *Tehran Times* report ("Iran dismisses resolution, announces plan to produce 20% enriched fuel.,” 2010) which quotes some Iranian officials who convey indifference about the sanctions ("worthless scrap of paper") and negativity, anger, and warning toward the United States. The researchers also note a purposeful “manifestation of power” in the article as well as *legality, consensus, national-glorification* and *presupposition* by calling Iran’s pursuit of a nuclear program a “legal and inalienable right[s],” Iran as one of the “most powerful and stable
countries,” and “hostile actions and pressures by these few powers” (p. 2119). The analysis on the comparable article in the *Los Angeles Times* (P. Richter, 2010) illustrates the new United Nations’ sanctions as a “diplomatic setback” for the United States because they could not get unanimous support. The use of the word “fail” and “punish” in regards to Iran’s illegality is offered as a type of “irony” in that Iran has acted illegally and dangerously, and the world has failed to punish them as it should with a single mind. The analysis portrays *consensus* with the use of the phrase “U.S. officials and many world leaders” and *illegality* with “atomic weapon capability,” (p. 2119). Ahmadian and Farahani conclude that the *Tehran Times* report uses mostly *lexicalization* while the *Los Angeles Times* report used mainly *illegality* thus confirming Dijk that “ideologies impinge on discourse,” (p. 2120).

This last analysis of the *Los Angeles Times* article is difficult to square with Ahmadian and Farahani’s critical framework. Rather than being an example of positive self-presentation the article could arguably be an example of negative self-presentation which contradicts the researcher’s theory. This might suggest a more fundamental underlying intent or value to which the authors of the article are striving. In presenting the Deal as a “failure” the authors seem to be suggesting that even though sanctions went through that the efforts of their government should be seen as not good enough since unanimity was not reached. The potential hazards of such an approach will be more thoroughly discussed at the conclusion of the analysis of Ahmadian and Farahani’s study.

The researcher’s study concludes that the most frequently used approaches in all of these reports that realize their categories of macro-strategies of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation were *lexicalization, presupposition, consensus, hyperbole, illegality*, and *disclaimer* (p. 2120).
Although using a different method of critical discourse analysis, this study of Ahmadian and Farahani has bearing on the current study by helping to establish ideological motivations and manipulations behind the use of language in its wording, presentation, and phrasing. As stated previously, this study will concern itself with the values behind such motivations and manipulations as they are presented, covertly and overtly, in the form of rhetorical claims in television news articles. The hazards of Ahmadian and Farahani’s approach are epistemological in nature. Their study is concerned with an interpretation of reality that remains enigmatic. They present and interpret two contrary views of that reality and as such, as complete representations they could both be wrong or one of them could be completely accurate despite the language and structural concerns that the researchers point out. If both representations are incorrect, then the truth may lay somewhere in-between and this may be what the researchers are trying to convey. As such, underlying values are arguably the foundational structure from which even Ahmadian and Farahani’s categories of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation emerge. As discussed earlier, some values are basic to human beings and others are based upon social contexts of various sorts such as family, nation, and other social groupings which pertain especially if it is accepted that human beings are social creatures. In the analysis at the conclusion of this study, these things will be drawn out of the discourse under consideration.

Nafiseh Hosseinpour and Hossein Heidari Tabrizi (Hosseinpour & Tabrizi, 2016) have done critical discourse-historical work “Inspired by Wodak” (Wodak, 2001) analyzing editorials about Iran’s nuclear program from the New York Times. The researchers quote a piece of scholarship which argues that editorials are good sources to determine a publication’s general stance on issues because they are usually the work of its owners and managers (Bilal, Rafaqat,
Hassan, Mansoor, & Zahra, 2012). Hosseinpour and Tabrizi use a theoretical approach that they posit can determine the implicit and explicit argumentative strategies used in these editorials. The conclusion(s) from reading one of these editorials, they argue, are made manifest in the warrants that they contain (Kienpointner, 1992).

Hosseinpour and Tabrizi begin with a brief foray into the politico-historical context of Iran’s nuclear program. Since this history has been generally covered already, only pertinent items not covered elsewhere will be included here. These scholars do include a part of the IAEA’s November 2003 report (p. 10) which states that while no evidence for building nuclear weapons was found, the report also states that it was “unable to conclude that Iran’s nuclear program was exclusively peaceful” ("Implementation of the NPT Safeguards Agreement in the Islamic Republic of Iran," 2003). There is also inference of how important the West believed slowing down Iran’s nuclear capabilities to be by way of sanctions, sabotage, and assassination (See: (Katzman, 2015; Kerr, 2012)). In 2010, after Iran declared itself a nuclear power, the accord of Iran, Brazil, and Turkey, which has already been discussed, comes into play. Since then, the United States and Iran have come to an agreement, the first such agreement in thirty-six years (Katzman, 2015). Of course, this is what this study is about. Whereas these studies are looking at language between Iran and the United States, this study will concentrate on language between factions in the United States, those who portray the Deal as a good thing, and those who portray the Deal as a bad thing.

The method that Hosseinpour and Tabrizi use is qualitative and quantitative critical discourse analysis. Their subject is fifty-five editorials from the New York Times published from January 2010 to April 2015. The researchers categorized argumentative strategies contained in
the editorials as “advantage,” “disadvantage,” “threat,” “reality,” and “history,” all of which prompt action in response to these conditions (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001).

Hosseinpour and Tabrizi use “advantage” and “disadvantage” first to categorize the claims in editorials which argue that the actions taken by the West are useful even though they include sabotage and assassination. The researchers argue that these claims make “no respect” to “human rights or justice” (p. 244). They go on to claim that the language used in which Iran is trying to free itself of sanctions but the West is trying to slow or halt Iran’s nuclear program “creates an ‘us’ versus ‘them’ ideological dichotomy” (p. 244). “Disadvantages” were categorized as “failure of diplomatic relations,” “Israel extremist policies toward Iran,” “congress opposition to president Obama’s policies,” and “rejecting a permanent deal” (p. 246).

The category of “threat” was used by the researchers to describe the potential of Iran to develop a nuclear warhead, Iran’s threat to close the strait of Hurmoz, and retaliation for the assassination of scientists. Hosseinpour and Tabrizi posit that the initial language of the Iranian threat described by the United States was downgraded in order to make Obama more appealing to the American public due to his re-election bid (p. 246).

Many of these editorials, the researchers claim, assume to be true the “reality” of Iran’s ambition of pursuing a nuclear weapon. Because China and Russia continued business relationships with Iran and the fact that sanctions seemed to be “failing” in regards to slowing or halting Iran’s nuclear program, the researchers advance that “diplomatic negotiations” were presented to the American public as the best route. Thus, if negotiations fail, all that may be left is a military response (p. 247).

Hosseinpour and Tabrizi analyze the history of the use of sanctions as presented by the New York Times in that the author argues that no previous president has been as successful as
President Obama in getting international cooperation and implementation concerning them. The author seems to emphasize the hostile nature of the relationship between Iran and the United States and the current effect of sanctions in order to increase Obama’s “credibility and value” contrasted with previous presidents (p. 248). The conclusion of Hosseinpour and Tabrizi’s study suggests that the New York Times has given methodical handling of these stories in a way that portrays “Persephobia” or fear and mistrust of middle-eastern peoples and countries (Behnam & Zenouz, 2008). Before the United States presidential election, the researchers also argue that the newspaper articles present President Obama as the “savior” of the situation. After the election, the newspaper emphasizes the success of Obama’s efforts in gaining international support and applying sanctions (p. 249).

At this point in this overall study of the Deal, the sources examined have become repetitive in terms of their addition of data. We have examined studies that all use critical discourse analysis in order to establish an underlying theme which motivates the discourse. The studies examined discourse from the Los Angeles Times, the Tehran Times, the New York Times, The Economist, the Guardian, the Daily Telegraph, the Times, the Independent, BBC, ABC, CBS, NBC, FOX, CNN, the Washington Post and USA Today. Thus, these studies cover a wide swath of perspectives and viewpoints from all over the western world but only one from the middle-eastern world. The question remains and is still pertinent to this overall study as to what, if anything, might be motivating these themes even more fundamentally.

**Conclusion**

This chapter began with an explanation of functional theory and its six axioms of classification which describe contextual concerns when analyzing political speech and dialogue. Although these axioms are not entirely abandoned, challengers of functional theory have
suggested that additions to it are necessary to compensate for essential cultural characteristics that they claim the theory cannot capture. But cultures vary, so, a foray into the nature of rhetorical claims and their relationship with values was considered. Many scholars argue that values are inherent in claims. This overall study extends that to suggest that if values are inherent in language then perhaps they are ontological in the sense that they are attached to the definition of human being. If so, then expressed values may be a reflection of some sort of normative standard of treatment pertaining to human beings. If that is the case then analysis of language to determine values expressed would be a more fundamental approach than functional theory alone or with the additions suggested by its challengers. Next, a contemporary political object, the nuclear Deal between Iran and the United States as negotiated by the Obama administration, was chosen to investigate for its expressions of value. The chapter then delves into the contextual history surrounding the Deal and then ends with examples of other investigations into the language of the Deal.

The question that will guide the analysis done in this overall study is based upon the relationship between the categories established by functional theory and the values expressed, albeit implicitly, in the rhetorical claims made therein. What kind of values can be determined from the function of rhetoric and how does determining value build on functional theory?

In the next chapter the theoretical construct behind the method by which the language of the Deal will be collected and analyzed, qualitative content analysis, will be explained. Examples of qualitative content analysis done in past research will be given and explained in terms of their pertinence to this overall study. This will be followed by an explanation of how qualitative content analysis will be applied to the Iran Deal. The chapter will conclude with a description of the texts that will be the objects of analysis.
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CHAPTER III. METHOD

Introduction

The literature review of this overall study of functional claims of the language of the Deal and the values contained therein covered a wide array of media sources. All of the analyses done were textual or dealt with overall content of various texts. The method used here will also be a qualitative content analysis of various texts. The use of functional theory, particularly by Benoit, up to this point has been as a quantitative measure of the qualitative effect of rhetorical persuasion. This study will not be quantitative in nature but rather qualitative. This study will utilize a close content analysis of the values to which the texts and media involved point. In other words, where argument is presented by both or either side whether in print or other media, this study will examine the claims being made and specifically the hierarchy of values to which they appeal, latent or explicit. Particular notice will be taken wherein inductive arguments seem to make deductive claims (where perhaps the latent deductive claim is enthymemic). Where available, analysis will be done on print, radio spots, and television advertisements. It is difficult to differentiate exactly when journalists specifically began covering what is now known as the “Iran Deal” and the events that led up to it but select stories from a variety of media available online beginning around September of 2013 up to and including submission of this study will be examined. Textual, aural, and visual rhetoric will be considered where applicable.

First, some background about qualitative content analysis will be examined. Then a look into some past research that contains methods and approaches of qualitative content analysis that will be utilized in this overall study. Penultimately, how such methods and approaches might be applied to the object(s) of this overall study will be presented. Lastly, the object(s) of focus for this overall study will be specifically named before moving on to analysis itself.
Qualitative Content Analysis

Qualitative content analysis, which includes interpretive, ethnographic, and naturalistic investigation, tends to avoid mathematical computations to uncover meaning from events that might be too complex for such simplifications. In this way, it is thought, the contextual implications might be better preserved and included in terms of their impact. John Van Maanen (1983) has an apt description of qualitative research when he describes it as an “umbrella term covering an array of interpretive techniques which seek to [. . .] come to terms with the meaning, not the frequency, of certain more or less naturally occurring phenomena in the social world” (p. 9). Norman Denzin and Yvonna Lincoln (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000) add that qualitative research “crosscuts disciplines, it contains ambiguous phenomena that bridge theory and method, it has no particular defining method,” however, it uses “aesthetic forms of montage (in which images of social life are juxtaposed to create a larger narrative” (p. 1).

John Lofland differentiates qualitative research by the kinds of questions asked by those engaged in it, “qualitative analysis is addressed to the task of delineating forms, kinds, and types of social phenomena; of documenting in loving detail the things that exist” (p. 13). The methods found in qualitative analysis “converge on issues of how humans articulate and interpret their social and personal interests” (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002)( p. 19). Paul Ricoeur (Ricoeur, 1977) notes that social action, as also in written text, contains intention, good or bad. When interpreting meaning, investigators often trace inferences to other texts, qualitative researchers investigate texts for emotions, thoughts, and motives (p. 322).

Uncovering motives or attempting to understand texts from an actor’s point of view is paramount in drawing conclusions from qualitative research. Wilhelm Dilthey (Dilthey, 1974) first called this type of approach verstehen or gaining an empathetic insight into others’
perspectives. Precursor to Dilthey, Immanuel Kant (I. Kant, 1929) argued that perception of the world by human beings is mediated by conceptual categories which form an epistemological framework by which we form inquiries about reality. Verstehen was, in part, a response to the positivist influences of the time wherein hard science was seen as the only reliable source of knowledge.

Influenced by this re-turn to a humanistic approach, hermeneutics, which was traditionally used to interpret ancient scripture, became a favored method to interpret the meaning of a text by empathetically envisaging the experience of its author to derive insight (Ricoeur, 1977; Schwandt, 2000). Anthony Kerby (Kerby, 1993) claims that the first scholar to look to hermeneutics for use other than in scriptural exegesis was Friederich Schleiermacher. Bernhard Radloff (Radloff, 1993) describes as circular the textual situation that validates the use of a hermeneutical approach posited by Schleiermacher, “[i]nterpretation moves in a circle. In order to understand the word, the sentence must be understood and vice versa; striving to understand an author’s work, we attempt to unfold it sentence by sentence, but the sentence remains opaque unless we have already grasped, by a leap in advance, its rhetorical function in the whole of the work” (p. 550). In other words, as put by Schleiermacher, interpretation involves continually comparing the whole to its parts and vice versa. The philosophical approach of hermeneutics places emphasis on verstehen as vital to the human condition and places dialogue at the forefront to elucidate and convert biases that might hinder knowledge. Clifford Geertz (Geertz, 1973) suggests that such work in hermeneutics could promote “mutual intelligibility” between cultures.

Often indirectly associated with these concepts, Edmund Husserl pursued the “essence” of the objects of human perceptions in his work. Using terms of his own, Husserl posited that
human beings use standards, and abstractions of repeated situations. He further argued that finding such essences could reduce the intricacy of interactions and potentially increase their predictability (Husserl, 1931). Husserl’s method of understanding what seems “natural” to human beings, specifically in terms of social interaction but also in terms of where the former and the natural world collide, he called “transcendental reduction.” James Anderson (J. A. Anderson, 1987) calls Husserl’s approach a “purified form of scientific induction.” Alfred Schutz argues that the issue of understanding and dialoguing about a mutually shared reality or an intersubjective world comes from the assumption that humans share knowledge about its essential characteristics. Thus, they assume perspective reciprocation (Schutz, 1967). Martin Heidegger and Hans-Georg Gadamer take the potential of hermeneutic inquiry even further. They claim that hermeneutic inquiry reveals texts in terms of their ontological significance in the nature of human existence. They see interpretation, the quest to understand, as a basic, unceasing activity of human existence (Gadamer, 1976, 1982; Heidegger, 1962). Therefore, in terms of this overall study, values, as they are revealed by examining linguistic rhetorical claims, might reveal ontological significances about humanity. Matthew Hyde and C. R. Smith (Hyde & Smith, 1979) posit that rhetoric has as its ontological function “to ‘make known’ meaning both to oneself and to others” (p. 348). “[S]howing [. . .] understanding by interpretation, such that meaning is made known, is rhetoric in its purest sense; it is how rhetoric originates as a fundamental condition of human existence” (p. 354). In other words, human beings make meaning by comparing what is being discovered or investigated with what is already known. The language used in this comparison is persuasive in nature. As Kenneth Burke stated “Wherever there is persuasion, there is rhetoric. And wherever there is ‘meaning’ there is ‘persuasion’” (Burke, 1950)(p. 172).
All of this is not to say that qualitative procedures and conclusions drawn from them are not in any way contested. Robert Craig (Craig, 1999) argues that due to its interdisciplinary approach, qualitative theories and their application are often debated. Thus, as Mats Alvesson and Stanley Deetz (Alvesson & Deetz, 1996) point out, there tends to be no prior consensus about the acceptability of blending theories of various fields, such as blending value theory and functional theory in this overall study. Rather, onus is upon the researcher to explain the appropriateness of such a move.

Along these lines, a particular challenge to the conclusions drawn by qualitative research is that it is possible to come to different interpretations from the same data depending upon the perspective of the researcher (Heider, 1988). The constraints of the theory(s) used may help in this regard as long as those constraints do not corrupt the integrity of the data. In other words, a qualitative researcher may recognize that data may have multiple levels of meaning but in focusing in on one level via the theory(s) incorporated they hope to add to the overall understanding of the entirety of the meanings present. Ultimately, the object of investigation such as the definition of a human being or human communication, is too complex for one theory to explain it in its entirety. Rather, the goal is to add to the body of definitions, not provide a final, complete summary to end all summaries. Where such additions seem to contradict, then this is impetus for further investigation and might lead to deeper insight.

This section introduced qualitative content analysis as the method that will be used in this overall study. The method is an attempt to preserve the complexity of data rather than simplify it in a way that leaves important features out of interpretation. Qualitative content analysis tends to be interdisciplinary and thus tends also to have no prior agreement among its users or the various fields from which it borrows as to application and blending of theories. Essential to content
analysis is *verstehen* or understanding wherein an attempt is made by a researcher to view something from another’s perspective. Verstehen guided by a hermeneutical approach to close reading of texts moves reciprocally back and forth from specifics to contextual generalities in order to glean out as close as one can, the meaning intended by the author(s). Some scholars believe that this approach can work to promote cross-cultural understanding. Further, other scholars think that the reason that a hermeneutical approach to understanding in qualitative analysis is effective cross-culturally is that it reveals human essences or standards. In other words, it reveals ontological human characteristics. Next, a look into some studies that have used qualitative content analysis to see it in action.

**Qualitative Content Analysis in Past Research**

The texts presented in chapter 2 “Language of the Deal” tend to mix qualitative and quantitative analysis wherein a classification of language is made using theoretical categories by researchers and then the text(s) placed in those categories were enumerated. Conclusions and predictions were then drawn by those enumerations. As stated previously, the approach used in this overall study will be qualitative in that any numerical coding employed will be further explained by inductive analysis. Examples of the use of functional theory in both its use of qualitative categories and quantitative analysis have already been provided in chapter 2. Although, at the time of this writing, there have been no analyses done combining functional and value theories, the following studies might help to demonstrate qualitative content analysis as a method and particularly what role they play in this overall study. Qualitative content analysis is employed across disciplines and in their respective sub-disciplines. Recent examples and their bearing on this overall study will be given from the humanities, social sciences, and sciences. These will be presented according to their bearing on this overall study, namely: research
framework; definitional considerations; search technique(s) and data filtering; text selection; and theme derivation. A more in-depth treatment of the application of the pertinent information to this overall study will be presented in the next section.

Nicole Glenn, C. C. Champion, and John Spence (Glenn, Champion, & Spence, 2012), performed a qualitative content analysis of online news media and the comments provided by readers of that media as it pertained to weight loss surgery. They begin by pointing out that media affects public opinion and policy direction. They also note that obesity and its “only effective long-term solution,” weight-loss surgery, are increasing in Canada. The researchers’ goal was to understand the dominant messages conveyed. They used articles from the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation website and found that while the articles were predominantly positive, reader comments were predominantly negative. As it pertains to this overall study, Glenn et al’s study is a good demonstration of inductive categories derived from data combined with deductive categories from previous research. This overall study will use virtue-categories induced from data which has been placed in deduced categories from previous research on functional theory. This overall study will borrow from Glenn et al’s research questions which are inherent in the decontextualization process, the first stage of the research framework (see next study). A more direct account of the inherent nature of Glenn et al’s research questions within the overall framework’s first stage will occur in the next section.

Glenn et al introduce the medical problem that they are trying to understand better. They claim that obesity is on the rise in Canada suggesting that it has doubled since 1980. They also state that diet and exercise have not helped to reduce the problem but that bariatric surgery has. The researchers then point out the importance of online media as a source for information. They
also posit that “[r]esearch indicates that media representations reveal existent social values including those that promote stigmatization and discrimination” (p.126).

Glenn et al present their method as one which was conducted using “inductive” categories derived from data and “deductive” categories derived from previous research. In describing their method, they quote Robert Weber (Weber, 1983) stating that content analysis “[is] to make inferences about some characteristic of a message, its source and/or its audience from its content” (p. 126).

After giving sample filtering information that they used to look for related articles the researchers explain their process. They first read the articles to enable “immersion in the topic and data” and to determine the “appropriateness of the [research] questions” (p. 127). Then each line was examined following four research questions: (i) what is the primary/dominant intent of the message; (ii) who is speaking (i.e. voice); (iii) who is the target audience; and (iv) what is the tone of the article or comment?” Glenn et al define “tone” as “supportive/unsupportive; aggressive/passive; negative/positive/neutral)” (p. 127).

As to the findings concerning their first research question, the researchers concluded that four main themes were prevalent: providing information or opinion related to obesity; responses to the authors or other commentators; providing information or opinion on weight loss surgery; and sharing personal narratives (p. 127). The second research question concerned who was speaking. The researchers found three distinct voices: anonymous; self-proclaimed experts; and those who revealed their names (p. 128). The third research question dealt with the intended audience. The researchers posit that the intended audiences were the general readership, other commentators, and specific others such as parents, politicians, and doctors. The fourth research
question had to do with tone. The researchers found that most of the text was negative and the least amount were neutral with positive comments falling in between.

Glenn et al then discuss these findings in which they provide commentary on what meanings they have inferred from them and then reveal limitations to their study. They admit that their sample size was small in that it came from only one website and therefore not generalizable to other websites or contexts. They suggest that their findings are impetus for further studies which are broader in scope.

Glenn et al conclude their study by stating that it is the first of its kind to explore this topic as an online text. They also suggest that they have provided bedrock for further inquiry in this area that is broader in scope with the goal of generalizability. They mention another study that found that commentary did vary according to news source. So, they hope that such further studies will help to overcome “stereotyping, discrimination, bias, and stigma” and that in turn will make seeking help easier for those suffering from this condition (p. 130).

This study provides an example of the type of online, inductive textual analysis that this overall study will utilize, although the content is different as well as the contextual concerns. Concerning this overall study, deductive categories will be taken from functional theory to facilitate inductive analysis. This will be further explained later. This overall study will examine online statements in an inductive, hermeneutical fashion to exhume the values that underlie the manifest text. What follows is a more through account of the type of framework that this overall study will utilize.

Mariette Bengtsson (Bengtsson, 2016) attempts to describe the qualitative content analysis research process from planning to presentation while emphasizing credibility in nursing. She argues that credibility concerns begin immediately at the planning stage and that all
resources must be identified as well as any potential personal biases of which the researcher may be aware. She posits that any meaning drawn from data must be “realistic” and that choice of analysis must be made from a broad surface structure (manifest) and deep structure (latent). She describes four main stages for qualitative content analysis in nursing: decontextualization, recontextualization, categorization, and compilation (p. 8). As it pertains to this overall study, these are the stages which will be utilized, a more direct treatment of which will take place in the next section. Further, operative definitions provided in Bengtsson’s study in terms of the inductive, deductive, manifest, and latent processes involved will also be used in this overall study. A more direct treatment of the relationship of these terms and processes will take place in the next section.

Bengtsson’s study begins with a treatment of what she calls “external” resources which include economics, time, and informants. “Internal” resources are considered when working with a team such as knowledge and ability. Citing Satu Elo et al (Elo et al., 2014; Long & Johnson, 2000), she then moves to the problem of researcher bias and emphasizes the need to consider “pre-understanding” to minimize unfairness in planning and analysis. Having “preconceived knowledge of the subject and to be familiar with the context can be an advantage as long as it does not affect the informants or the interpretation of the results [. . .] the researcher needs to understand both the context and the circumstances in order to detect and take into account misrepresentations that may crop up in the data” (Catanzaro, 1988)(p. 8). Bengtsson then lists various types of qualitative methods often used in nursing research such as phenomenology, hermeneutics, grounded theory, ethnography, phenomenographic and content analysis. Quoting Klaus Krippendorf (Krippendorff, 2004), the researchers explain content analysis to be “a research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from texts (or other meaningful
matter) to the contexts of their use” (p. 18). Similarly, Barbara Downe-Wamboldt (Downe-Wamboldt, 1992) is quoted as saying that as a research method content analysis “provides a systematic and objective means to make valid inferences from verbal, visual, or written data in order to describe and quantify specific phenomena” (p. 314).

Bengtsson then begins to describe and explain the steps involved in the planning phase in terms of qualitative content analysis in nursing. Aside from knowing what one wants to find out, how, and from whom, a decision must be made in terms of an inductive or a deductive approach. Bengtsson describes the former as “developing conclusions from collected data by weaving together new information into theories” whereas the latter involves “testing hypotheses or principles” (p. 10). Further, in nursing, Bengtsson explains, the researcher must continually consider the aim, the sample and units of analysis, choice of data collection method, choice of data analysis method, and practical implications. The types of text can include interviews, written data, pictures and films. Thus, for this overall study, there is an established tradition upon which to rely in justifying the use of such media for analysis. Bengtsson notes that content analysis can be qualitative, quantitative, deductive, or inductive, or any combination of these approaches. A nursing researcher can also choose between manifest analysis, where exactly what the informant says is important, or a latent analysis, where investigation is “extended to an interpretive level in which the researcher seeks to find the underlying meaning of the text” (p. 10). There are also ethical implications involved with nursing research where there are often human subjects involved. Steps must be taken in order to protect them and their privacy. Paraphrasing Phillip Burnard (Burnard, 1995), Bengtsson notes that the “researcher can never be certain that the method of data collection provides data that capture the real context of the informants. The words used by the informants may not correspond to the researcher’s view of
their meaning. Other misrepresentations may arise due to the informants not telling the whole truth, or their being unable to express themselves, or their being affected by what they think the researcher wants to hear” (p. 11). This, it would seem, is the risk with all qualitative analysis and is perhaps due to the inherent interpretive nature of language itself. In terms of data analysis, Bengtsson explains that in the field of nursing, opinions differ about the use of concepts, procedures, and interpretation but that a valid study “truthfully reflect[s] the phenomena” (p. 11). Reliability, for nursing, in a qualitative study “requires that the same results would be obtained if the study were replicated” however, “there is always a risk that different researchers draw dissimilar conclusions from the same data” (p. 11).

The first of the four main stages that Bengtsson explains is decontextualization. She explains that the researcher must familiarize themselves with the entire text to “obtain the sense of the whole” first. Then “meaning units” can be derived from “constellations” of text comprising characteristics correlated to one another in terms of the overall research question(s) (p. 11). The process in nursing then involves some type of coding wherein all of these meanings can be worked with more easily. Codes that are created inductively often change as the process progresses in order to better capture latent ideas. She emphasizes the human element in interpretation over and above use of software which may make coding easier.

The second main stage, recontextualization, is the process of double-checking the units of meaning with the whole text for accuracy and to make sure nothing pertinent is left out.

The third main stage is categorization which involves “condensing meaning units [. . .] based on theoretical assumptions” to create “themes” (p. 12). Bengtsson explains that the researcher “knows when the categorization is good enough” or “finished” when “a reasonable explanation has been reached” (p. 12). In other words, categorization can be said to be completed
when a logical inference can be made between the categories and the data they are said to represent.

The fourth stage, compilation, is the process of explaining the meaning(s) uncovered by the analysis done. Bengtsson states “[i]n phenomenological and hermeneutical based studies, the researcher focuses on exploring how the informants make sense of experience and transform experiences into consciousness” (p. 12). She goes on to explain that this process involves finding the “essence” of the text. In a manifest analysis, constant reference back to the original text is vital. In a latent analysis, the researcher must contemplate the meanings underlying the actual text by considering it within its contextual circumstances.

Bengtsson concludes her study with a summary of the benefits of qualitative content analysis as it applies to the field of nursing. The concepts in this study are important to consider in that they are cross-applicable to other fields that utilize the same method and also find it beneficial. The current overall study is no exception. As stated earlier, this overall study will utilize the stages from Bengtsson as well as definitions of inductive and deductive, manifest and latent processes and information. The following study provides input for this overall study in terms of the importance of the consideration of values in communication and decision making.

The study conducted by Esther Bernhofer, Rose Hosler, and Diana Karius (Bernhofer, Hosler, & Karius, 2016) is of particular relevance because it concerns the effect(s) of values in a certain communicative setting and the need to measure such instances qualitatively. This overall study has as its aim the consideration of the impact of values on communication. Further, this overall study will borrow from Bernhofer et al in terms of the operational definition of value as it is used here. This study examined written responses to questions posed to nurses regarding any practice changes they have made to caring for patients with pain after participating in a class that
included a segment on personal values. The researchers utilized a qualitative content analysis of the written responses of twenty clinical registered nurses from a large midwestern healthcare system. From the answers provided to two open-ended questions, Bernhofer et al identified four main themes: understanding the patient, the importance of pain education, nurse’s self-awareness, and interpretation of personal values. They concluded that nurses who learned how their personal values affect their pain management decisions described new insights into their own approach to pain management.

Bernhofer et al begin by defining the issue of pain and its management in healthcare. They describe it as a subjective phenomenon for both nurse and patient and thus miscommunication can arise between these two parties which can then lead to less than optimal care. They state that despite regular education and good results from such education, there remains an unsatisfactory result in pain management. The researchers are attempting to describe and possibly lessen this gap by suggesting that acknowledging and understanding personal values may be what is missing in education. Citing Sabine Goethals, Chris Gastmans, and Bernadette Dierckx de Casterlé (Goethals, Gastmans, & Dierckx de Casterlé, 2010), Bernhofer et al argue that “personal values contribute greatly to decision-making behavior” and so must be considered in pain management education. Further, citing Myriam Hunink et al (Hunink et al., 2014) the researchers agree that “[v]alue judgments underlie virtually all clinical decisions.” They continue by citing the research of Adam Hirsch, Mark Jensen, and Michael Robinson (Hirsch, Jensen, & Robinson, 2010) which concluded that nurses may not even be aware of the influence their own values have on their decisions and thus this factor left unaddressed will prevent potential change in practice despite other knowledge factors (p. 385).
Bernhofer et al, then turn to explaining their method which is based upon Shalom Schwartz’ Theory of Basic Human Values (Schwartz, 2012). This theory states that there are values common to all cultures, they are expressed according to the priority of the individuals, and that they therefore can explain behavior. The researchers define “values” for the purpose of their study as “the level of importance placed on an idea or situation” (p. 386).

The researchers then provide their research questions which include: How do nurses who participated in a pain class that included a segment on the importance of examining the clinician’s own values and decision-making styles describe their pain care decision-making experiences before and after attending the class, and how do they describe whether or not how understanding their personal values affected choosing resources to provide pain care to their patients? Unlike the previous studies reviewed in this overall paper, this particular study did not use a word-count but rather what they term a “conventional” qualitative content analysis. Bernhofer et al suggest that they found the latter to be more appropriate than the former in terms of answering their research questions, particularly since “little is known” about their subject matter. They collected their data via returned emailed questions and concluded collection once no new themes emerged from the data thus achieving saturation. The researchers then provide credentials in terms of their qualifications to perform qualitative analysis as well as credibility of the data and analysis process. This is followed by a copy of the email that was sent with the two, open-ended questions as well as some answer samples (p. 387).

---

4 For a supporting study see: Seedhouse, David (Seedhouse, 2005). Values-Based Decision-Making for the Caring Professions. West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons.
Bernhofer et al then provide their results. They found four main themes: understanding the patient, importance of pain education, nurse’s self-awareness, and interpretation of personal values. The first of these themes revealed that the nurses concluded that more time and communication was needed in order better understand the perspectives of the patients in terms of pain measurement and meaning. The second theme found that through education of both nurses and patients about pain and the values that might be behind its expression, better management might be possible. The third theme revealed that many nurses learned of their own philosophies on pain and how that can affect how they manage the pain of others who might have a different philosophy. Thus, they were able to look for a way to acceptably adjust their practice by “work[ing] within the boundaries of each of [their: nurse and patient] differences.” The fourth and last theme found that while many judged values-education to be rewarding, few defined which values they found helpful with the exception of “respect” (p. 389).

Bernhofer et al then discuss their findings. The first theme, understanding the patient, was judged to be a value in and of itself. The second and third themes had some joint findings in that nurses became aware of their own need for further education thus increasing their self-awareness. Borrowing from Meg Rohan (Rohan, 2000), in reference to those nurses who responded defensively or dismissively, the researchers state “even if defined as the level of importance, [values] cannot be completely separated from the idea of ethics and personal moral standards, because those ethics and standards determine the level of importance placed on an idea, activity, or belief” (p. 389). Bernhofer et al do mention that there were a small number of nurses who did not find the values education segment helpful and would rather have had more technical information concerning pain management.
As they conclude their study, Bernhofer et al describe the limitations and implications of their findings which include, among others, inadequate generalizability. But this they qualify by noting that qualitative analysis is not designed for generalizability but rather examination of the “experiences of a unique group.” They also admit that some of the questions may have been leading and that written responses lack sufficient tone and facial expression data. They also recommend that more values-education be implemented earlier in the training process before nurses are licensed. They suggest that more specificity is needed in terms of which values are to be promoted in the profession. Nurses who enacted changes in their practice(s) did so voluntarily but if such changes result in improved metrics then an attempt should be made to standardize values-training throughout the field (p. 390-391).

The study by Bernhofer et al is particularly important in this overall study because it utilizes a qualitative metric of values in a similar way to what will be done in this overall study although the object and context are different. The implications of the Bernhofer et al study have as its goal a contribution to the change in the practice of nurses for the better. This overall study also has as its goal a contribution to the understanding of how values play a role, indeed perhaps an unavoidable role, in the claims that human beings make particularly in the Iran Deal. This, in turn, may contribute to the overall understanding of values as they pertain to human beings in communication and ontologically. The next example provides definition of various types of approaches to qualitative content analysis in terms of credibility.

Chareen Snelson presents information about the usage and trends of qualitative and mixed methods used in social media research (Snelson, 2016). Snelson investigates research published from 2007-2013 totaling 55 of 229 articles which were identified as using qualitative and quantitative (or mixed) methods of analysis. Snelson used a qualitative content analysis
approach to glean the data from these articles to determine that the most commonly used research approaches involved collecting data from people through interview, focus group, and survey methodologies. The second most used approach was determined to be qualitative content analysis which utilized Facebook posts, Tweets (Twitter posts), YouTube videos, or other social media content as a data source. As it pertains to this overall study, Snelson’s search technique(s) and data filtering ideas will be utilized to determine applicable texts and relevant verbiage. A more direct treatment of the application of Snelson’s techniques will occur in the next section.

Snelson begins by discussing how social media and research concerning it is widely used and still trending upward. Scholars, Snelson says, are interested in how social media impacts contemporary society. Snelson provides an overview in the form of a table in which she lists the fields in which mixed method approaches are being utilized in studying social media impact. These include: sociology, psychology, economics, education, health care, information systems, advertising, communication, marketing, public relations, tourism, hospitality, nursing, and other interdisciplinary fields and research. Some of these studies focus on categorization of trends. Others focus on field-specific topics such as adolescent well-being, health-care professionals, type 1 diabetes, or prediction of events (p. 2). Snelson describes a mixed-method approach as one in which a researcher “gathers both quantitative (closed-ended) and qualitative (open-ended) data, integrates the two and then draws interpretations based on the combined strengths of both sets of data to understand research problems.” Snelson asks the questions, “what are the overall trends in qualitative and mixed methods social media research and to what extent does the design of mixed methods social media studies align to an established typology for mixed methods research” (p. 3)?
Snelson explains that the reason for starting her research at 2007 is because studies involving social media were scant prior to that date due to its relative newness. She goes on to describe her search techniques in order to locate pertinent articles with which to complete her study. This she refers to as the “pre-search” stage, the first of four stages in her process description. The second stage Snelson calls the “search” stage which takes place after the best search parameters were determined during the first stage. She also details some of the obstacles encountered during these stages including “too many results,” and a scope that was “too restrictive” (p. 4). The third stage Snelson calls “data cleaning.” During this phase, Snelson selected articles which met the following criteria: “the study applied qualitative research methodology or mixed methods research with a qualitative research component, the study emphasized online social media, the article was published in a peer-reviewed journal, and a full-text English copy of the article was available.” The last stage Snelson terms “analysis.” Her analysis consisted of a qualitative approach in which her coding frame was both defined in advance (concept driven) and data driven. She reviewed her content at different points in time to cross-check results for accuracy and describes in detail how she used the software that was used to code the texts.

Snelson then explains and describes the limitations that were inherent in her study. These included “specific social media platforms, databases, types of literature (e.g., articles and conference papers), languages, publications (e.g., specific journals), or use of specific search phrases” (p. 5).

The results of Snelson’s study are presented in a general to specific fashion where overall trends are presented first followed by a more in-depth treatment of each field. Snelson’s findings reveal an overall increase in qualitative and mixed methods research. The top countries of origin
are the United States, United Kingdom, Australia, Canada, and Taiwan. The top journals included *New Media & Society; Journal of Computer Mediated Communication; Public Relations Review; Computers in Human Behavior; Australasian Journal of Educational Technology; British Journal of Educational Technology; Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking; Information, Communication & Society; Journal of Medical Internet Research; Behaviour & Information Technology; International Journal of Emerging Technologies & Society; Learning, Media and Technology; The Information Society; and Internet and Higher Education* (p. 7). These journals represent scholarship in the humanities and the sciences which further show the prevalence of qualitative analysis.

Particularly of interest is that qualitative content analysis was found to be “the most commonly used analytic approach across this group of qualitative and mixed methods research studies.” Snelson also points out that the terminology varies across fields as far as labeling the methodological approach of a study. Some use “qualitative” and/or “quantitative” and some use the terms “mixed” or “multi” (p. 8). Snelson then explains her findings in regard to mixed method design. In order of use, they include convergent parallel, explanatory sequential, exploratory sequential, and other designs. These designs combine the findings of the qualitative and quantitative analyses of a study in a way found to be most appropriate by the researcher. Convergent parallel designs take the quantitative and qualitative portions of a study which were conducted in parallel strands and combines or connects their results to each other at the end of the study. Explanatory sequential designs present the quantitative portion of a study first, followed by the qualitative portion which is used to help explain the quantitative findings. Exploratory sequential designs present the qualitative portion of a study first, followed by the quantitative portion which is used to test or to generalize findings. This overall study on the
language of the Deal will utilize an explanatory sequential design wherein, if an enumeration occurs, it will be presented first followed by a qualitative explanation of its contextual meaning(s). Snelson ends her study with a summary of her findings and directions for further research. The latter of which focuses on social media and so will not be reproduced here. The next study focuses upon selection of text.

Klaus Levinsen and Charlotte Wien (Levinsen & Wien, 2011) were interested in the role that media plays in shaping public perceptions of youth. They state that previous investigations have provided evidence that the media steadily present negative images of youth by focusing on crime, accidents, and moral decay and that these studies provided data too limited to show changes over time. Thus, they attempt to expand the scope of data in order to compensate for this gap. They conclude that there is no evidence of increasing negativity towards youth by the media but rather there are more neutral representations. As it pertains to this overall study, Levinsen and Wien selected their text by utilizing the same parameters. The information source should be evidenced as being a main source of information for consumers, and it should therefore be readily available to them and the researcher(s). A more direct treatment of these parameters will take place in the next section.

Levinsen and Wien begin their study by acknowledging previous research which concludes that the media “contribute[s] to negative stereotypes and stigmatization of youth” (p. 837). They then go on to present various models of media that exist in differing political systems. They claim that these models explain certain characteristics that are not generalizable to other models because other systems do not have those characteristics. Thus, generalizing one model to another system would taint the representations of certain groups where there may be no similar data calling for such a move. The researchers give several other contextual reasons why
conclusions from other studies conducted in other systems may not be applicable including social setting, and changes (over time) in social, economic, journalistic, and political arenas.

Levinsen and Wien then provide definitions for concepts that they will use throughout their study as well as their theoretical perspective and a review of previous related studies conducted on the subject. The first group of studies they examine conclude that media coverage influences society and vice versa. Groups will often change their behavior according to the dominant media descriptions to which they are exposed. If media portrays youth negatively then youth tends to act negatively. Thus, the researchers note the importance of media in social groups’ self-image. They present studies done in the United States and the United Kingdom which conclude negative media influence on youth. They also admit to one weakness in their methodological approach, they “cannot maintain an analytical constant” over the period of time on which they are conducting their study (p. 841). Acknowledging the weakness of one’s perspective or argument is important in terms of credibility and reliability and is thus cross-applicable to various fields that utilize qualitative content analysis. The researchers do however, draw attention to a similar study done on the elderly in Denmark using the same method and time frame. That study found a significant change from positive to negative perception that they claim is related to the long-term social, political, and economic change in the country. Thus, they plan to compare the findings in their current study with those of the previous study to support their explanations (p. 842). They also mention that they attempt to compensate for this by focusing on “significant trends seen over the entire period” rather than the time in between. They contend that all longitudinal studies of media coverage of certain issues face this problem (p. 844).
Levinsen and Wien chose as their object of study the content of five different newspapers rather than television, radio, or web content. They support this choice by arguing that newspapers continue to be the main source of information for other media and their content is more easily obtainable considering their scope. Their choice of newspapers is meant to represent the Danish “landscape” (p. 842) and includes a national paper, a national tabloid, a regional paper, a local paper, and a religious paper. From those papers they collected issues from the same week every tenth year and acknowledge that such a choice limits their findings in terms of the period in between their samples. Further definitions and examples are given to describe their search criteria such as “youth,” “adolescent,” etc. as well as words used to denote positivity and negativity. The texts that could not be categorized into either positive or negative was labeled “neutral.”

Levinsen and Wien’s analysis and discussion of their findings also includes language that placed youth into certain groups or as individuals, since the former often carries with it certain positive or negative connotations while the latter depends upon other descriptive words for bivalency. In terms of gender, the researchers found that more often than not males were represented negatively and females positively. However, they do not find a trend toward increasing negativity as did studies in other countries. Rather, there was more news trending “neutral” than anything else. Treatment of youth as individuals over group affiliation also increased. This they credit to changes in journalism that they claim has led to a reduction in bias. They then conclude with recommendations for expansion of their study. Levinsen and Wien’s study presents a good example of qualitative content analysis as applied to media effects in communication research. It also more closely resembles the type of analysis that will take place in this overall study in terms of media analysis as opposed to the previous studies which tend to
use as their objects interviews and questionnaires. This overall study will follow the example of Levinson and Wien in terms of text selection by choosing that which is most readily available online and is a widely used source of information. This will be detailed later. The following studies from Priest et al., Onuzulike, Elwafi, and Park are all demonstrative of the type of theme derivation that will take place in this overall study.

Helena Priest, Paula Roberts, and Leslie Woods (Priest, Roberts, & Woods, 2002) discuss “essential features and methods inherent [in] three methodologies commonly used in nursing and healthcare research” (p. 30). These methods include grounded theory, qualitative content analysis, and narrative analysis. For the purposes of this overall study, focus will be placed upon qualitative content analysis and the other methods will be set aside. Priest et al., emphasize philosophical bases and principles while they describe each stage and step.

Priest et al. begin with an issue pertinent at the time that they hope to address which was the “lack of guidance” in terms of how to handle qualitative data (p. 30). In part 2 of their work (not covered here) they present each theory as applied to the same data set. The paper begins with investigation of grounded theory but then on page 35 the researchers begin their coverage of content analysis. Citing Bernard Berelson (Berelson, 1952), they suggest that the method began in the 1950’s as a “quantitative approach to analyzing the content of media text to enable similar results across a group of text coders” (p. 35). However, this approach was challenged by Siegfried Kracauer (Kracauer, 1953) who argued that “text loses its meaning through radical reduction” and instead he advocated a qualitative approach “whereby meanings and insights are elicited from the text more holistically” (p. 36). Priest et al argue that qualitative content analysis “facilitates contextual meaning in text through the development of emergent themes derived from textual data [where] repetition of coding produces the significance of particular themes” (p.
They go on to say that such data can be gathered through “manifest content, whereby respondents’ actual words form concepts, or through latent content, whereby concepts are derived from the interpretation and judgment of participants’ responses” (p. 36). The researchers posit that qualitative content analysis “facilitates the production of core constructs from textual data through a systematic method of reduction and analysis” (p. 37). Although the researchers are speaking from the standpoint of their field, nursing, which utilizes interviews, questionnaires, and computer assisted coding techniques, they still contend that the method “gets the answers to the question to which it is applied” (p. 37). Much of the rest of their study is about coding and computer applications specific to qualitative nursing research and is not applicable here. However, eliciting themes and other contextual information in the method is much the same in terms of application across fields. Citing Kader Parahoo (Parahoo, 1997), Priest et al explain that “constructs are formulated through a process of interpretation based on the contextual settings from which the data were derived” (p. 37). As it pertains to this overall study, Priest et al’s process of constructing themes through a process of interpretation based on the contextual settings from which the data is derived mirrors the same goal.

For our purposes, the paper by Priest et al functions as an example of the extensive use of qualitative content analysis in the field of nursing and nursing research but particularly of the type of theme derivation that will be used in this overall study. Qualitative content analysis was viewed as a productive method but as the researchers note with few exceptions, the method lacked necessary guidance particularly for neophyte nurses. The following study from 2016 is meant as a guide for nursing researchers wanting to employ qualitative content analysis and might help to show the further standardization of the method in nursing from the previous study as well as another example of the process of theme derivation.
Ochenna Onuzulike (Onuzulike, 2013) also conducted a qualitative analysis but of online news media reactions to the “labeling and stigmatizing of children as witches in Eket, within the state of Akwa Ibom, Nigeria.” As it pertains to this overall study, Onuzulike utilizes a similar method for text selection and theme derivation. The analysis focuses particularly on the period of time after the Governor of the area appeared on CNN wherein he stated that the stigmatization of these children was “exaggerated.” Onuzulike posits that the media created “perspectives” in response to the CNN interview. The researcher uncovered three main themes from the data: children accused; behavior of “gatekeepers” (parents, guardians, religious leaders, and government officials, etc.); and the practice of witchcraft. Subthemes include physical harm, structural harm, being deceitful, terrorizing, superstition, and evil. Onuzulike argues that “the Governor is defensive and in denial, that the involved pastors are opportunists, and the accused children are abandoned, maltreated, and often murdered.” He also posits that “none of the analyzed online news media specifically blame the parents of the accused children; rather they blame the Governor and pastors, and specifically Helen Ukpabio.” He also declares that “poverty is not necessarily the root of the problem” as the Governor stated. Onuzulike concludes by suggesting “acknowledgement of folk belief systems in the training of gatekeepers” (p. 447).

Onuzulike begins here study by stating that there is no research addressing this issue since the governor’s CNN interview. The governor made several statements which were challenged by various individuals and studies. Namely, that poverty is the real culprit rather than witchcraft with the issue of children being stigmatized. He also stated that charitable organizations were taking advantage of the situation in order to gain contributions. The researcher states that the study will analyze the “characterizations” of the children, gatekeepers, and the practice of witchcraft in selected, online news media during a four-month period after the
Onuzulike begins by providing studies that conclude that accusing children of witchcraft is a relatively new phenomenon. These also state that normally the persons accused of this practice include women and the elderly. When children are accused, it is normally by churches or the family in which they belong. He goes on to state that while witchcraft differs from culture to culture, a common theme is that it is harmful. Such accusations have been linked to abuse, and denial of rights. He provides articles in which those accused of witchcraft were said to have used children as sacrifices. Onuzulike also provides other sources showing that in many countries where Christianity is being introduced to supplant local religions, child accusation of witchcraft is an issue (p. 449).

Turning to focus on his own country (Nigeria, Africa), Onuzulike provides further definition of witchcraft and notes that in Africa, misfortunes are often associated with spiritual experiences and therefore must be dealt with as such. He suggests that these are the reasons that gatekeepers use to justify what the west calls “abuse” or “abandonment.” Onuzulike suggests that the governor is only concerned with the image of his administration rather than the plight of the citizens by citing research that shows that CNN ran stories blaming the churches and gave him an opportunity to defend his work in this area. The Governor pointed to legislation passed by his administration that has as its goal the protection of children’s rights. Onuzulike points out that no arrests have been made since its passing (p. 450).
Within Nigeria, Onuzulike cites research that concludes that Pentecostalism has reinforced the spiritual aspect of misfortunes and thus “revived [a] witchcraft mentality in popular Christianity” which claims the power to deal with such misfortunes. This, Onuzulike among others argues, has led to child abuse. In other words, Christian pastors have taken advantage of the traditional African mindset that intertwines religion with its total world-view suggesting that old ways are akin to evil.

Onuzulike then moves to address the use of online news media as a news source. He cites studies showing its increased use and influence, positive and negative (p. 451), and thus asks the following research questions: how were the children accused of witchcraft characterized by the online news media; how was the behavior of the gatekeepers characterized in the online news media; and how was the practice of witchcraft characterized in the online news media (p. 452)?

Onuzulike then begins explanation of his method as a qualitative analysis wherein online news articles within the time frame are selected by various pertinent keywords. He coded stories for topics, words and phrases after reading them several times until the given themes emerged (p. 453). From there Onuzulike turned to his results.

The first theme, characterization of children accused, was supported by many citations from online articles in which physical harm, and structural harm (sub-themes) were prevalent. The second theme, the characterization of the behavior of gatekeepers was classified as “deceitful” and “terrorizing” as inferred by relevant words such as “manipulation,” “exaggerated,” “gunmen,” “tormentor of children,” etc. The Onuzulike interprets the articles in the media as placing no blame on parents for abuse but rather on people of “influence” in society. He provides citations from other research which support this interpretation (p. 457). The third theme, the characterization of the practice of witchcraft as “evil” and “superstitious” was
derived from keywords such as “misfortune,” “blood-sucking,” and “sickening cruelty” which were accredited to those who practice witchcraft. Onuzulike defines “evil” as an “immoral intention to cause injury.”

To conclude, Onuzulike summarizes his findings by reiterating that the governor is in denial about the real problem which the researcher claims is more prevalent than the governor suggests and that the latter is attempting to mislead by suggesting the problem is really poverty. The researcher also notes that accusations of witchcraft are typically based upon family misfortune wherein children are usually the recipients of these accusations but he cites research that concluded that the rich can be accused of the practice too if they do not account for their wealth satisfactorily. The accusations often then result in abuse by gatekeepers (p. 459). Further, Onuzulike argues along with other studies which he cites, that poverty is not the only reason such accusations occur. Rather, “poor governance, ignorance, poor health services, failure of the churches in authentic prophetic ministry, unemployment, youths restiveness, as well as the proliferation of churches which equal commercialization of religion and the [self-enrichment] of the purveyors of prayers and miracles for money and prosperity in Southeast Nigeria” are also listed as causes. The researcher also states that since the belief in witchcraft is “entrenched in the people’s world view,” it will be harder to eradicate than merely enacting laws against such accusations. Onuzulike then makes recommendations to improve the situation which include “training for key government actors, addressing the cultural media which are considered to perpetuate the belief, regulation of churches and their leaders, [and] articulation and acknowledgement of the intertwine of folk beliefs and the broader culture.” He also suggests that “more proactive organizations should get involved” and gives examples of such that utilize “grassroot” efforts to remedy child abuse. Onuzulike ends by suggesting that
organizations “should also utilize local media outlets and traditional mass media” in these efforts (p. 461).

The study by Onuzulike is pertinent to this overall study as an example of news media analysis and interpretation by providing definition and solutions to a prevalent problem. It also provides another example of the process of theme derivation that this overall study will utilize. Definition is key in creating a solid argument by which to convince audiences of both problems and solutions to issues at hand. The use of qualitative analysis to build these arguments has proven to be a powerful tool in research concerning otherwise complex issues which may lose meaning when conducted under quantitative analysis alone. The following study also provides example of latent theme derivation from manifest content.

Paige Elwafi, and Barbara Wheeler (Elwafi & Wheeler, 2016) conducted a qualitative content analysis pertaining to the effect(s) of music on patients with breast cancer. As it pertains to this overall study, Elwafi and Wheeler utilize a similar method in terms of theme generation. The researchers wanted to know what themes emerged as patients listened to music associated with music therapy sessions while undergoing breast cancer treatment and what information emerged from the logs that was “unforeseen.” Elwafi and Wheeler discovered several themes including relaxation, memories, emotions, spirituality, beauty, strength, energy/fatigue, pain relief, family, and physical problems/illness. The researchers’ implications pertain to furthering understanding of patients’ experience of cancer and suggestions for using music therapy.

Elwafi and Wheeler begin their study with an explanation of the importance of music in many people’s lives and posit that it can also be potent in therapy as well. They provide citations from research in psychoanalysis which conclude that music “reach[es] people at levels beyond their conscious awareness” whereby patients are more compliant to the therapeutic process. The
researchers add that music can help patients become aware of feelings and thoughts of which they were previously unaware, decrease any treatment related stress, and diminish hospital-related noises. Elwafi and Wheeler emphasize the importance of the human voice in song which serves to provide intimate contact with the listener. The songs chosen by patients, Elwafi and Wheeler posit, can provide insight into physical, emotional, and spiritual needs. Some of the studies cited by the researchers focus upon the importance of “personal creativity within participants accounts of healing” and four other themes were found including a mirror of positive inner feelings blocking negative feelings, bridge to the inner self, music as a therapeutic medium, and barriers to music therapy.

Elwafi and Wheeler analyzed the content of music listening logs of eight women who were being treated for breast cancer. The researchers describe their interest and involvement in the project in terms of credibility and possible bias. They also explain the process they used to analyze the music, logs, and uncover themes in their data. What follows is a description of the findings regarding each theme.

The first theme, relaxation, was found to be the most prevalent wherein patients wrote about how the music helped to make them feel more relaxed. The second theme, memories, revealed that patients, when listening to music, remembered both good and bad memories but the music helped them focus on the former rather than the latter. This experience enabled them to discuss such memories in their therapeutic sessions (p. 42). In terms of emotions, the third theme, patients wrote of being returned to good moods due to the music and allowed them to confront their prognoses such that they began preparatory planning for their short time left. Patients also wrote about a return to and uplifting experience of spirituality, the fourth theme. The fifth theme, beauty, was also an experience described by patients wherein music brought
forth feelings and contemplation on the concept. Strength, the sixth theme, was described by patients as a renewed feeling brought about by listening to music. As a parallel to the sixth theme, patients also describe a lessened degree of fatigue and increased energy, the seventh theme. One patient described a lessening of pain, the eighth theme, due to listening to music. Some patients wrote of an increased awareness of the importance of family, the ninth theme, and thus a further reliance on and strengthening of that support group (p. 43). The tenth and last theme was physical problems and illness. Patients wrote that in some cases these symptoms were diminished or that the music helped to alleviate these indications (p. 44).

In their discussion of their findings, Elwafi and Wheeler state that “therapeutic growth” occurred with the patients due to listening to music. They also suggest that since the themes were common among all the test subjects that perhaps these themes might be generalized to other patients in regards to a therapeutic regimen. The researchers note that some unexpected results include the theme of beauty wherein the patients described “feeling beautiful” as a result of listening to music. Although the researchers were unable to establish a direct correlation, one patient experienced healing after listening to music in which she imagined her tumors disappearing. Similarly, other patients described closer relationships with family members brought on by their experiences in this regard.

This is an important study in terms of examining qualitative method of investigation in the sense that these types of findings would be difficult if not impossible to discover through purely scientific experimentation alone. The kind of approach(es) that qualitative methods offer researchers seem to better equip those trying to study complex human phenomena. These approaches are also able to offer suggestions in terms of improvement and progression for better
and further understanding and even application in some cases. It is hoped that the same will hold for this overall study. The following study is similar in this regard.

So-Youn Park, Changwoo Shon, Oh Young Kwon, Tai Young Yoon and Ivo Kwon conducted a qualitative thematic content analysis of medical students’ essays on professionalism (Park, Shon, Kwon, Yoon, & Kwon, 2017). Citing “changes” in health care delivery systems and medical professionalism values around the world, the researchers wanted to investigate the effect of these changes on South Korea in regards to its traditional concept of medicine as a “benevolent art.” As it pertains to this overall study, Park et al utilize a similar method in terms of theme generation. They analyzed written responses of 105 medical students enrolled in a medical ethics course. The students were to write about an instance of medical professionalism that they witnessed and reflect on their own professional context. The results revealed two core concepts of professionalism in South Korea: respect for patients and physician accountability. The most common theme found was trust while distributive justice was deemed “non-essential.” The researchers conclude that while distributive justice, such as fair distribution of medical resources, is promoted in Western countries, medical students in South Korea were more inclined to emphasize doctors’ relationships with patients. They also suggest that medical educators should develop curricula regarding medical professionalism that reaffirms cultural context-specific definitions of professionalism to meet the legitimate needs of patients in their own culture.

Park et al begin their study by claiming that there is no scholarly consensus on the definition of medical professionalism in South Korea. They state that education comprising of only lists of unapproved behaviors can leave students with a negative impression of professionalism. They also suggest that because of the changes occurring in delivery systems and
traditional professionalism values, physicians around the world are wrestling with balancing changes with patients’ legitimate rights. In western medicine, the researchers state, professionalism is based upon the medical profession’s “contract with society” but in South Korea medical professionalism is based upon the “character of the doctor” (p. 1). Further, the after-effect of the Korean war left Korea’s medical system, including facilities, funds, and licensed practitioners devastated. The Korean government took control to expedite the process of recovery but in the process adopted western notions of professionalism. Park et al describe the aim of their study as the “first step in refining the concept of professionalism in South Korea by examining the distinctive moral convictions that exist within this cultural context.”

The researchers began with pre-determined categories gained from the Medical Professional Project by the European Federation of Internal Medicine Foundation, the American College of Physicians and American Society of Internal Medicine, and the American Board of Internal Medicine. These were revised according to their findings. They include: primacy of patient welfare, physician–patient relationships, social justice, and other physicians’ responsibility.

Many of the responses analyzed placed emphasis on patient welfare, the first theme, wherein the “need for a doctor to think about the best interest of patients” and that a doctor should “try to understand and put himself or herself in the patient’s shoes” were common ideals. Most students described the physician–patient relationship, the second theme, as one of the most important characteristics of professionalism. Subcategories of the second theme include: patients’ confidentiality, physician–patient communication, respect for patients’ autonomy, trust (viewed as the most important), and honesty (p. 2). Park et al provide many quotes from their data to support their analysis (p. 3).
The third theme, social justice, was addressed by the fewest students’ responses. Some of the students stressed distributive justice as a need in the Korean health care system. The researchers note that social justice is not a category under which the doctor’s role is established in Korea. Rather, patient care based on ethics and autonomy, doctor–patient relationships, professionalism and self-management, and self-regulation led by professionals are the focus. The last theme, other responsibilities of physicians, is comprised of professional competence, professionals’ autonomy, and work[ing] collaboratively with other professionals.

In their concluding discussion, Park et al state that students recommend promoting the professional virtues of altruism, trust, communication, and professional competence to reduce unprofessional behaviors. The researchers argue that “an introspective examination of professionalism from [Korea’s] own perspective is necessary before implementing the associated education in South Korea” because “previous studies reported that the Western framework of medical professionalism might not be appropriate for non-western countries.” Park et al also note that their own previous research underscores communication as the foundation for building rapport of mutual respect between patients and doctors. They further recommend that a guide for core content be developed from a Korean perspective of professionalism to be used in all medical education in Korea. This, they posit, should include education in terms of practical application in real clinical situations. Lastly, the researchers conclude that Korean physicians should change how they recognize patients’ autonomy and move from a paternalistic mentality to a more egalitarian mindset (p. 5).

The study by Park et al utilized a qualitative analysis of written text to determine values expressed by students in a medical ethics class concerning concepts and experiences of medical professionalism. The researchers used the data and their findings to further understanding of
culturally situated values in the Korean medical arena. Despite their arguably advanced scientific training, they chose qualitative content analysis as the best method to better understand their complex object of study. Along with the other studies presented so far, this further suggests that at least in regards to written communication, a qualitative approach might be the best choice in sifting through the complexities of human communication in an attempt to uncover deeper meaning(s).

Qualitative content analysis, as shown in the previously reviewed studies, has proven to be a potent method in gleaning deeper meanings from complex data sets than with quantitative methods alone. Studies from the humanities, social sciences, and the sciences utilizing qualitative content analysis were reviewed. The first study reviewed was an analysis of online news media and the comments provided by readers of that media as it pertained to weight loss surgery. This study was reviewed due to its dependence on qualitative content analysis of online content and the effects of such content by consumers of it. These concepts have bearing on the overall study as well as the study’s combination of inductive and deductively derived categories. The main research questions in this study are inherent in the first stage of this overall study’s research framework, decontextualization. The second study was meant as a guide for nurses who want to conduct qualitative content analysis and provides recommendations from planning to reporting. It was included in this review to show the potential inculcation of qualitative content analysis in a hard-science-saturated field such as nursing. It also provides the operative definitions of the processes of induction, deduction, manifest interpretation, latent interpretation, and the four-stage framework that this overall study will utilize. The third study concerns the effect(s) of values in a certain communicative setting and the need to measure such instances qualitatively. It also provides the operative definition of value that this overall study will use.
The fourth study examined the usage trends in research of qualitative content analysis. It also demonstrates the type of search and data filtering techniques that will be used in this overall study. The fifth study looked at the role of newspapers in shaping public opinion about youth. Its inclusion in the review section shows not only a demonstration of qualitative content analysis in the humanities but also the role that news media plays in shaping general public opinion. Both of these concepts have direct bearing on this overall study. It also demonstrates parameters used in this overall study in determining appropriate texts. The last set of studies illustrate the kind of theme derivation that will be utilized in this overall study. Priest et al was a meta-analysis of qualitative approaches in the field of nursing. The study noted that there is no consensus on approach, methods, or interpretation for qualitative research in nursing but the method is still extensively used due to its ability to reveal meaning from complex data where quantitative analysis lacks. The study by Onuzulike analyzed online news media reactions to the labeling and stigmatizing of children as witches in Eket, within the state of Akwa Ibom, Nigeria. Similar to the study by Levinsen and Wien, this piece was reviewed due to its dependence on qualitative content analysis and the real-life effects that news media may have on consumers. The study by Elwafi and Wheeler pertained to the effect(s) of music on patients with breast cancer and was conducted by analyzing their listening logs. Certainly, the effects of music and written self-reflection on cancer patients in terms of physical health can be measured scientifically but quality of life and physical health, the study contends, are also connected with such things as attitudes and mental health … things which may only be able to be measured qualitatively. So, again, even in fields which tend to solely rely on hard, scientific investigation the need for qualitative evaluation is seen as a powerful method to improve upon the overall goal of health, mentally and physically. The study by Park et al was an analysis of medical students’ essays on
professionalism. An abstract concept such as professionalism requires definition so as to be able to enforce its application in specific circumstances according to the field in which it is meant to be practiced. Assessment of training and physical and mental reaction to application require gathering and analysis of complex data due to the nature of written and spoken human communication. In order to retain usable meaning(s) from such data, researchers chose qualitative content analysis as a more thorough approach than quantitative methods alone. What remains to be seen is how qualitative content analysis, and the processes and concepts from these reviews will be used in this overall study as well as what the object(s) of the study will be. The following sections will address these concerns, respectively.

**Qualitative Content Analysis: The Iran Deal**

As documented in the previously reviewed studies, qualitative content analysis is quite flexible in terms of its adaptability to the data and the research question(s). Some of the previous examples utilized a qualitative method but also incorporated an enumeration of words to facilitate support for thematic discussion. Some of the previous studies also utilized a grounded approach wherein themes were derived purely via the text during close reading. As stated previously, this overall study will avoid employing quantitative methods but rather, content analysis will be done via a directed hermeneutical approach wherein language will be deductively categorized using distinctions provided by functional theory with the goal in mind of inductively understanding the values expressed within the rhetorical claims made in those categories. However, where enumeration is helpful, this study will employ an explanatory sequential method of using qualitative analysis to further explain and elucidate any quantitative data (see Snelson above).
According to Harold Lasswell (Lasswell, 1948), the purpose of qualitative analysis is “to study who (says) what (to) whom (in) what channel (with) what effect.” These are the basic research questions found in Glenn et al (above). They are inherent in the first stage of the research framework which this overall study will use and will be further described below. Thus, as stated by Ole Holsti (Holsti, 1969) a researcher can make valid “inferences by objectively and systematically identifying specified characteristics of messages” that are, according to Klaus Krippendorf, “not necessarily from an author’s or user’s perspective” (Krippendorff, 2004). Otherwise stated, one can glean from a text the latent values which may not be apparent to the author or the intended audience. As per Bernhofer (above), the value that is emphasized, whether manifest or latent, will reveal the level of importance that the speaker places on it. Interpretation of such potential findings will occur in later chapters but looking forward, such information might enable better understanding (verstehen) of communication and the decisions surrounding it.

Looking for the semantic relationships within a text, considering the complexity of human communication, is a more logical approach than denoting frequency of the occurrence of terms alone, particularly when some terms can take on the exact opposite meaning in certain contexts. For example, the word “bad” can mean “good” when used as slang in certain contexts. Sometimes this can only be determined by noting the semantic relationships of the word to the sentence, the sentence to the paragraph, and so on. “This roller-coaster is bad,” could have the literal meaning that it is not fun or not safe but when the speaker is considered, perhaps a teenager, and the audience, other teenagers, and the result is that those in the audience proceed to get in line for the ride, “bad” could mean “good.” A word count alone cannot reveal such a contextual meaning. However, once contextual meanings are considered, word counts can help
to add credibility in terms of reliability and veracity to meanings garnered from texts. Thus, within the context of this overall study, semantic relationships will take precedent but frequency of words, phrases, and concepts may be used to bolster these relationships. Next, the framework of this overall study will be presented.

Levinson and Wien (above) selected text according to its availability and use as a main source of influential information. This study will use the same categories in selecting text for analysis. Following text selection, using a similar framework provided by Bengtsson (above), this overall study will consist of the following steps: decontextualization, recontextualization, categorization, and compilation. Decontextualization will consist of determining what is said, how it is said, by whom, and to whom (see Glenn et al above). Recontextualization will consist of double-checking the decontextualized parts to their contextual whole to verify that meanings are not neglected. Categorization will involve theme creation wherein generation of reasonable inferences between data and functional and virtue themes will signal an end to analysis. The process used in the derivation of themes will be akin to the process found in the above research from Priest et al, Onuzulike, Elwafi, and Park et al. These first three steps will be recursive in terms of determining whether the data signifies an attack, acclaim, or defense functionally and to which virtue an appeal is being made. The former, application of functional theory, will be a deductive process and the latter, application of value theory, inductive. The last stage, compilation, will consist of discussion of the manifest and or latent meanings which support the determined categorizations.

As stated, functional theory will be used to deductively classify rhetorical claims made with regard to language pertaining to the Deal. Functional theory categorizes speech acts as acclaims, attacks and defenses. Acclaims can be seen as the praise of oneself or another such
that one espouses or exhibits a particular value with which a stakeholder might identify. An attack may be seen as an accusation wherein the accused lacks a value to which the accuser appeals. A defense may be seen as an appeal to evidence of some kind that shows that the accused does indeed display the value of which they are accused of not espousing.

Plato identifies four basic values which he calls “virtues” with the faculties of human beings in the ideal city where such values are practiced as a rule. They are: wisdom, bravery, temperance, and justice (Plato, 1997). Aristotle lists human values as “justice, courage, temperance, magnificence, magnanimity, liberality, gentleness, prudence, wisdom.” (Aristotle, 1955). He refers to them as “forms” in the sense that any other virtue/value of which one can think is simply a reiteration or a more specific example of one or more of those in the given list. Cicero returns to Plato’s original four and refers to them as “habit[s] of mind in harmony with reason and the order of nature” (Cicero, 2017), re-emphasizing the inherent nature of values. There are many other philosophers and theologians who have discussed the importance of these values. They are also found in the Jewish text the Wisdom of Solomon (8:7) and thus used as a basis for Judeo-Christian moral theology and ethics. Augustine defines these four basic values in terms of what he believes to be the supreme value, love: "For these four virtues I should have no hesitation in defining them: that temperance is love giving itself entirely to that which is loved; fortitude is love readily bearing all things for the sake of the loved object; justice is love serving only the loved object, and therefore ruling rightly; prudence is love distinguishing with sagacity between what hinders it and what helps it" (De moribus eccl., Chap. xv). The four main virtues have come to be known as the “cardinal” virtues which is translated from Latin as “hinge” virtues. Again, reiterating the meaning that any other value of which one can imagine can be
situated as a version or example of one or more of these four. As to the working definitions of these hinge values there is much debate.

Prudence tends to be defined by most sources as “practical wisdom” wherein the possessor has the knowledge needed and understanding of the situation to act virtuously. In terms of functional theory and the Deal, an acclaim or a defense would suggest that the possessor has the needed knowledge and understanding of the details surrounding the situation involved with the Deal while an attack would suggest a lack thereof.

Justice, regarded by Aristotle as the most important virtue, is also known as fairness and righteousness in the sense that one attempts to give to oneself and others what they are due. Regarding functional theory and the Deal, an acclaim or a defense posits that the possessor is acting with justice in regards to the parties involved while an attack charges a lack of fairness or respect.

Temperance tends to mean restraint and discretion wherein the possessor does not act rashly or base their actions purely on emotional response. As it pertains to functional theory and the Deal, an acclaim or a defense argues that the possessor is acting with discretion while an attack suggests that one lacks restraint in their actions.

Courage, also known as fortitude, entails the ability to confront fear, uncertainty, and intimidation. In terms of functional theory and the Deal, an acclaim or defense contends that the possessor is not acting out of fear and intimidation while an attack maintains that one lacks courage in their actions.

These values tend to be inter-dependent in the sense that one cannot act prudently if one does not adhere to the other three values as they pertain to a given situation and one cannot act with temperance, justice, or courage without prudence or the knowledge and understanding of
what such action(s) might entail, again, given the situation. Each of these values have their corresponding vices which entail either a lack or what might be termed an exceeding of that which is required in terms of prudence. Due to space and time requirements, these will not be addressed in this overall study.

As used for the basis of argument, values are major premises and actually come before the textual data conceptually albeit enthymemically. A graphic representation might look like the following:

![Diagram](image)

The stated claim(s) in the argument then follow as minor premises which serve to link the implied value to the attack (lack of the value), or acclaim, or defense (ownership of the value).

Even though arguments make deductive claims based upon virtue, the values, for the most part, remain enthymemic. Thus, they will have to be induced from the language where they are not manifest. Therefore, rhetorical claims analyzed from the language of the Deal will first be deductively categorized utilizing the functional categories of acclaim, attack, or defense. Then these claims will be further inductively subcategorized under one or more of the four hinge values: prudence, justice, temperance, and courage. For each of the associations made between their rhetorical function and inferred value an attempt at justification will be made by a further discussion of the semantic relationship which seems to occur in the text at hand. For example, represented visually, such a categorization might look like the following:
Step one decontextualizes the textual data to its constituent elements of what is being said, who is saying it to whom and how is it being said. Step two involves a recursive check from part to whole to make sure nothing pertinent is left out. Step three involves the deduction of the functional category into which the text is being categorized. Step four comprises induction of the value(s) to which the text is alluding. This does not necessitate that more than one value will be assigned to a rhetorical claim but rather shows the possibility of such an occurrence. The relationship represented here is meant to show that one value may be alluded to more so than another, however, values do contain some cross-over attributes due to their relationship with one another and so it may be appropriate to discuss secondary and tertiary values as well.

According to Klaus Krippendorf (Krippendorff, 2004), there are three modes of reliability pertaining to method in qualitative content analysis. In order of strength, weakest to strongest, they are stability, reproducibility, and accuracy. Accuracy compares coding of the data set to some known standard of categorization pertaining to the same data set. Reproducibility or
inter-observer reliability, uses multiple coders to code the same data set independently to reveal inconsistencies. Stability or intra-observer reliability, requires a coder to code the same set at least two different times, allowing for discrepancies to be examined. The last of these methods described, stability, is the method that will be utilized in this overall study. As stated by Carol Hoskins (Hoskins, 2004), “each inquiry is unique and distinctive and the inferences depend on the skills, insights, analytic abilities and style of the investigator.” However, there is an ever-present need to “demonstrate a link between the results and the data to substantiate for the methods employed in the research” (Polit, 2011).

As stated previously, this overall study argues that all rhetorical claims contain value-laden inferences. The value-laden rhetoric that is inherent in the process of negotiating or promoting one side of an agreement, generally speaking, is aimed at persuading stakeholders of the value or lack thereof that acceptance of that agreement will gain them. Further, value-laden rhetoric is used by representatives to persuade constituent stakeholders that an agreement does or does not have value to them. There are participants on all sides of the Deal who have been public about their positions and how any other options pertaining to the Deal might result. The next section will attempt to specify the texts that will be analyzed in regards to value-laden rhetoric of the language of the Deal.

**Texts**

It is not the purpose of this overall study to examine the veracity of the statements made by any stakeholder pertaining to factual details of the Deal itself. Such an investigation would involve access to resources which are not available to this researcher in regards to this overall study. Further, the veracity of the factual details is not the focus of the theories motivating this overall study. It is true that if a speaker is mistaken or lying about factual details then their
acclaim, attack, or defense is faulty and therefore the value to which they appeal may be unsupported. However, this overall study is concerned with the notion that speakers are appealing to values, and the nature and importance of those appeals as they pertain to revelations of a human standard, aside from the truth or falsity of the propositions used. Rather, the values inferred by rhetorical claims themselves will be the focus. As stated previously, Levinson and Wien (above) selected text according to its availability and use as a main source of influential information. This study will use the same categories in selecting text for analysis. Further, as mentioned earlier, texts pertinent to the Deal seem to become prevalent in the news from about September 2013 onward. These texts can contain technical information about the Deal itself or things related to technical information about the Deal, and they also can contain rhetorical language about the technical details and about the other language being used by actors and about other actors themselves. The latter (rhetorical language) will be the focus of this overall study rather than the former (technical details). This will also be a guideline in determining which texts will be examined. If the text seems to be purely or mostly technical then it will be bypassed. Storylines from texts concerning the Deal are limited to Iran’s nuclear programs, sanctions, compliance, congressional involvement, and international reaction. Therefore, all storyline-pertinent texts from newspapers and broadcast networks accessible online by a global audience will be analyzed in chronological order for coherence. Analysis per storyline will occur until either repetition of meaning occurs or no more information is available due to the ongoing nature of the issue. From the United States, these sources may include the Cable News Network (CNN), the American Broadcasting Company (ABC), the Columbia Broadcasting System (CBS), the National Broadcasting Company (NBC), FOX news, the New York Times, USA Today, the Los Angeles Times, the Chicago Tribune, the Washington Post, The Economist, and the Wall Street
Journal. From the United Kingdom, they may include the Guardian, the Telegraph, the Independent, British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC), and the Times; from the middle-East, the Tehran Times. As noted previously, one limitation to this study is that there is only one source representing the views from the middle-east specifically, however, language purported to originate from the middle-east, especially Iran, will be referenced by the other sources. These sources tend to rely on language from those primarily involved in the Deal-making process but other prominent public figures who arguably have secondary influence are also referenced. So, their language will also be potential objects of analysis as well.

Conclusion

This chapter discussed the method of qualitative content analysis as it has been used in many other scholarly pursuits of knowledge across fields where quantitative methods were deemed to be insufficient. These fields include both the humanities and the sciences. A short history of the development of qualitative content analysis as a tool for capturing what quantitative methods were missing was also covered. Then an explanation of how qualitative content analysis will be used followed by objects of investigation upon which it will be used was presented.

The next chapter will begin by describing findings concerning the data itself before analysis as well as explicating on predominant voice perspective utilized during analysis. A table displaying the percentages of functional theory categories and values per news outlet enabling comparison will be shown. The table will be followed by an explanation of the general outcomes displayed in the table. Next, a discussion of the themes derived from analysis will follow along with a table displaying theme and news outlet percentages to allow for comparison. The chapter
concludes with proportionate examples of the results of the analysis itself given for each news outlet.
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CHAPTER IV. ANALYSIS

Introduction

The first part of the research question guiding this overall study asked, “What kind of values can be determined from the function of rhetoric?” This chapter will present the findings from analysis which addresses this part of the question. The rhetoric analyzed was gotten from news articles about the Iran nuclear deal from five different publications: Al Jazeera, British Broadcasting Corporation, USA Today, New York Times, and Washington Post.

First, an introduction and short explanation on the data collected will be presented. This will be followed by a short discussion on the determination of voice which affected analysis in terms of both functional theory and values. Then tables showing general quantitative outcomes in terms of the relationship between functional theory and values will be presented and explained. Penultimately, an explanation of the themes discovered will be given. Lastly, a presentation of the findings from each source separately. Each of these will begin with specific quantitative explanations of the results as determined by the relationship of functional theory categories and values. A small table will accompany each of these explanations to help illustrate the results. The articles chosen for this presentation from each source were chosen at random to show theory saturation however, complete analysis for all articles included in this study can be seen in the appendix. Analysis included in the examples is given in brief showing results in brackets for clarity. The findings for each source are presented in chronological order according to that source over the research period indicated previously (September 2013 - September 2015) and increase in magnitude according to the ratio of articles available. The only exceptions to this are the data from Al Jazeera and the British Broadcast Corporation. Those sources have all their data included due to the limitations of material available which will be explained in the next
section. The examples given in each article were chosen because they represent the general narrative of the article itself thus giving context to the line-by-line analysis provided. Each article’s analysis will conclude with a summary including theme relationship (see themes below).

**A Word on Data**

Using the search criteria explained previously, no pertinent articles were found for the years 2013 or 2014 from *Al Jazeera*. There were nine pertinent articles found from this publication written in 2015 and all were included for analysis. No pertinent articles were found from the *British Broadcasting Corporation* for the year 2014. There were three articles found written in 2013 and eight found written in 2015 all of which were included for analysis.

From *USA Today*, the *New York Times*, and the *Washington Post*, respectively, there were many pertinent articles found for each year of the time frame for this overall study and so a random sample of two articles per month, where available, in each year were chosen. These articles were chosen by listing all pertinent articles available in spreadsheets, one spreadsheet per month per publication. Then a random number generator was used to choose two articles per month to analyze and include in this study. Some months had no pertinent articles, others had many. From *USA Today*, of all pertinent articles available, there were two articles chosen written in 2013, nine chosen from 2014, and fifteen chosen from 2015. From the *New York Times*, of all pertinent articles, six were chosen from 2013, twenty-three chosen from 2014, and fourteen chosen from 2015. From the *Washington Post*, of all available pertinent articles, four were chosen from 2013, twenty were chosen from 2014, and nineteen were chosen from 2015.
Voice

The analytical approach used for each of the samples taken from the publications on which this overall study is focused involved scrutiny of each sentence in each article. Sometimes these sentences contained no quoted text, sometimes the sentences consisted of only quoted text, and sometimes there was a mixture of quoted and non-quoted text in a sentence. As indicated in the last chapter, analysis consisted of determining “who” was speaking. When the sentences under scrutiny contained no quotes, the voice, or “who” was determined to be that of the author. Similarly, when there was a mixture of quoted and non-quoted text, the choice was made to attribute the voice to the author since there was most likely some paraphrasing happening and thus interpretation and condensation of text and meaning. Sentences which consisted of only quoted text were usually attributed to the voice credited by the author. Therefore, instances determined to be an acclaim, attack, or defense are, in some cases, attributed to the author and in some cases attributed to the voice credited by the author.

Table 1: Percentages of Functional Theory Categories and Values Per Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AL JAZEERA (9 articles)</th>
<th>Aristotelian Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Functional Theory Categories</strong></td>
<td><strong>Overall total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acclaims</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attacks</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defenses</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BRITISH BROADCAST CORPORATION (11 articles)</th>
<th>Aristotelian Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Functional Theory Categories</strong></td>
<td><strong>Overall total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acclaims</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attacks</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defenses</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The previous tables show the general outcome of functional theory categories of acclaims, attacks, and defenses, and their relationship to prudence, justice, fortitude, and temperance as well as overall totals for each publication used in this overall study.

**General Outcomes**

The previous tables show that appeals to prudence were the most common in both acclaims and attacks. As a reminder, prudence is commonly defined as wisdom, good judgment, and common sense. In other words, authors appealed to a lack of and the presence of wisdom more than any other virtue. For example, in the coming samples, the deal is often referred to as...
the “best” or *wisest* option. But sometimes the deal is referred to as a “mistake” or *unwise* (attack). Plentiful textual examples of this are given in the coming sections. Appeals to the presence of *wisdom*, or acclaims of *wisdom*, outnumbered appeals to a lack of (attacks) *wisdom*. In many cases such appeals were made to *prudence* (or a “wise course of action”) alone but there were also many instances to which *prudence* was appealed in conjunction with other values, particularly *justice*. As a reminder, justice is defined as fairness, equity, objectivity, and honesty. For example, in the coming samples, the deal is often referred to as making constituents “safer” or providing what is argued to be one’s *right*. But sometimes the deal is referred to as not making constituents “safer” or not providing what is argued to be one’s *right*. Plentiful textual examples of this are given in the coming sections. Analysis revealed an aspect of *prudence* in every appeal, even if not primary, whether an acclaim, an attack, or a defense, or pertaining to *justice*, *fortitude*, or *temperance*. However, for the sake of space and brevity, note was only made indicating an appeal to *wisdom* if the language used was strong enough to place it on at least a tertiary level. In other words, the idea that to be temperate is a wise course of action, to be *courageous* is a wise course of action, and to be just is a wise course of action was suggested in the language. Therefore, *prudence* was most often paired with other virtues followed by *justice*, *fortitude*, and lastly *temperance*. In example, fortitude is commonly defined as courage, hope/faith, and power. In the coming samples, stakeholders of the deal are sometimes referred to as “authorities” or *powerful*. But sometimes stakeholders are referred to as “weak” or lacking in *power*. Temperance is commonly defined as patience. In the coming samples, stakeholders are sometimes referred to as “patient” and sometimes as “rash” or *impatient*. More examples will follow in the coming sections.
The tables also show that across publications with only one exception, acclaims outnumbered attacks, which in turn were more numerous than defenses. Not only were acclaims more numerous but acclaims to prudence dominated the language followed by acclaims to justice, then fortitude, and lastly temperance. The order of appeals to virtues as just indicated remained consistent throughout the publications with no exceptions. In other words, acclaims, attacks, and defenses of prudence outnumbered acclaims, attacks, and defenses of justice, followed by acclaims, attacks, and defenses of fortitude, and lastly acclaims, attacks, and defenses of temperance. The only exceptions to this order were in Al Jazeera and the British Broadcast Corporation wherein acclaims and attacks regarding temperance outnumbered acclaims and attacks regarding fortitude. As stated previously however, there was one exception in terms of the magnitude of acclaims, attacks, and defenses and that was with Al Jazeera.

Themes

Across sources, there were direct appeals made to each of the four virtues: prudence, justice, fortitude, and temperance. But as analysis progressed, certain themes became apparent from the relationship of functional theory categories and values. Emphasis must be placed on the fact that these themes are highly dependent upon context. These themes were shared by those for and against the deal as well as by the voice of the author. In other words, acclaims, attacks, and defenses were made by the author and those on both sides of the issue via direct appeals to the virtues and by thematic language.
Table 2: Aristotelian Values and Themes Generated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aristotelian Values and Themes Generated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prudence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom/knowledge/understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Wisdom of) Productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(wisdom of) Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Wisdom of) Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The previous table illustrates the shared themes generated from this analysis; they are listed in no particular order.

Theme findings in terms of prudence or appeals to wisdom, showed that stakeholders on both sides were concerned with results of courses of action including the potential for productivity regarding negotiations. In other words, as will be shown in the example sections to follow, there were those whose language revealed that they thought that negotiations had the potential to be fruitful, making negotiations a wise course of action. But there were those whose language revealed that they thought that there was no potential for negotiations to be fruitful, making negotiations a waste of time and thus unwise (attack). There was also language that suggested that the potential and actual benefits acquired from a negotiated deal would outweigh the cost involved with any concessions lost, making negotiations a wise course of action. In contrast, there were those whose language suggested that concessions lost overshadowed any benefits gained from a deal, making it an unwise (attack) course of action. There were also those who argued that the deal and negotiations leading to it were wise because the overall result would be increased safety for themselves and their allies. However, there were also those on the other side of the issue who argued that the overarching result would be less safety for themselves...
and their allies even after a deal and thus unwise (attack). Another choice for those advocating a deal was to trust Iran, which proponents thought to be a wise choice. Opponents, however, argued that trusting Iran was unwise (attack). References to wisdom, knowledge, and understanding constitute more direct appeals to prudence. These categories are dependent in a nested fashion in the sense that one cannot have wisdom without understanding and one cannot have understanding without knowledge. In many instances, language from the author(s) and/or those whom the author(s) quoted suggested that their primary concern was that the reader or listener (in the case of speeches being made) have the knowledge that their words were imparting to them. As will be shown in the example sections to follow, that knowledge included information of a factual nature and/or knowledge of a particular person’s stance on something. Imparting that knowledge seemed to be aimed at helping the reader or listener better understand the scenario under description or the potential underlying factors that may have led to the dialogue being introduced. Thus, the author(s) of that knowledge thought it best (wise) to impart that information. Similarly, in many cases, the principal interest of the author(s) seemed to be aimed at making sure that their readers understood the concepts involved or the situation as it was/is. This usually involved some interpretation included in the text even when quotes were involved. Thus, suggesting that readers and listeners understand something was deemed the best or wisest course of action. References to wisdom included factual information (knowledge), contextual interpretation (understanding), and advocacy from the predominant voice. These last few themes have unique import to the results of this overall study in terms of voice and categorization and they will be dealt with in a more in-depth manner in the next chapter.

Theme findings in terms of justice included those who argued that the negotiations and the deal, as they were evolving, were fair to both sides. In contrast, there were those that
contended that negotiations and the deal as they evolved were not fair to their respective sides. There were also those who argued that choosing to engage Iran in negotiations was not fair or right because of Iran’s treatment of its own people and destabilizing activities on the world stage. Rather, what would be fair, would be to maintain or increase sanctions against Iran. Proponents of the deal tended to suggest that issues of terrorism and human rights were separate problems from those being dealt with in the deal, namely, weapons of mass destruction. In many instances, as the examples section to follow will show, language of fairness referenced the concept of rights, either directly or indirectly. Iran consistently argued that sanctions and other restrictions on their use of nuclear energy violated their rights as a sovereign nation. As with the theme prudence, language concerned with justice also turned to issues of trust, however, contextually speaking the language centered more around the concept of justice than prudence in these cases. In particular there were those opposed to the deal who posited that since Iran had a history of cheating, they would most likely cheat on this deal as well and that would be unfair (by definition). Proponents however, argued that trust in Iran could be supported by means of verification as part of the deal and thus fairness would be enforced, so to speak. Many instances of the language in terms of justice suggested that the deal was unjust because it lessened or did not promote the safety of those concerned. In many examples safety was alluded to as a right. Those in favor of the deal argued that safety concerns would be fairly met in the deal and by subsequent actions after the deal was ratified such as military reinforcements. There were also arguments in some cases, about the trustworthiness of the negotiators. Opponents of the deal, who expressed being taken aback by concessions being made by their own side, began to question the motives of the negotiators and in turn the fairness of the deal. Proponents countered that benefits outweighed concessions in the deal which made it more than fair.
Theme findings in terms of fortitude, utilized language that suggested that proponents should have faith in the negotiating process and the deal itself. Whereas those who opposed the deal emphasized doubt about the negotiating process and the deal. These kinds of references were made concerning the negotiators themselves as well. In other words, proponents stressed faith in negotiators’ motives and hope in their abilities while opponents underscored doubt in negotiator motives and abilities. More specific references to hope in the benefits of the deal in terms of their fruition were also made by proponents. Whereas opponents stressed doubt in benefits coming to be. Those in favor of the deal also underscored faith that concessions were not too costly. But those against the deal expressed doubt in regard to the cost of concessions. Particularly, opponents of the deal promoted faith in sanctions and the hope that they would be effective. As with the themes prudence and justice, proponents of the deal emphasized faith in the deal providing safety for constituents. Whereas opponents articulated doubt that the deal would protect let alone promote their safety. In other words, proponents argued that stakeholders should have faith that the deal would not only preserve but would improve their safety concerns. But opponents doubted that claim and instead expressed belief that the deal would not improve but would actually diminish their safety. Some instances of the references to fortitude made by proponents of the deal, connoted the power of negotiators and the legislators who were working to push legislation through. Opponents of the deal argued that negotiators and those for the deal were weak or weak-minded. These claims and appeals were also directed at President Obama, where proponents emphasized Obama’s power but opponents stressed his weakness in one way or another.

Theme findings in terms of temperance included proponent language which emphasized patience with the negotiating process and with negotiators. Whereas opponents of the deal
underscored impatience in terms of the negotiations. Opponents also stressed patience in terms of
the sanctions placed on Iran and the idea that negotiators should wait for Iran to be ready to give
ground in negotiations. As will be shown in the examples sections to follow, language that
appealed to temperance showed that stakeholders on both sides were concerned with issues of
endurance, including awaiting long term results. In other words, both proponents and opponents
of the deal used language to suggest that their respective positions might only be vindicated
when long-term results could be observed. Theme findings for each outlet will be covered in
their respective sections to follow.

Table 3: Theme and News Outlet Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total theme references: 280</th>
<th>AL JAZEERA THEMES</th>
<th>British Broadcast Corporation THEMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prudence</td>
<td>Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acclaims: 93 (~33%)</td>
<td>Wisdom: 29 (~31%)</td>
<td>Understanding: 14 (~15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge: 14 (~15%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attacks: 176 (~63%)</td>
<td>Wisdom: 79 (~45%)</td>
<td>Safety: 8 (~5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trust: 3 (~2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defenses: 11 (~4%)</td>
<td>(nominal)</td>
<td>Fairness &amp; hope (nominal)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total theme references: 279</th>
<th>Prudence</th>
<th>Justice</th>
<th>Fortitude</th>
<th>Temperance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acclaims: 143 (~51%)</td>
<td>Wisdom: 46 (~32%)</td>
<td>Knowledge: 27 (~19%)</td>
<td>Fairness: 15 (~10%)</td>
<td>(nominal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understanding: 32 (~22%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attacks: 103 (~37%)</td>
<td>Wisdom: 72 (~70%)</td>
<td>Fairness: 23 (~22%)</td>
<td>(Nominal)</td>
<td>(nominal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defenses: 32 (~11%)</td>
<td>Wisdom: 24 (75%)</td>
<td>(nominal)</td>
<td>(nominal)</td>
<td>(nominal)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### USA TODAY THEMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total theme references: 523</th>
<th>Prudence</th>
<th>Justice</th>
<th>Fortitude</th>
<th>Temperance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acclaims:</strong> 332 (~63%)</td>
<td>Wisdom: 72 (~22%)</td>
<td>Understanding: 114 (~34%)</td>
<td>Fairness: 70 (~21%)</td>
<td>(nominal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attacks:</strong> 181 (~35%)</td>
<td>Wisdom: 93 (~51%)</td>
<td>Fairness: 25 (~14%)</td>
<td>(nominal)</td>
<td>(nominal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defenses:</strong> 10 (~2%)</td>
<td>(nominal)</td>
<td>(nominal)</td>
<td>(nominal)</td>
<td>(nominal)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NEW YORK TIMES THEMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total theme references: 1,475</th>
<th>Prudence</th>
<th>Justice</th>
<th>Fortitude</th>
<th>Temperance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acclaims:</strong> 989 (~67%)</td>
<td>Understanding: 366 (~37%)</td>
<td>Wisdom: 266 (~27%)</td>
<td>Fairness: 144 (~15%)</td>
<td>(nominal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attacks:</strong> 415 (~28%)</td>
<td>Wisdom: 230 (~55%)</td>
<td>Fairness: 90 (~22%)</td>
<td>Trust: 31 (~7%)</td>
<td>(nominal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defenses:</strong> 71 (~5%)</td>
<td>Wisdom: 38 (~54%)</td>
<td>Trust: 17 (~24%)</td>
<td>Fairness: 7 (~10%)</td>
<td>(nominal)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WASHINGTON POST THEMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total theme references: 1,223</th>
<th>Prudence</th>
<th>Justice</th>
<th>Fortitude</th>
<th>Temperance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acclaims:</strong> 928 (~76%)</td>
<td>Wisdom: 296 (~32%)</td>
<td>Understanding: 303 (~33%)</td>
<td>Fairness: 93 (~10%)</td>
<td>(nominal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attacks:</strong> 255 (~21%)</td>
<td>Wisdom: 139 (~55%)</td>
<td>Fairness: 40 (~17%)</td>
<td>(nominal)</td>
<td>(nominal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defenses:</strong> 40 (~3%)</td>
<td>Wisdom: 16 (~40%)</td>
<td>Fairness: 3 (~7%)</td>
<td>Trust: 6 (~15%)</td>
<td>(nominal)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Al Jazeera

Differentiating the results in terms of publication reveals some interesting results. The only publication in which attacks occurred more frequently than any other functional category
was *Al Jazeera*. Attacks in that publication occurred in greater number in both the *prudence* and *justice* value categories. These phenomena did not occur in any other publication.

**Table 4: Al Jazeera General Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Theory Categories</th>
<th>Overall total</th>
<th>Aristotelian Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prudence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acclams</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>68 (~73%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attacks</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>120 (~68%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defenses</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4 (~36%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The previous table shows the general outcome of functional theory categories of acclaims, attacks, and defenses, and their relationship to *prudence*, *justice*, *fortitude*, and *temperance* as well as overall totals for samples from this publication.

In regards to appeals to *prudence* and *justice* from *Al Jazeera*, the ratio of acclaims to attacks found in other publications (~2:1) was reversed (~1:2). This suggests that authors contributing to *Al Jazeera* made the most negative appeals to *prudence* and *justice*. Another way to say this is that these authors made the most appeals to a lack of wisdom (attack) and a lack of *justice* concerning their topics surrounding the Iran deal. The authors contributing to *Al Jazeera* also made the least amount of appeals to *courage* and the second least amount of appeals to *temperance* (patience) in regard to their topics as compared with the other publications. There were no attacks on *fortitude* found in the samples obtained from *Al Jazeera* nor were there any defenses of *temperance*. It is also interesting to note that as compared with other publications, the fewest number of pertinent articles within the research time-frame were found. The following articles for this source are presented in chronological order. The examples given in each article
represent the general narrative of each article and thus the general sense of values represented.

The following results contain indications of functional theory categories as well as values, both designated within brackets. Each example is followed by a summary according to theme relationship.

Table 5: Al Jazeera Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total theme references: 280</th>
<th>Prudence</th>
<th>Justice</th>
<th>Fortitude</th>
<th>Temperance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acclaims</td>
<td>Wisdom: 93 (~33%)</td>
<td>Understanding: 29 (~15%)</td>
<td>Fairness: 14 (~19%)</td>
<td>(nominal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge: 14 (~15%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attacks</td>
<td>Wisdom: 79 (~45%)</td>
<td>Safety: 8 (~5%)</td>
<td>Fairness: 27 (~15%)</td>
<td>(nominal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trust: 3 (~2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defenses</td>
<td>(nominal)</td>
<td>Fairness &amp; hope (nominal)</td>
<td>(nominal)</td>
<td>(nominal)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The previous table shows major findings in *Al Jazeera* with respect to themes.

As the table for themes revealed in *Al Jazeera* shows, the majority of articles found and used in this study focused more on attacking the wisdom in the courses of action of the various actors involved with the deal, particularly in which the results made stakeholders feel unsafe (attack). Aspects of fairness in terms of the deal and those involved were also attacked in significant numbers. Secondarily, there were acclaims made to the wisdom of the courses of action of the various actors involved with the deal. There were also significant acclaims made about the fairness of the deal and those involved with it.
Al Jazeera Analysis Examples

Despite the overwhelming number of attacks concerning the Iran Deal in *Al Jazeera*, there were articles which attempted to take a more balanced approach in representing appeals made on both sides of the debate.

John Bell (Bell, 2015) for example, in his article “The Deal that Cuts Both Ways,” contains appeals to both sides of the debate [*acclaim: justice*]. In terms of *prudence*, in example of those whose arguments were pro-deal, there were acclaims made about the *wisdom* of the “debate” even taking place, suggesting that dialogue and the search for “stable ground” is better than none [*acclaim: prudence*]. Attacks were made against those who did not recognize the *wisdom* of “diplomacy” over and against any potential status quo or military option [*attack: prudence*]. Those against the deal, Bell references as making acclaims about the *wisdom* of a “Middle East free of WMD [weapons of mass destruction]” and to which a wiser alternative to the deal might be to “empower the troubled Arabs” particularly by “Russia” and the “EU [European Union] [*acclaim: prudence*].” Those against the deal also attacked its *wisdom* based upon the extant “distrust (attack)” and “hostility” of Iran which they argue mirrors the “regional perception” of the country [*attack: wisdom*]. Those anti-deal also attacked the *wisdom* of a deal that does not develop “regional rules” in a quest for “relative equilibrium” in a place where a “battle is still on for territory, power, and control [*attack: prudence*].” As regards *justice*, those pro-deal appealed to the deal as being a diplomatic quest for fairness between negotiating parties and those initiating them, “Obama” in particular, as having just demeanors [*acclaim: justice*]. Those anti-deal also make appeals to *justice* as referenced in Bell’s article. They describe “objections” to the deal as being founded upon recognition of an Iran that tends to seek only its own “interests,” has “disregard for rules,” and has an “if you can get away with it” mentality
[attack: justice]. They also warn that without removing all Iran’s nuclear capabilities there will be a “temptation for other states to match Iran's nuclear capacities” in an attempt at a just balance of power [attack: justice]. Whereas those pro-deal do not make appeals to temperance in this piece, those anti-deal attack what is deemed to be an impatient “rush” to do business with the Iranian economy despite their not being “peace between Israel and the whole region” which will take more time [attack: temperance]. To summarize: in terms of prudence, appeals (acclaims) were made to the benefits of the debate about the deal, the wisdom (direct appeal to prudence) of a pro-deal majority, the wisdom of diplomacy (via a deal) over military action, the wisdom of both sides’ points, the safety of a middle-east free of weapons of mass destruction, and the wisdom of empowering Iran’s Arab enemies. In terms of justice appeals (acclaims) were made to the fairness of the people involved, distrust (attack) and unfairness (attack) (attacks) of Iran, and impatience (attack) of those wanting to do business with Iran. The primary concern of this article was about the wisdom of the course of action concerning the deal with those attacking or questioning the course more than lauding it. Issues of fairness came second with those most concerned about the deal not being fair to those opposite Iran.

Patty Culhane (Culhane, 2015) focuses on the political maneuverings in the United States between President Obama and Congress concerning the Iran deal. With few exceptions the bulk of her article focuses on pro-deal appeals. In terms of prudence, Culhane claims that Obama was “smart enough to not frame this [Iran Deal] as an official treaty” thus avoiding potential intrusion from the rest of the American government [acclaim: prudence]. Those opposed to the deal she attacks as having the “mentality that the US is the centre of the world [attack: prudence].” In an effort to gain some control over the deal and negotiations concerning it, Congress made threats to wield what control they had over the sanctions against Iran which were on the table in the
negotiating process. Culhane attacked those attempts by Congress calling them a “mischaracterization […] assuming that without US sanctions relief Iran would walk away from their side of the bargain [attack: prudence].” She further attacks the wisdom of this move by some members of Congress as a ruse so that they can “tell their constituents that they are "being tough [attack: prudence].”” She goes on to argue that the only result such a move will bring is to “embarrass their president on the world stage,” and “keep American companies from benefiting from any sanctions relief [attack: prudence].” Those anti-deal are represented by Culhane as appealing to just “concerns […] about the authority that is exercised by the president of the United States to conduct foreign policy,” suggesting that President Obama may be unfairly overreaching [attack: justice]. In spite of Congress’ attempts to control negotiations on the deal by controlling sanctions, Culhane makes claims to justice by pointing out that Congress cannot “stop President Barack Obama from making the agreement or going to the UN and lifting international sanctions [acclaim: justice].” Thus, giving courage to herself and those readers who are pro-deal that “Congress can’t kill it [deal] [acclaim: fortitude].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, appeals (acclaims) are made to the wisdom of Obama, the lack of wisdom (attack) (attack) of the those against the deal and their tactics, and the prudence of questioning the reach of presidential authority. In terms of justice, an appeal (acclaim) is made to the fairness of not being able to stop Obama from exercising his office as he sees fit. In terms of fortitude, an appeal (acclaim) is made to give hope that the deal cannot be hindered. This article focuses mostly on attacking the wisdom those against the deal and their tactics (their courses of action).

In his article, “A dangerous deal for the region [attack: prudence],” Seth Frantzman (Frantzman, 2015) reiterates some of the anti-deal arguments presented previously by John Bell but with some new developments. Frantzman acclaims the wisdom of Israeli Prime Minister
Benjamin Netanyahu, describing the latter’s vision as the “future we seek [acclaim: prudence].” He attacks the wisdom of a deal that ignores a “Middle East [that] is on fire due to Iranian meddling” as if “negotiations have been taking place on another planet [attack: prudence].” Frantzman notes polls at the time that “oppose a diplomatic resolution” including “Saudi Arabia and 10 other nations” thus attacking moves that go against the wisdom of such a large group [attack: prudence]. He also attacks the Obama administration for a one-track approach with Iran where “criticism of it [approach] is viewed as placing an obstacle in their path [attack: prudence].” This is demonstrated, according to Frantzman, by the “administration's wrath at Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's speech” to Congress … a wrath which he attacks as unwise (attack) [attack: prudence]. He also notes (attacks) the lack of wisdom (attack) concerning what he believes are “Iran’s [obvious] ambitions” as demonstrated by “funding and arming Hezbollah [attack: prudence].” Frantzman suggests that the Obama administration is unaware of their own weaknesses which can be a downfall in negotiations but that “Iranians understand the Obama administration’s desire for ‘peace’ and the American proclivity for ‘getting to yes [attack: prudence].’” As part of the “administration’s desire for "peace" and the American proclivity for "getting to yes,"” Frantzman suggests that presenting the idea that the “absence of a deal can mean war” is unfounded and thus unwise (attack) [attack: prudence]. In terms of justice, Frantzman claims Netanyahu’s vision of the “future” as just and that Israel has acted as a “canary in the goldmine” in regards to an unjust deal [acclaim: justice]. Thus, the deal in its current form was attacked as unjust [attack: justice]. Iran’s “ambitions” are attacked as unjust to the region including funding what are commonly viewed as terrorist organizations [attack: unjust]. Frantzman attacks negotiations wherein “Iranian Foreign Minister Mohammad Javad Zarif [is] always smiling” as a sign that the “region has been handed to them on a silver
platter [attack: justice].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, appeals (acclaims) are made to the wisdom of Netanyahu’s future vision, the lack of wisdom (attack) (attack) of negotiating with Iran, the lack of wisdom (attack) of going against those anti-deal, the lack of wisdom (attack) of not listening to deal critiques, the lack of wisdom (attack) of Netanyahu’s speech to Congress, the lack of wisdom (attack) of not dealing with Iran’s terrorism, and the lack of wisdom (attack) of Obama’s concessions. In terms of justice, appeals (acclaims) are made to the fairness of Netanyahu’s future vision, the unfairness (attack) (attack) of the deal, the unfairness (attack) of Iran’s actions, and the unfairness (attack) of the negotiations. The bulk of this article focused on attacking the wisdom (courses of action) of proponents of the deal, attacking the fairness of the deal, Iran, and the negotiations themselves.

Richard Heydarian (Heydarian, 2015) claims that the “Iran nuclear deal is a triumph of diplomacy [acclaim: prudence],” in the title of his piece on the matter. Suggesting that it was a wise course of action in the end that took “extraordinary intelligence and luck.” He supports this appeal by calling the deal “historic” and further that “high-profile Democrats in the US Congress as well as Gulf Arab countries, particularly Qatar, have openly expressed their support.” As a result of this deal, Heydarian claims, “America will reopen its embassy [and] President Barack Obama, will visit Iran [acclaim: prudence].” Heydarian claims that this deal is not unlike the “Nixon-Mao rapprochement” and holds similar “promise of unlocking one of the world's most promising markets [acclaim: prudence].” He attacks as unwise (attack) the “prospect of a devastating confrontation” or “military intervention” that proponents insist would occur without a deal [attack: prudence]. In terms of justice, Heydarian claims the “shift of power” that will occur as a result of a deal that promises to keep Iran’s nuclear ambitions within “strictly civilian parameters [acclaim: justice].” He also claims that the “Obama administration
has enough legislative support [power] to overcome Republican and Israeli opposition [acclaim: fortitude].” Heydarian posits that the deal would justly treat Iran, a “member of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and ostensibly end its pariah status in favour of greater integration and interaction with the international community [acclaim: justice].” He claimed that “Iranian people in the streets seeing a brighter future, exploded into celebrations” at the announcement of a deal, that their unjust treatment was over [acclaim: justice]. Heydarian attacks the fairness of whom he refers to as “hardliners” who claim that “red lines [were] stealthily crossed [attack: justice].” He thinks they are only trying to unjustly malign the process [attack: justice].

Heydarian warns those who are “overoptimistic” about the deal and what it might accomplish since he feels this would not be a fair expectation [attack: justice]. The deal, he explains, “falls short of fulfilling all the major demands of both sides [attack: justice],” as was to be expected.

To summarize: in terms of prudence, appeals (acclaims) are made to the wisdom of diplomacy, the benefits of a deal towards relations, the wisdom of comparing the Iran deal to the Nixon Mao deal, and the lack of wisdom (attack) (attack) of military action. In terms of justice, appeals (acclaims) were made to a shift in power towards fairness, fairness toward Iran, the unfairness (attack) (attack) of hard-liners and their tactics, the unfairness (attack) of over expectation about benefits of a deal, and the expectation of equal unfairness (attack) of the deal. In terms of fortitude, an appeal (acclaim) was made to the power to overcome opposition to the deal. This article focused mostly on conveying (acclaiming) understanding (prudence) of the subject.

The editorial board of Al Jazeera felt the need to report on then Secretary of State John Kerry’s testimonial defense in front of the senate of the Iran nuclear deal ("Kerry defends Iran nuclear deal in Senate testimony," 2015) [defense: prudence]. In regards to prudence, during that testimony the deal was claimed as a wise course of action in terms of a “peaceful means” of
dealing with Iran [acclaim: prudence]. In an attack on the wisdom of such a deal the board noted that “few of America's friends in the region back the deal” because they think that the Americans are being “‘fleeced’ by the Iranians [attack: prudence].” Kerry attacked the idea that there could be “a better deal with Iran as “a fantasy, plain and simple [attack: prudence].”’ In defense against Kerry’s attack, the board noted that it would be unwise (attack) not to acknowledge that Iran will “continue to back its allies in Arab states” even after the deal [defense: prudence]. In terms of appeals to justice, Kerry claims that the deal has “closed off all paths to a bomb” and that many “U.S. allies” support the deal [acclaim: justice]. He attacks those against the deal including “Republicans in control of the House and Senate” in saying that “rejection of the accord would give Iran "a great big green light" to swiftly accelerate its atomic programme” which therefore would not be a just approach [attack: justice]. The board attacks a deal that ignores that “US policies in the region were ‘180 degrees’ opposed to Iran's” otherwise suggesting that ignoring these conflicts will result in Iran’s continued unfair interference “in Arab conflicts and pushing hard for heightened regional influence [attack: justice].” In this regard, Kerry defended the fairness of the deal by insisting that the “technical underpinnings of [it] are solid,” “reassure[ing] Gulf Arab officials meeting in Qatar that the US will work with them to ‘push back’ against Iranian influence in the region [defense: justice].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, appeals (acclaims) were made to the wisdom of the deal, the wisdom of diplomacy, the lack of wisdom (attack) (attack) of pro-deal negotiators, the lack of wisdom (attack) in thinking there could be a better deal, and the safety of U.S.’ Arab allies. In terms of justice, appeals (acclaims) were made to the benefit of closing paths to a bomb, trust in the allied pro-deal majority, the unsafe (attack) (attack) results of the tactics of those anti-deal, the unfairness (attack) of Iran’s actions, and the safety of U.S. allies. This article focused mainly on
attacking the wisdom of opponents of the deal including the unfairness (attack) of their tactics and the unfairness (attack) of Iran’s actions.

Al Jazeera’s editorial board then followed up on the report of Kerry’s testimony to the U.S. Senate by reporting on Kerry’s talks on the Iran deal with top Gulf leaders ("Kerry holds talks on Iran deal with top Gulf leaders," 2015) [acclaim: prudence]. The board uses the word “top” as an appeal to the wisdom and influence that such talks might carry. During this meeting Kerry thought it wise to “address security concerns” by offering a “military support package” to “reassure” [defense] those in attendance [defense: prudence]. Despite public support expressed by Gulf leaders, the board noted attacks on the deal’s wisdom from “many [who] have expressed private reservations” about it [attack: prudence]. Concerning justice as appealed to in this short report, the U.S. brought up the “issue of human rights and pressed Egypt on the arrests of dissidents and journalists and mass trials” as a reminder of its concern for fairness [attack: justice]. To summarize: in terms of prudence, appeals (acclaims) were made to the wisdom of talks, the safety of U.S. allies, and the lack of wisdom (attack) (attack) of the deal. In terms of justice, an appeal was made to the unfair (attack) actions of Egypt. This article focused mainly on acclaiming the wisdom and fairness of talks and the contextual knowledge conveyed about the subject.

The editorial board also reported on Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu’s efforts to influence United States Jews to oppose the Iran deal ("Netanyahu lobbies US Jews to act against Iran deal," 2015) [acclaim: prudence]. Netanyahu’s message was to be webcasted and the article claimed that “10,000 people - not taking into account expected group audiences - had signed up to view the webcast.” Thus, wisely producing “grassroots pressure” on the U.S. government [acclaim: prudence]. The board claims that opponents of the deal have been “much
more vocal and active in expressing their case” than proponents in this regard and noted that “thousands attended a very organised Jewish rally [acclaim: prudence].” The board also noted that “Citizens for a Nuclear-Free Iran” had spent at least “$1.7m to lobby against the deal [acclaim: prudence].” Netanyahu attacks the wisdom of proponents of the deal that said that “the deal was the only way to avoid eventual war with Iran [attack: prudence].” Rather, the Israeli Prime Minister said that the deal itself “will bring war” in that “sanctions relief could help Tehran finance destabilising regional conflicts [attack: prudence].” Netanyahu was asked to speak to Congress by “invitation of the Democratic President’s Republican rivals,” which “infuriated the Obama administration,” who questioned the wisdom behind such a move [attack: prudence]. The board interpreted Netanyahu’s actions as those of someone “cast[ing] himself as the emissary of an Israeli public” whose actual opinion on the Iran deal is “mixed [attack: wisdom].” In terms of justice, Netanyahu’s message included that for the American Jewish people it was “time to stand up and be counted [acclaim: justice].” Which suggests that he assumed that everyone would agree with him. He attacked the deal by saying it “was not enough to curb Iranian nuclear projects with bomb-making potential [attack: justice].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, appeals (acclaims) were made to the benefits and knowledge of lobbying efforts of Netanyahu and others anti-deal, the lack of wisdom (attack) (attack) in thinking that the deal was the only way to avoid war, the lack of wisdom (attack) of a deal that brings war, the lack of wisdom (attack) in Netanyahu speaking to Congress, and the lack of wisdom (attack) in thinking Netanyahu speaks for all Israelis. In terms of justice, appeals (acclaims) were made to the fairness of being listened to, and the unfair concessions (attack) of the deal. This article focused mainly on attacking the wisdom of proponents of the deal, the deal itself, and Netanyahu and his actions.
The editorial board also reported more specifically on the aforementioned rally against the deal ("Thousands march in New York against Iran deal," 2015) [acclaim: prudence]. In regards to prudence, Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu claimed the rally as a gathering of “Americans to speak with one voice [acclaim: prudence].” Considering that a poll at the time suggested that “48 percent disapprove[d]” of it, those in attendance attacked the deal “as a threat to Israel and global security [attack: prudence]” and called on the U.S. Congress to “throw the deal out [acclaim: prudence].” Members of Congress on both sides at the time were “very skeptical” about the wisdom of the deal [attack: prudence]. Attendees were of the opinion that it should be “very, very obvious why anyone would be against the deal [acclaim: prudence].” Iran has been an “enemy for 36 years” and there is “no sensible reason why anyone would believe that Iran should be trusted with weapons [acclaim: prudence].” The fairness of the deal was attacked at the rally by showing a “montage of news reports about bombings around the world carried out by armed groups linked to Iran [attack: justice]” prompting speakers to say that “Congress must do its job and stand up for the American people [acclaim: justice].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, appeals (acclaims) were made to the knowledge and benefits of the numbers rallying against the deal, the unsafe (attack) concessions (attack) of the deal, the wisdom of rejecting the deal, the lack of wisdom (attack) of the deal, and the lack of trust (attack) in Iran. In terms of justice, appeals were made to Iran’s unfair and unsafe (attack) (attacks) actions, and the fairness (acclaim) of Congress listening to those anti-deal. This article focused mainly on attacking the wisdom of the deal, its concessions, and the lack of trust (attack) in Iran.

Chris Sheridan reported on Republican candidates from the 2016 presidential election in the United States and specifically their language concerning then President Obama’s Iran policy(Sheridan, 2015). As can be expected all of the candidates were against the deal however
some were reported as being against the deal because they thought that a deal would never be reached. Republican strategist Rich Galen is reported as claiming that “if they [candidates] thought there was a chance of success […] they would hedge their bets [acclaim: prudence].” In other words, Galen thinks the candidates are choosing what they think is the wisest course of action based not upon the content of a deal but upon a deal not emerging from negotiations at all. He thinks “they believe that the ‘deal’ will be nothing more than words and it will go down as a failed negotiation [attack: prudence].” Carly Fiorina, claimed that the wisest course of action was to “put all the sanctions on that we could unilaterally and not talk to them again until they had agreed to full, unfettered inspections of every single nuclear facility they have [acclaim: prudence].” Sheridan uses phrases like “blast” and “sounded the alarm against” while talking about the candidates attacks on the wisdom of the deal [attack: prudence]. He reports that some candidates were arguing that “Iranians still celebrate a ‘Death to America’ day” and as the “premier sponsor of terrorism on the planet […] Tehran is ‘the single greatest threat’ to security” and therefore the “president should have never entered into these negotiations [acclaim: prudence].” Candidates attacked the wisdom of Obama’s entire approach to the mid-east arguing that he “does not fully grasp the dangers posed by many of the actors in the region [attack: prudence]” and that he “wants the Iran deal primarily as a way of retroactively ‘earning’ his Nobel Peace Prize [attack: prudence].” They furthered their own candidacy by attacking the president’s actions toward allies saying that the United States “need[s] a president that does not disrespect our friends like Israel [attack: justice].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, appeals were made to assuming negotiations would be (acclaim) and would not be (attack) productive, the wisdom of sanctions versus negotiations, the lack of wisdom (attack) (attack) in the deal and entering into negotiations, and the lack of wisdom (attack) (attack) in Obama’s mid-east policy.
In terms of justice, an appeal was made to the unfair (attack) action of the president toward U.S. allies. This article focused mainly on attacking the wisdom of negotiations, entering into a deal with Iran, and Obama’s mid-east tactics.

The British Broadcasting Corporation came next in terms of the number of pertinent articles.

British Broadcasting Corporation

Closely following Al Jazeera in terms of pertinent number of articles were articles published by the British Broadcasting Corporation. The BBC samples adhered to the most common pattern in terms of magnitude of acclaims outnumbering attacks which in turn outnumbered defenses. The BBC samples also adhered to the pattern to which prudence was appealed more so than justice, followed lastly by temperance. The only exception to the common pattern was to be found in the categories of acclaims and attacks on justice. Wherein the other publications, except for Al Jazeera, the ratio of acclaims to attacks regarding justice was around two to one, the ratio of acclaims and attacks regarding justice in the BBC was around one to one. Interestingly, there were no appeals to fortitude at all nor were there any attacks on temperance contained in the samples obtained from the BBC.

Table 6: BBC General Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Theory Categories</th>
<th>Overall total</th>
<th>Prudence</th>
<th>Justice</th>
<th>Fortitude</th>
<th>Temperance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acclaims</strong></td>
<td>146</td>
<td>117 (~80%)</td>
<td>27 (~19%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (~1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attacks</strong></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>74 (~74%)</td>
<td>23 (~23%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defenses</strong></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29 (~91%)</td>
<td>2 (~6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (~3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The previous table shows the general outcome of functional theory categories of acclaims, attacks, and defenses, and their relationship to prudence, justice, fortitude, and temperance as well as overall totals for samples from this publication.

Table 7: BBC Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BRITISH BROADCAST CORPORATION THEMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total theme references:</strong> 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prudence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acclaims: 143 (~51%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding: 32 (~22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attacks: 103 (~37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defenses: 32 (~11%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The previous table shows major findings in the British Broadcast Corporation with respect to themes.

As the table correlating functional theory categories, values, and themes shows, the articles from the British Broadcasting Corporation were primarily focused on acclaiming aspects of the deal and the actions of its stakeholders as well as conveyance of the knowledge the author’s felt important to facilitate understanding of the subject. Secondarily, the articles focused on attacking the wisdom of stakeholders involved with the deal as well as the fairness of their actions and the fairness of the deal. Lastly, relatively significant defenses were made in regard to the wisdom (course of action) of the deal.
BBC Analysis Examples

The following results contain indications of functional theory categories as well as values, both designated within brackets. Each example is followed by a summary according to theme relationship.

Russian commentary on the Iran deal and its effects on the Syrian crisis as told to the Chinese and published by the BBC are included in the first chronological article ("Iran nuclear deal to have positive impacts on Syrian crisis - China commentary.," 2013) [acclaim: prudence]. In this particular article Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov claims the potential “positive impacts on the Syrian crisis” of the Iran deal [acclaim: prudence]. These are speculations on the results of choosing what is judged to be a just, wise course of action [acclaim: justice & prudence]. Lavrov further postulates that the situation in Syria “has never been a domestic issue, but an international one widely linked to other regional issues [acclaim: prudence].” He states that the Iran deal “will put an end to the flow of terrorists, weapons and money into Syria” and will thenceforth be “conducive to opening up discussions, dialogues and communication between all external Parties [acclaim: justice & prudence].” However, the article also mentions that there are those that are “sceptical that the Iran deal would have positive effects on the Syrian crisis [attack: prudence].” In this regard the Iran deal is viewed as an unwise (attack) course of action that will lead to unjust consequences, in particular because the deal does address the “non-stop support for the rebels and al-Qaida-linked groups from regional players” destabilizing the region(s) in question [attack: prudence & justice]. To summarize: appeals (acclaims) were made in this article to the justice and wisdom of the benefits of the deal for Syria, the knowledge of the source of the crisis in Syria, lack of wisdom (attack) (attack) thinking that the deal would benefit Syria, the lack of wisdom (attack) and justice (safety) of the deal for Syria. This article focused
mainly on acclaiming the wisdom of the deal and the fairness of the benefits for Syria as well as conveying the knowledge involved with these matters.

Turkish reports published by the *BBC* on the Iran deal also talk about its possible impacts on the nation of Turkey ("Commentary views possible impact on Turkey of nuclear deal in Geneva," 2013) [acclaim: prudence]. The deal is viewed positively in this article in terms of a prudent approach to not only the situation in Iran but also its potential effects on Turkey [acclaim: prudence]. The deal is referred to as a “major seismic shift in the region that rearranges the entire chess board as claimed by respected analyst Vali R. Nasr [acclaim: prudence].” The speculation of rearrangement is bolstered by the qualifier “respected” in reference to the source. In other words, this is a prediction coming from a wise person [acclaim: prudence]. The article reports that “Turkish stocks and the lira went up after the good news” and that that could lead to “a substantial decrease in the big current account deficit [acclaim: prudence].” Sanctions being lifted concerning the deal with Iran may create “new possibilities for trade with Iran” but that “the real test for Turkish foreign policy will be how it copes with the effects of the Iran deal on the situation in Syria [acclaim: prudence].” These are all appeals to wisdom in terms of the deal’s future power of influence. Nevertheless, the article does describe the overall view of the deal in this regard as “optimistic and expect that further American-Iranian rapprochement will make reaching a deal on a cease-fire and, ultimately, a political solution in Syria easier because of Iran's enormous leverage with Syrian President Bashar al-Assad [acclaim: prudence].” As an attack on the wisdom of the deal, the article suggests that accurate predictions are “still out […] on the consequences for Turkish foreign policy [attack: prudence].” In a more “sobering” reference to the situation in Syria, the article notes that “Brookings Doha Centre Research Director Shadi Hamid does not expect Iran to distance itself from Assad as long as there is no
final nuclear deal \textit{[acclaim: prudence].}” Still, in defense of the potential positive trade relationship between Turkey and Iran that may result from a finalization of the deal the article reports that “Foreign Minister Ahmet Davutoglu already did some fence-mending in Baghdad earlier this month and will visit Tehran this week \textit{[defense: prudence].}” To summarize: in terms of \textit{prudence}, appeals (acclaims) were made in this article to \textit{knowledge} of the deal’s impact on Turkey, the \textit{benefits} for Turkey, the \textit{knowledge} of a power shift in the region, \textit{wisdom} and \textit{trust} for the source, \textit{benefits} for Syria, \textit{lack of knowledge (attack)} (attack) of the results for Turkey, and \textit{knowledge} of Iran’s position on Syria without a deal. This article focused mainly on attacking the lack of wisdom (attack) in terms of knowledge of the potential results of the deal for Turkey. Secondarily, the article acclaimed the potential benefits (prudence, wise course of action) of the deal for Turkey.

News on the Iran deal from Dubai as reported by the \textit{BBC} shows concern for Gulf Cooperation Council involvement in any final ratification ("US senator says any permanent Iran deal requires GCC "involvement.," 2013) \textit{[acclaim: prudence].} U.S. Senator Tim Kaine claimed the \textit{wisdom} of including the Council in the negotiating process by saying that “any permanent Iran deal requires GCC ‘involvement.’” However, in an attack on the \textit{justice} and \textit{wisdom} of the process, GCC officials pointed out that the “nuclear issue is not the only problem with Iran, and if Iran is to be welcomed back to the regional community it needs to stop trying to destabilise its \textit{neighbours [attack: justice & prudence].}” They further noted that Iran has been an “active backer of Hezbollah in Lebanon, of several groups in Iraq, and has been sending its own troops and Hezbollah units to fight for the regime in Syria [attack: justice].” Specifically, Iran was accused of the unjust action of encouraging “Hezbollah to blame Saudi Arabia of being behind the recent bombing in Beirut [attack: justice].” Kaine “attempted to allay GCC fears that any deal with Iran
cannot just cover the nuclear issue” in defense of the wisdom of the current U.S. position [defense: prudence]. The GCC “reiterated the well-defined Saudi position that any full agreement with Iran has to also include a wider clarity banning weapons of mass destruction from the entire region, in a clear reference to Israel's nuclear weapons,” as a more just approach than currently being considered [acclaim: justice]. In defense of the justice of the negotiations, Kaine “deliberately focuse[d] on allaying international fears” in this regard [defense: justice]. To summarize: in terms of prudence, appeals (acclaims) in this article were made to the knowledge of GCC involvement for a final deal, the unfair and unwise (attack) actions of Iran, and the wisdom of the U.S. position on Iran and the deal. In terms of justice, appeals (acclaims) were made to the fairness of banning all weapons of mass destruction in the region, and the fairness of negotiations. This article mainly focused on attacking Iran’s actions as unwise (attack) and unfair (attack) but also acclaiming the wisdom of the U.S. position on Iran and the deal.

In another perspective from Turkey, this particular observation acclaims the Iran deal while lamenting Turkey’s absence from the process ("Commentary hails Iran deal, rue[s Turkey's absence from process," 2015) [acclaim: prudence; attack: prudence]. The article uses language such as “Well done! [and] … something to celebrate [acclaim: prudence].” They hope that the deal will “help restore peace in the Region [acclaim: fortitude].” Negotiations on the deal are claimed as the “most realistic and rational thing to do” and the “best solution [a] return to diplomacy in the Middle East, and talking to Iran is an inevitable step to achieve a diplomatic solution [acclaim: prudence].” Author’s in this piece present themselves as “fan[s] of Iran as a beautiful country and great culture [acclaim: prudence].” Some “wish Turkey could have been a part” of this event [acclaim: prudence]. In more of an attack on their own country, some even “rue[s] Turkey’s absence” as unwise (attack) and a call the act a “missed opportunity for Turkey
They go on to argue that Turkey was “isolating itself from the Western alliance while also its relations with Iran [were] also deteriorating.” The article attacks the wisdom of previous “Western politics, which have been shaped by hostility to Iran since the Islamic Revolution, [and] had done nothing but increase turmoil and suffering in the Middle East.” However, one author defends his own wisdom in previously “saying the best solution was to politically engage with Iran.” There is also a claim of the justice and patience of the “current” Turkish government that “put in real effort to mediate between Iran and the West and should be given credit for its previous political line.” To summarize: in terms of prudence, appeals (acclaims) in this article were made to the wisdom of the deal, Turkey’s unwise absence from negotiations, hope (fortitude) in the benefits of the deal, the wisdom of diplomacy, knowledge of the country and culture of Iran, Turkey’s participation as a wiser choice, unwise letting Turkey’s foreign relations deteriorate, and the previous unwise Western policies toward the mid-east. In terms of justice and temperance, appeals (acclaims) were made to the benefits of the fair and patient initial bridge-building efforts of the Turkish government. This article primarily attacked the wisdom of Turkey’s absence from negotiations and the West’s previous mid-east policies. Secondarily, the article acclaims the wisdom and benefits of the deal.

President Obama received specific acclimations in an article by the Turkish Islamic Daily published by the BBC (“Turkish Islamic daily praises US president's handling of Iran nuclear talks,” 2015) [acclaim: prudence]. The article “praises [the] US president’s handling” as the actions of a wise man. Comparison of Obama is made to Winston Churchill who is quoted as saying “To jaw-jaw is always better [wiser] than to war-war.” The wisdom of Obama’s efforts to “challenge the traditional norms of American foreign policy” by making it
“clear he would be willing to talk to them [Iran]” is also lauded [acclaim: prudence]. Obama is said to have “delivered on his promise” in this regard at least [acclaim: justice]. Further, the wisdom of Obama’s “determination to prioritize nuclear non-proliferation over America's involvement in other Middle Eastern conflicts” is claimed to be the “main reason why this deal became possible [acclaim: prudence].” Because he “rightly believed that any direct military involvement to topple the Assad regime would have jeopardized nuclear talks [acclaim: prudence].” Some caution is advised as a wiser approach however, to “reserve judgment and see how the administration explains the clauses of the agreement [acclaim: prudence].” But that the Iran deal will “most likely be remembered as the most important foreign policy achievement of the Obama presidency [acclaim: prudence].” The author speculates that “a different, more hawkish, American administration could have intervened in Syria and prioritized bringing peace and quiet to this country rather than engaging in nuclear diplomacy in Iran [acclaim: prudence].” The drawback (attack) to Obama’s tactic, the author argues, was that he “took serious risks with both Saudi Arabia and Israel by pursuing talks with Iran [attack: prudence].” In an effort to criticize [attack] Obama as “being a naive pacifist” Hillary Clinton challenged his method(s) [attack: prudence]. But the author points out that in defending his approach “[Obama] cleverly argued that the Iraq war, which Clinton had voted for and supported, helped Iran to establish political supremacy over Baghdad [defense: prudence].” Further defending Obama, the author claims that he “did not lose [his] strategic patience [temperance] and managed to continue the nuclear talks with Iran despite serious interventions from Israel to the American domestic political process [acclaim: temperance].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, appeals (acclaims) were made to the wisdom of Obama, the wisdom of negotiations, the wisdom of placing safety from weapons of mass destruction first, the wisdom of caution until details are
revealed, the deal will be remembered as wisest achievement of Obama in foreign policy, knowledge of those pro military action, the lack of wisdom (attack) (attack) in risking relations with allies, the unwise (attack) (attack) tactics of Obama toward the mid-east, and the Iraq war as unwise (attack) (attack). In terms of justice, an appeal (acclaim) was made to the fairness of Obama keeping a promise. In terms of temperance, appeals (acclaims) were made to strategic patience despite opposition. This article primarily focused on acclaiming the wisdom in Obama, negotiations, and conveyance of understanding of the surrounding situation.

In an article by the Turkish press, published by the BBC, there is some discussion on the Iran nuclear deal and the talks surrounding it ("Turkish press discusses Iran nuclear deal, coalition talks," 2015) [acclaim: prudence]. Some claim that the “possibility of a political solution in Syria” might be realized by the deal, making it a wise course of action and that the “anti-ISIS international front has become much stronger after the deal achieved with Iran [acclaim: prudence].” In terms of justice, some claim that there may be “great benefits for Turkey” including being “rescued from the limitations caused by the sanctions against Iran” and thereby “increase the trade volume with Turkey [acclaim: justice].” Returning to the Syrian crisis, some argue that there has been an unfair “material and non-material burden caused by the Syrian refugees” placed on Turkey [attack: justice]. Freed from that, contrast is made between Turkey and Iran in regards to ISIS in that it would be “unnecessary to ask the permanent members of the Security Council who they will trust most on fighting against ISIS - Iran or Turkey [acclaim: prudence]. In that sense, if Syria and thus Turkey benefits in regards to the deal, it would not be wise to abandon efforts toward it [attack: prudence]. Pointing towards the potential shortcomings of the deal, those against it challenge its wisdom in that it “has allowed Iran to legitimize its armament of the region with weapons other than nuclear ones [attack:
Further, it is argued, “[f]rom now on, anyone can set up a nuclear centrifuge, enrich uranium and have nuclear arms technology [acclaim: prudence].” Therefore, there is expression of “hope that the world will not one day name this deal among the reasons for the start of a nuclear war [acclaim: fortitude].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, appeals (acclaims) in this article were made to knowledge of discussion of Iran talks, benefits of a deal that helps fight ISIS, trust in Tukey over Iran, lack of wisdom (attack) (attack) in abandoning a deal, lack of wisdom (attack) (attack) in legitimizing Iran’s armaments, and knowledge (acclaim) of the deal initiating an arms race. In terms of justice, appeals (acclaims) were made to benefits for Turkey from the deal, and Turkey’s unfair (attack) burden from Syrian refugees. In terms of fortitude, an appeal (acclaim) was made to hope that the deal would not lead to nuclear war. This article primarily focused on acclaiming the knowledge to facilitate understanding of the Iran talks as well as acclaiming the wisdom behind them. Secondarily, the article attacked the lack of wisdom (attack) in Iranian actions and abandoning talks with Iranians.

The Israeli Press wrote a piece published by the BBC that examined Obama’s attempt(s) at defending the Iran nuclear deal (“Israel's Hebrew press focuses on Obama defence of Iran nuclear deal,” 2015) [defense: prudence]. Obama is described as “defend[ing] [the wisdom of] the Iran nuclear deal now before Congress, accusing its opponents of ‘selling a fantasy [attack: prudence].’” A claim for the wisdom and justice of the deal was made wherein the

Military Intelligence Research Department and the Mossad provided senior decision makers [made an] assessment based on analysing the agreement between the five powers plus the EU and Iran, according to which what we have here is a reasonable, even good agreement which includes the means that will deny Iran nuclear weapons in the coming decade [acclaim: prudence & justice].
Obama “accused critics of his deal of being the same Republican war mongers who drove us into the ground war against Iraq and has warned that they would offer ‘overheated’ and often dishonest arguments [attack: prudence].” He also “complained about the influence of lobbyists and money on the process of deciding this important issue [attack: justice].” These are appeals to a lack of wisdom (attack) and unfairness (attack) in opposing the deal. The author, assuming the ratification of a final version of the deal suggests that Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu “should show restraint [acclaim: temperance].” He argues that Netanyahu “does not have to bless [the agreement], but [instead] do what his predecessors did […] when there were disagreements with the White House the personal channel with the president was kept [acclaim: prudence].” The author suggests this is the wisest course. The author goes on to posit that unwise (attack) actions “pushed Obama into a situation in which he must distinguish between the security interests of the United States and those of Israel, and clarify that they are not necessarily the same [attack: prudence].” This “brought about an open rift between the Oval Office and the Prime Minister's Office in Jerusalem [attack: prudence].” Particularly when “Netanyahu crossed red lines in his battle against the Iran deal, when he grossly intervened in domestic American politics and tried to present himself as someone who knows America's interests better than the president of the United States [attack: prudence].” Thus Obama “directed at Netanyahu several sharp arrows … defined those who proposed a better agreement as ‘sellers of fantasy’ and then marked the detractors of the agreement as ‘ignorant or they do not speak the truth [attack: prudence & justice].’” However, the author attacked the wisdom of Obama’s tactic as “sound[ing] hollow” and said that the “audience got a familiar melody intended to ridicule his political opponents and at the same time scare the American public by drawing apocalyptic
scenarios about what is expected as a result of Congress thwarting the presidential veto [attack: prudence].” He suggests that such

ad hominem arguments [are] becoming less and less convincing as more Democratic members of Congress, more liberal supporters of the president, more nuclear experts and more foreign policy gurus are expressing deep concern, and sometimes strong opposition to the deal [attack: prudence].

His advice to the President to be fair and just is to “stop attacking his critics and to start answering their hard questions with specific and credible answers [acclaim: justice].” He further charges that “the deal with Iran is diplomatic deception … those who signed it did not read it and are not familiar with many documents that are supposed to constitute means of supervising and implementing it [attack: prudence].” The author notes that the “wild applause” following Obama’s distinction between U.S. and Israeli security interests is but a “small example of the serious problem Israel finds itself in [acclaim: prudence].” However, the author does offer that “it is possible to change the grave reality which the agreement puts before the world” by arguing that “when US Jews act out of concern for Israel they do not put their loyalty [to America] to the test [acclaim: prudence].” He goes on to suggest that “quarrel and strife will not assist in filling Israel weapons' stores [acclaim: prudence]” and that it was unwise (attack) that the “prime minister had not chosen to enter discreet discourse opposite the US administration on the required package of compensation and assistance to secure Israel's security [attack: prudence].”

To summarize: in terms of prudence, appeals (acclaims) were made to the wisdom of the deal, lack of wisdom (attack) (attack) of those anti-deal, the wisdom (acclaim) of keeping communication open, the lack of wisdom (attack) (attack) in Obama’s tactics, lack of wisdom (attack) (attack) of those pro-deal, knowledge (acclaim) of Israel’s problematic situation,
knowledge (acclaim) of Jews’ loyalty concerns, and lack of wisdom (attack) (attack) of Netanyahu. In terms of justice, appeals (acclaims) were made to the fairness of the deal, the unfair (attack) influence of those anti-deal and their tactics, and treating critics fairly (acclaim).

In terms of temperance, an appeal (acclaim) is made for Netanyahu to have patience. This article primarily attacked the wisdom of those on both sides of the deal, especially the unfairness (attack) of opponents of the deal. Secondarily, the article acclaimed information to facilitate understanding of the subject, the course of action leading to a fair deal, and knowledge surrounding both.

The Hebrew Press also wrote a piece published by the BBC in which discussion of fears of a Russian – Iranian “coalition” was discussed ("Israel's Hebrew press discusses fears of Iranian-Russian "coalition."," 2015) [acclaim: prudence]. The previous piece, “Israel's Hebrew press focuses on Obama defence of Iran nuclear deal,” brought out the idea that President Obama had argued that he did not see the security interests of the United States and Israel being one and the same. In this current piece, Obama “passionately defend[s] [the wisdom of] the Iran nuclear arms deal [defense: prudence]” however he “shares their concerns about Iran's threats to Israel [acclaim: prudence].” Rather, “ensuring a nuclear-free Iran was the most important objective [acclaim: prudence].” The article attacks the wisdom of Obama’s defense saying that he is “undoubtedly qualified to argue that the Iran deal enhances US security, [but] how can he say the same about Israel's security when its elected leaders and a strong consensus on both the Right and the Left see things very differently [attack: prudence]?” The authors note that it is unwise (attack) that the “tone of debate between Israel and the USA, between American Jews and between Democrats and Republicans surrounding the Iran deal has turned too vitriolic [attack: prudence].” Even Obama has “called for a more civil debate over the Iran nuclear deal [acclaim:
prudence)” as a wise choice. In any case, the article recognizes the lack of cordiality coming from both sides of the debate over this matter and therefore thinks it wise to “join[s] Obama's call for more civility [acclaim: prudence]” despite unsettled differences, claiming that “US and Israeli policy concerning Iran will realign ‘pretty quick [acclaim: prudence].’” To summarize: in terms of prudence, appeals (acclaims) in this article are made to knowledge of a possible Russian–Iranian coalition, wisdom of the deal, knowledge of Iran’s threat to Israel, wisdom of a nuclear-free Iran, lack of wisdom (attack) (attack) in Obama, lack of wisdom (attack) of the tone of conversation, wisdom of improved tone of conversation, and knowledge (acclaim) of future improved relations. This article primarily focused on acclaiming understanding the knowledge behind the tone of the conversation between proponents and opponents of the deal. Secondarily, the article focused on attacking the wisdom in the tone in the conversation and Obama’s course of action (unwise (attack)).

A previous piece, “Israel's Hebrew press focuses on Obama defence of Iran nuclear deal,” briefly touched on a former Israeli spy’s critique of Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu’s diplomatic efforts concerning the Iran deal. This piece, written in the Jerusalem Post and published by the BBC, adds a bit more detail to that information ("Former Israeli spy chief raps Netanyahu handling of Iran deal," 2015) [attack: prudence]. The attack comes from “former Mossad chief” Meir Dagan wherein he assesses the “Israeli government's handling of the Iranian nuclear threat [acclaim: prudence].” Dagan argues that “Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu was only serving to alienate the Jewish State from the United States and its president, Barack Obama [attack: prudence].” A particular vehicle of that alienation which Dagan “harshly criticize[s]” was “Netanyahu's speech to US Congress [attack: prudence].” He also “ridiculed [attacked the wisdom of] Netanyahu's assertion that Iran posed a threat to the United States
The article claims that the “problem is Iran, not President Obama” and that the “conflict [is] reaching to places that [he] think[s] are against the interest of Israel and against the interests of the United States.” To summarize according to theme: in terms of prudence, appeals in this article were made to the lack of wisdom (attack) in Netanyahu and his tactics, the wisdom (acclaim) of Dagan, lack of wisdom (attack) (attack) thinking Iran was a threat to the U.S., and knowledge (acclaim) of the source of the problem and the negative escalation of dialogue about it. This article primarily attacked the wisdom of Netanyahu and his actions as well as the thought that Iran was a threat to the U.S. Secondarily, the article acclaimed the conveyance of knowledge which facilitates understanding of the subject.

Another short article focusing on Russia’s role in Syria, this time from the perspective of the Palestinian Press critiquing the Hebrew Press and their story on the same subject, both published by the BBC (“Israel's Hebrew press ponders Russia's role in Syria, support for Iran deal,” 2015). The article claims that the Israelis are “naturally worried about the future” in regards to the Iran deal but that there are “reasons for hope as well.” The assertion is made that it is wise to believe that “Sunni Arab states led by Saudi Arabia [are] likely to turn even more to Israel for an alliance against Shi'i Iran” and that there is a “growing chance that a pro-Israel Republican could win the 2016 presidential election and undo much of the Iran deal.” Barring that, the article claims that it is important to remember that “Israel [is] by far the strongest power in the Middle East” and has a “strong First World economy.” This is contrasted with Iran whose economy is called “third world” and whose government is called “highly corrupt” and its elections “pseudo-Democratic at best.” To summarize: in terms of prudence,
appeals (acclaims) in this article were made to knowledge of the Hebrew Press’ story about Russia’s role in Syria and support for Iran deal, Israel’s concern for the deal as wise, knowledge of a future pro-Israel U.S. president, knowledge of the strength of Israel and its economy, and the lack of wisdom (attack) (attack) in Iran’s economy and government. In terms of fortitude, an appeal (acclaim) is made to hope for benefits from the deal. This article focused primarily on conveying the knowledge to understand Russia’s role in Syria and Israel’s positive future. The next publication with the most pertinent articles was USA Today.

USA Today

The pertinent samples obtained from USA Today outnumbered those found in Al Jazeera and the British Broadcast Corporation by around two to one respectively. Those found in USA Today followed the most common pattern established by all these publications in which acclaims were more numerous than attacks which in turn were more numerous than defenses. These samples also adhered to the pattern in which the most appeals were made to prudence followed by justice, then fortitude, and lastly temperance. This pattern held for acclaims, attacks, and defenses in that order of magnitude.

Table 8: USA Today General Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Theory Categories</th>
<th>Overall Total</th>
<th>Aristotelian Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prudence</td>
<td>Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acclaims</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>228 (~69%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attacks</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>99 (~65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defenses</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The previous table shows the general outcome of functional theory categories of acclaims, attacks, and defenses, and their relationship to prudence, justice, fortitude, and temperance as well as overall totals for samples from this publication.

Table 9: USA Today Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USA TODAY THEMES</th>
<th>USA TODAY THEMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total theme references</strong>: 523</td>
<td><strong>Prudence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acclaims</strong>: 332 (~63%)</td>
<td>Wisdom: 72 (~22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attacks</strong>: 181 (~35%)</td>
<td>Wisdom: 93 (~51%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defenses</strong>: 10 (~2%)</td>
<td>(nominal)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The previous table shows major findings in USA Today with respect to themes.

As the table for themes revealed in USA Today shows, the majority of articles found and used in this study focused more on acclaiming (conveying) the information that the author(s) felt was needed to understand the context of the subject. This was closely followed by attacks on the wisdom in the actions of deal stakeholders and their views. Secondarily, the articles acclaims the wisdom and fairness in the actions of deal stakeholders and their views.

USA Today Analysis Examples

The following articles for this source are presented in chronological order according to the research period (indicated previously). The examples given in each article represent the general narrative of each article and thus the general sense of values represented. The following
results contain indications of functional theory categories as well as values, both designated within brackets. Each example is followed by a summary according to theme relationship.

The article “Israel says ‘bad’ Iran deal will bring war [attack: prudence]” (Dorell, 2013b) published by USA Today contains many appeals to values for and against the deal. The title itself refers to Israel calling the deal “bad” [unwise (attack)] in that it will have the opposite of its intended effect in bringing war. Israel “prevailed upon negotiators to harden the deal to avert war [acclaim: prudence]” as the wise choice. Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu argued that “any [wise] deal should force Iran to abide by U.N. Security Council demands it end its enrichment of uranium” as well as “maintain economic sanctions imposed on Iran to force it to open up its nuclear program to inspections and to stop ongoing construction [acclaim: prudence].” He further argued that those who are pro-deal are appealing to a false dilemma in saying that it’s either the deal or war [attack: prudence]. Instead Netanyahu says that “there is a third [wiser] option: Keep the pressure up; in fact, increase the pressure [acclaim: prudence].” He describes a nuclear Iran as a “threat to [Israel’s] existence [attack: justice] and it will launch a military strike if necessary to stop it.” Iran however, has “held firm, insisting its program is peaceful and that it has the right [acclaim: justice] to pursue it.” Those who are pro-deal claim that the deal will “calm the Middle East and improve the odds of a better future deal [acclaim: prudence].” President Obama appealed to the patience of Congress by “ask[ing] U.S. senators to hold off on their intention to propose tougher sanctions [acclaim: temperance]” against Iran. However, the wisdom of that move was attacked wherein it seems to be “proposing to ease sanctions without getting proper assurances that Iran will end its nuclear program [attack: prudence].” Overall, those anti-deal even in its interim phase, the article contends, believe it to be “defective [attack: prudence].” The article quotes Representative Ed Royce, R-Calif., and
Representative Eliot Engel Democrat of New York who say that the United States “cannot allow Iran to continue to advance toward a nuclear weapons capability while at the same time providing relief from the sanctions pressure we worked so hard to build [attack: justice].” The article contends that one must understand (wisdom) that Iran “already has five bombs' worth of lower enriched uranium and could convert it in a matter of weeks to weapons-grade uranium [acclaim: prudence].” Thus, those anti-deal posit that any deal in any phase “that lets Iran off the hook will lead to the military option that the world is trying to avoid [acclaim: prudence].” Secretary of State John Kerry defends the wisdom of the deal in saying “[n]othing that we are doing here, in my judgment, will put Israel at any additional risk … In fact, let me make this clear: We believe it reduces risk [defense: prudence].” Benjamin Netanyahu counters that it is unwise (attack) that “Kerry is prepared to accept a deal that allows Iran to keep intact its machinery and facilities for making nuclear weapon fuel [attack: prudence].” Kerry insists that this deal is only a “‘first step’ in broader negotiations to curtail Iran's nuclear program [acclaim: prudence].” But those anti-deal note that Israel is “not the only party urging caution [acclaim: prudence].” The article points out that France, for example, “scuttled the negotiations early this month when it said they were headed toward a deal that would not guarantee the safety of the region [attack: justice]” and that it would “maintain sanctions and pressure against Iran until [it] is certain that it has renounced a suspected nuclear weapons program [acclaim: justice].” The article contends that those anti-deal are saying that sanctions “should not be removed in return for half-measures by Iran [acclaim: prudence].” They are calling the interim deal “a mistake, a terrible mistake, a historic error [attack: prudence].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article makes appeals to the deal being unwise (attack) (attack), hardening benefits/lessening concessions as wise (acclaim), lack of wisdom (attack) (attack) of those pro-deal, wisdom
acclaim) of continued pressure, benefits of the deal, bad concessions (attack) (attack) of the deal, the deal being safe (acclaim), knowledge of Iran’s capabilities, knowledge that the interim deal is a beginning, and knowledge of the plurality of those anti-deal in terms of justice, appeals were made to Iran’s unfair (attack) threat to Israel’s existence, Iran’s right (acclaim) to use nuclear technology peacefully, the deal being unsafe (attack) (attack), and sanctions being fair (acclaim). In terms of temperance, an appeal (acclaim) is made for Congress to have patience.

The primary focus of this article is to acclaim the wisdom of the courses of action of deal stakeholders but an equal amount of time is spent on attacking the wisdom of their courses of action too. An equal amount of time is also spent acclamation and attacking the fairness of stakeholders as well. Secondarily, the article focuses on the conveyance of knowledge to facilitate understanding of the subject.

The article “Iran deal leaves Arab fears intact [attack: prudence & justice],” (Dorell, 2013a) builds specifically upon the objections to the deal brought to light by Arab constituents concerned with the deal. There is of course an appeal to fear in the title which in turn is an appeal to prudence and justice in terms of safety. Part of the fears indicated have to do with the potential for the deal to “alter the Middle East dramatically” and the unknown outcomes of that alteration. According to the article, Abdullah al-Askar, chairman of Saudi Arabia's appointed Shoura Council argues that Iran will “give up something to get something else from the big powers in terms of regional politics [acclaim: prudence].” Abdullah worries that the deal might be “giving Iran more space or a freer hand in the region [attack: prudence].” He goes on to note that Iran “has an ugly agenda in the region, and in this regard, no one in the region will sleep and assume things are going smoothly [attack: prudence].” In contrast, the article points out that “Western governments and the allies of Iran praised [the wisdom of] the deal as walking the world back
from a possible military confrontation.” Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu is reported as attacking [the wisdom and justice of] the deal as “not a historic agreement, [but] a historic mistake.” Defending the relationship [defense: fortitude] between the United States and Israel, President Obama stated that the U.S. “will remain firm in [its] commitment to Israel, which has good reason to be skeptical about Iran's intentions.” The author attacks the wisdom of the deal however in noting that “differences over the two sides’ understanding of the deal” occurred “less than a day after the deal was made [attack: prudence].” In example, the article points to declarations made by Iran President Hassan Rouhani who said “that the deal recognizes Tehran's ‘right’ [acclaim: justice] to enrich uranium.” Whereas U. S. Secretary of State John Kerry countered that “it does not [acclaim: justice].” Members of Congress, the article contends, who were “pushing to strengthen economic sanction against Iran over its program [acclaim: prudence]” relented to President Obama’s appeal for patience [acclaim: temperance] and said that they would “hold off” in that regard. Some of the critics of the deal are upset that it “does not freeze or force a rollback of Iran's production of nuclear fuel [attack: prudence]” especially since there have been “several United Nations Security Council resolutions [which] demanded [it] [acclaim: prudence].” This is an appeal to an unwise (attack) lowering of standards. In defense of this accusation, Secretary of State John Kerry appealed to the temperance and prudence of critics by referring to the deal as a “first stage [acclaims].” Kerry also noted that Iran “agreed to put a cap on its nuclear program and give international inspectors greater access [acclaim: justice].” However, in return, the West “agreed to provide Iran about $7 billion in relief on sanctions [acclaim: justice].” The article states that other analysts are saying that “it looks as if the United States is retreating from its traditional role as the guarantor of security in the region” and that this is the “most worrying result” of the deal [acclaim: prudence]. Further,
these analysts are also arguing that the deal is “leaving Iran a threshold nuclear nation that can race across the weapons line in a matter of weeks or months [acclaim: prudence].” This means that “Israel and the Sunni nations must look more to each other to defend against Iran [acclaim: prudence].” In addition, the article quotes Michael Doran, who served as a Middle East adviser to President George W. Bush, who said that “the United States cannot be relied upon to stand up to Iran … Israel and our Arab allies will be forced to live by their wits [acclaim: prudence].” The author also posits that countries “across the Middle East” because of the deal are “now more likely to invest in nuclear programs of their own, form new alliances and reorient their policies to accommodate Iranian rather than American interests [acclaim: prudence].” The article also quotes Nadim Shehadeh of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, who argues that Iran’s “bottom line” is that it will “trade its nuclear capability with the recognition of its hegemony over the region” and as a result “Saudi-Iranian tensions and (tensions in) the broader Gulf region increase [acclaim: prudence]” which in turn “will lead to major sectarian escalation with incalculable price for the region [acclaim: prudence].” In fact, the article suggests, it is the Saudis who are “most alarmed by the potential U.S.-Iran detente and the rise of an unrestrained Iran [acclaim: prudence].” Professor Avraham Diskin, a political scientist at Hebrew University in Jerusalem, is quoted as saying that Iran is “not a threat only to Israel; it is a threat to the whole world and especially to the Middle East [acclaim: prudence].” He argues that these other countries in the Middle East “feel threatened and, like Israel, have a very strong interest in blocking Iran's potential nuclear military capabilities [acclaim: prudence].” In fact, Diskin says, these other countries “may not sit and wait” to see if Iran abides by the agreement [acclaim: prudence],” implying that they may take matters into their own hands and choose a military option to solve the problem. The author continues that “Jordan, Israel and the Sunni monarchies
in the Persian Gulf see the deal as the world letting Iran continue its nuclear work while pursuing its ambition of becoming the region's dominant power [acclaim: prudence].” The author quotes Danielle Pletka, a Middle East analyst at the American Enterprise Institute, who says that the “Saudis, Kuwaits, Emiratis, Jordanians […] have a dawning understanding like the Israelis that America no longer has their back [acclaim: prudence].” The author predicts that the “Saudis will seek nuclear capability for themselves” and that “there may be a domino effect across the region of countries seeking nuclear weapons … that applies for Turkey as well [acclaim: prudence].”

To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals to the deal being unwise (attack) (attack), knowledge (acclaim) of Iran’s tactics, bad concessions (attack) (attack) of the deal, the wisdom (acclaim) of the deal, lack of knowledge (attack) (attack) of the deal’s details, wisdom of sanctions (acclaim), knowledge of UN Security Council resolutions, knowledge of the interim deal as a beginning, benefits of the deal, the deal being unsafe (attack) (attack), knowledge (acclaim) of the results of the deal, knowledge of Iran’s capabilities, wisdom of a nuclear-free Iran, and knowledge of what Arab allies might do. In terms of justice, appeals were made to the deal being unsafe (attack) and unfair (attacks), Iran’s right (acclaim) to enrich, and Iran’s lack of right (attack) to enrich. In terms of fortitude, an appeal was made to the promise of the safety (acclaim) of Israel by the U.S. In terms of temperance, appeals (acclams) are made to patience for Congress, and patience for those anti-deal. This article primarily attacked the wisdom of the courses of action and the fairness of deal stakeholders. It also attacked the safety (injustice) of a deal that favors Iran. Secondarily, this article acclaimed the fairness of acting against Iran.

During the course of negotiations certain deadlines were set. As those deadlines approached, the drama of anticipation fueled other news stories in USA Today such as the one by David Jackson entitled “Obama firm as Iran nuke deadline set” (Jackson, 2014). The title itself is
an appeal to the *fortitude* of President Obama in standing “firm.” This lends support in a secondary sense to the *wisdom* of the deal. President Obama refers to the deal in this piece as “the best bet to deny Tehran the means to make nuclear weapons [*acclaim: prudence*].” In a move to protect the negotiations process, Obama “vowed to veto any Congressional legislation that slaps new sanctions on Iran [*acclaim: fortitude/strength*]” believing that doing so might “damage prospects for a long-term nuclear agreement [*attack: prudence*].” Encouraging critics to “give diplomacy a chance,” Obama claimed that he had “no illusions about how hard it will be to achieve this objective [*acclaim: prudence*].” The article includes some details on the deal in which Iran would “restrict its uranium enrichment program in exchange for the loosening of economic sanctions” which are said to be “crippling the Iranian economy [*acclaim: justice*].” In fact, Obama “credited the sanctions with forcing Iran's leaders to the negotiating table [*acclaim: prudence*].” On the other side of this effort, the article points out that “some Congressional lawmakers” are “skeptical” [*attack: prudence*] about the potential for success and the potential for a positive result. Along those lines, Congress has “proposed a new package of sanctions that have strong bipartisan support, despite opposition from Obama and his aides [*acclaim: justice*].” But Obama reiterates that “imposing additional sanctions” at this point may “risk derailing […] efforts to resolve this issue peacefully [*attack: prudence*].” Rather, Obama contends in this article, after the deal, “if Iran fails to live up to its commitments,” then “new sanctions can be imposed and the suspended ones can be re-applied [*acclaim: prudence*].” Jackson quotes Senator Mark Kirk, R-Ill who “fears the Obama administration's policies will lead to either a nuclear-armed Iran, or a pre-emptive military strike on Iran by Israel [*acclaim: prudence*].” Further, Kirk argues that the deal will “give the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism billions of dollars while allowing the mullahs to keep their illicit nuclear infrastructure in place [*acclaim:
Obama retorted that “that the temporary deal includes "new and more frequent inspections," to make sure Iran follows through on its pledges [acclaim: fortitude/trust].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals to the wisdom and benefits (acclaims) of the deal, the lack of (attack) and the wisdom (acclaim) in new sanctions, knowledge of the difficulty of the objective, the wisdom of sanctions, that negotiations will not be productive (attack), the lack of (attack) and the wisdom (acclaim) of the tactics of those pro-deal, and bad concessions (attack) (attack). In terms of justice, an appeal (acclaim) was made to the fairness of sanctions. In terms of fortitude, appeals (acclaims) were made to the power of Obama, and faith in the deal. This article primarily acclaimed the fairness of the actions of deal stakeholders. Secondarily, the article spent an equal amount of time acclaiming and attacking the wisdom of the courses of action of proponents and opponents of the deal.

Other authors had their opinions published in USA Today under the title “Easing sanctions a mistake,”("Easing sanctions a mistake," 2014). An attack on the wisdom of the action, the title speaks to the idea of lifting sanctions as a “mistake.” President Obama “easing sanctions and delaying further sanctions in his six-month agreement with Iran over nuclear inspections” is further described as “a deal with the devil [attack: prudence].” The article points out that Iran “has a long history of misusing diplomacy to buy time to further its devious activities in gaining more power in the region [attack: justice].” The argument is made that “a nuclear armed Iran would work toward the annihilation of Israel [acclaim: prudence]” and that “easing sanctions on Iran and threatening to veto increased sanctions on Iran by Congress” is “naïve” [attack: prudence]. Based upon the article’s appeal to Iran’s past history it contends that Iran’s promises are “false” and believing them in this regard “will result in Iran developing a nuclear weapon [acclaim: prudence].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, appeals were made
in this article to bad concessions (attack) (attack), lack of wisdom (attack) (attack) in the deal, and knowledge (acclaim) of Iran’s tactics. In terms of justice an appeal (attack) is made to Iran being unfair. This article primarily attacked the wisdom in the courses of action of deal stakeholders. Secondarily the article conveyed information the authors felt best to facilitate understanding of the subject.

Oren Dorell reported in *USA Today* about the talks over Iran’s nuclear program stalling (Dorell, 2014a) [acclaim: prudence]. The use of the word “teeter” in the title is an appeal to recognize that negotiations are about to topple or fail. Dorell reported that “Iranian leaders [were] vowing to keep [their nuclear program] despite a threat from the U.S. Senate of harsh sanctions should the talks fail [acclaim: fortitude].” However, the Obama administration still insisted that the negotiations would result in a deal that would “curtail Iran's ability to convert nuclear fuel to atomic weapons fuel [acclaim: prudence].” The article says that Israel, for its part, would “attack Iran's nuclear facilities if negotiations do not prevent Iran from being able to build a bomb [acclaim: justice].” Lending heft and credibility to the talks, mention of “Britain, France, Russia, China and Germany” as participants is an appeal to the wisdom behind the process. Dorell reported that after the initial agreement wherein Iran “agreed to limit some of its technology,” it had since said “it will not roll back centrifuges that can enrich uranium into bomb material, nor [would] it abandon a plutonium plant project in Arak or open up for full inspection a secret plant in Fordow [acclaim: justice].” This news comes just as a “majority in the U.S. Senate is unified behind a bill that would impose harsh sanctions on Iran if it fails to curtail its program [acclaim: justice].” Senator Mark Kirk, R-Ill, argued that the way negotiations were going “Iran's supreme leader [would] be able to wake up one day, kick out inspectors and race to the bomb [attack: justice].” Kirk is quoted as arguing that “‘[n]o’ should be the only acceptable
answer" to such a scenario [acclaim: justice]. The author contends that any deal “must have a clear goal of ending the nuclear program that is in violation of United Nations resolutions calling for Iran to suspend all nuclear enrichment [acclaim: justice].” For his part, President Obama was “trying to prevent the bill from coming to a vote, saying it would anger the Iranians into walking away from negotiations [attack: justice].” In reference to Iran’s intentions today as compared to years past, Dorell quotes Jofi Joseph, former director for non-proliferation for the White House National Security Council, who argues that the United States “do[es] not know today where Iran's ultimate bottom lines rest [attack: prudence].” The article notes that Iran up to this point has pushed the idea that their nuclear program is for peaceful purposes and if that is the case “then it ‘does not need’ a fortified underground enrichment facility [acclaim: prudence].” Dorell reports that Iran's chief negotiator, Mohammad Javad Zarif, dismisses any critiques about his country’s nuclear program as “worthless” and the that program is “non-negotiable” [acclaim: justice]. To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals to knowledge of talk productivity, wisdom of negotiations, lack of wisdom (attack) (attack) in those anti-deal and their tactics, lack of knowledge (attack) of Iran’s tactics, and knowledge of Iran’s situation. In terms of justice, appeals were made to attacking Iran as fair, rights of Iran, fairness of sanctions, Iran being unfair, bad concessions (attack), and just benefits. In terms of fortitude, an appeal is made to the power of the U.S. This article primarily acclaimed the fairness of the actions of deal stakeholders. Secondarily, the article focuses on conveying the information needed to understand the subject.

The follow-up piece in USA Today gives more information about whether or not Iran will get to keep its nuclear program in contradiction to UN resolutions up to that point("Deal may allow nuclear program," 2014). The article contends that the deal as it looked, was “unlikely
to satisfy lawmakers who seek to end Iran's ability to develop a nuclear weapon [*acclaim: prudence*]” because it seemed that the Obama administration would “allow an Iranian nuclear program that retains the capability to produce a weapon [*attack: prudence*].” Quoting Mark Dubowitz of the Foundation for Defense of Democracies, the article says that the Iranians will have “some kind of (uranium) enrichment capacity [*acclaim: prudence*].” In defense of the deal, the author notes that it is claimed that a deal “would increase inspections and monitoring, along with the number of inspectors in Iran and the number of places they can go [*defense: justice*].” Jofi Joseph, former director for non-proliferation in Obama's National Security Council, is quoted as saying that a deal would “significantly reduce the chance of Iran acquiring a nuclear weapon [*acclaim: justice*].” The reader is reminded that Iran “backs several terrorist organizations in the Middle East [*acclaim: prudence*]” but want the world to believe that their nuclear program is for “power generation” [*acclaim: prudence*]. Rather than complete restriction of enrichment activity, the deal hails the goal of “increasing Iran's ‘breakout period’ -- the time it would take to produce enough nuclear fuel for one bomb -- from two months to six to 12 months” as a “significant accomplishment [*acclaim: prudence*].” Increasing the “break-out time” might “give the United States more time to discover any duplicity and mobilize to stop it if Iran cheated on a deal [*acclaim: prudence*].” However, U.S. senators, both Republicans and Democrats “signed onto a bill that would increase sanctions on Iran unless it agrees to much greater limitations [*acclaim: prudence*].” To summarize: in terms of *prudence*, appeals (acclaims) in this article were made to *knowledge* of deal details, *knowledge* of how stakeholders see the deal, bad concessions (attack), *knowledge* of Iran’s tactics, *benefits* of the deal, and *knowledge* of tactics of those anti-deal. In terms of *justice* an appeal is made to the *benefits* of the
deal, and the safety of the deal. This article primarily acclaimed the knowledge surrounding the deal and secondarily, the fairness of the actions of deal stakeholders.

Despite deadlines, negotiations concerning Iran’s nuclear program were extended and so reports about this event continued (Dorell, 2014b). Considering the reports that came before this one from this same source, where the talks with Iran were about to stall, claiming that the talks are continuing could be considered an acclaim to prudence ... a wise choice to continue negotiations. The author claims that U.S. and Iranian negotiators “sought to break a logjam over Iran's disputed nuclear program [acclaim: prudence].” Appealing to the patience [acclaim: temperance] of the negotiators, the report notes that the meeting was scheduled for “five hours” and may go “all day.” This is important considering that the meetings that occurred the month prior “ended with negotiators far apart [acclaim: prudence].” The report reiterates that Iran claims that “its nuclear program is for power generation, research and medical purposes [acclaim: justice]” but that that “claim [is] doubted by the West [attack: justice].” The author claims that the “makeup of the U.S. negotiating team and Iran's official attitude about the talks show both sides are serious about reaching a deal [acclaim: prudence].” Thus, the article postulates that “a deal is looking more likely [acclaim: prudence]” and that negotiators are “moving toward the signing, sometime during the year, of a permanent nuclear deal [acclaim: prudence].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals (acclaims) to knowledge of productivity of negotiations, and wisdom of negotiators. In terms of justice, an appeal is made to the rights of Iran and lack thereof. In terms of temperance, an appeal is made to the patience of negotiators. This article primarily acclaimed the patience of negotiators and secondarily conveyed information to facilitate understanding of the subject.
Because of the aforementioned advancements made in talks, some stories were published claiming the idea of extending any deadlines concerning them ("Progress in Iran talks makes extension worthwhile," 2014). This particular article refers to these advancements as “progress” and suggests that this “progress […] makes extension worthwhile [acclaim: prudence/fortitude].” The article describes the talks on dealing with a “uniquely menacing threat” as having “percolated quietly” and thus “making progress that just a few months ago seemed far beyond reach [attack: fortitude/hope].” In that regard, it is noted that “all parties agreed to an extension [acclaim: fortitude/hope].” As part of the process, Iran “will continue to allow intrusive inspections and receive minor relief from economic sanctions that are crippling the Iranian economy [acclaim: justice].” The author posits that the “muted” reaction of those against the deal is “telling [acclaim: prudence].” Further, the author states, “alarmist predictions that easing sanctions would be disastrous … dire warnings that Iran would cheat while negotiations continued proved false [acclaim: prudence].” Iran, the article says, is “complying [acclaim: prudence].” In fact, the author continues, Iran has “gone further” than is required by “agreeing to alter the design of a key plutonium reactor and proposing to convert much of its bomb-grade uranium to a less dangerous form [acclaim: justice].” The author does warn the reader that “none of this” seemingly good news means that “an agreement will be reached [acclaim: prudence]” and that there are still “daunting […] technical obstacles [acclaim: prudence].” Not to mention “[h]ard-liners in Iran, Israel and the U.S. Congress appear intent on scuttling any deal [attack: prudence].” In fact, “[m]embers of Congress from both parties” have said that they will “vote to tighten sanctions -- not loosen them -- unless Iran also gives up its missile program and abandons terrorism [acclaim: justice].” The author notes that “neither” Iran’s missile program nor their funding of terrorism is “a subject of the current negotiations
Thus, dismissing the inclusion of those issues. The article quotes Republican Representative Ed Royce of California, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, who “criticized the extension of the talks” and “called for ratcheting up the economic pressure on Iran.” Those pro-deal argue that “moving ahead with new sanctions at this delicate point in the negotiations would undoubtedly derail them.” In addition to the political factions and pressures in the United States, President Hassan Rouhani, the article states, “faces powerful domestic opponents bent on holy war with the United States.” The supreme leader of Iran himself “sent conflicting signals, first forswearing nuclear weapons, then […] saying Iran must retain a robust enrichment capability, ostensibly for energy generation.” Appealing to the ideal hope, the author says that an “agreement in which Iran abandons nuclear weapons would be an astounding achievement, one that could lead to a reassessment of the caustic United States-Iran relationship.” Further, an agreement would “avoid a nearly certain nuclear arms race in the Middle East, not to mention an equally likely U.S. war with Iran prompted by an attack on Iran's nuclear facilities.” However, the article posits, “success remains against the odds” while the “rewards remain exceptionally high.” To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals (acclaims) to productivity of negotiations, knowledge of anti-deal reaction, knowledge of anti-deal prediction results, knowledge of Iran’s compliance/situation/message, lack of knowledge (attack) in those anti-deal, wisdom of pressuring Iran and lack thereof, benefits of a deal, and knowledge of a deal’s potentiality. In terms of justice, appeals were made to benefits of the deal, fairness of Iran’s actions, actions of those anti-deal being fair, fairness of the details of negotiations, and unfairness (attack) of talk extension. In terms of fortitude, an appeal was made
to *hope* in progress of talks, lack of hope (attack) in progress of talks, and benefits of a deal. In terms of *temperance*, and appeal was made to *patience* in negotiations. This article primarily acclaimed hope in the negotiations and secondarily conveyed information to facilitate understanding of the subject.

Daniel Jeffs continues the analysis in *USA Today* about extending the deadline for international talks about Iran’s nuclear program (Jeffs, 2014). The title of Jeffs’ piece makes a claim to the *wisdom* of extending the deadline in question as opposed to any other choice. The reiteration is made that “all parties” involved “agreed to a four-month extension [*acclaim: prudence/temperance*].” Some against the deal were saying that Iran was playing a “game of delay” until they “have what they want [*acclaim: prudence*].” However, those pro-deal counter that “[a]ny agreement in which Iran abandons nuclear weapons would be an astounding achievement [*acclaim: justice*].” Mainly because it would have the “potential to prevent a future nuclear war [*acclaim: prudence/justice*].” Further, “sanctions” it is said, “very rarely, if ever, work” and are thus a “waste of time [*acclaim: prudence*]” while “[n]egotiating has a chance of working if both sides take it seriously [*acclaim: prudence*].” Jeffs does acknowledge that sanctions are merely “a step in the process of convincing people of our seriousness [*acclaim: prudence*].” There is always the chance that sanctions may not work but as the article states “we need to try [*acclaim: prudence*].” The article portrays those who are against the deal as seeing deadline extensions as futile because those pro-deal think that “there is nothing else [they] can do [*acclaim: prudence*].” In rebuttal, those pro-deal depict their opponents as thinking the best alternative is “[m]aybe a harshly worded letter and give them the old “stink eye” [attack: *prudence*].” Those against the deal contend that countries that tend to be antithetical to the goals of the United States have “known for years that we have no teeth [*acclaim: prudence*],”
particularly in negotiation. Thus, “[n]egotiating with Iran to stop development of its nuclear program” is an “exercise in futility [acclaim: prudence].” They continue that Iran will “continue to pursue nuclear weapons until stopped by complete sanctions and military action if necessary [acclaim: prudence]” and that “President Obama's drive to have a nuclear weapons-free world is delusional [attack: prudence].” Reciprocation or “[a]greeing to reduce our nuclear weapons” would be a “deadly mistake [attack: prudence].” Obama, those anti-deal claim, wants to unwisely “reduce [our own weapons] even further.” They argue that the United States must use “overwhelming nuclear strength [acclaim: prudence/fortitude]” to deter potential enemies. Such action, they say, makes the United States “much more vulnerable, and the world […] less safe [attack: fortitude].” They see the results of the negotiations wherein the secretary of State and the White House are “being played for the fools they are [attack: prudence].” In their goal of finishing a peace deal no matter what, they are “refusing to deal with problems” by using semantic concealment. Rather, it is argued that one should “keep your friends close, and your enemies closer [acclaim: prudence].” The article reminds the reader that North Korea took a similar “approach of delay [acclaim: prudence]” and it resulted in them creating a full arsenal for themselves unhindered. A “three strikes and you are out [acclaim: prudence]” tactic is recommended. But “[h]olding out a carrot to Iran by pushing back the deadline without imposing stronger sanctions encourages it to develop nuclear weapons [attack: prudence]” the article concludes. To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals (acclaims) to the wisdom of talk extension and lack thereof, knowledge of Iran’s tactics, benefits of a deal, knowledge of sanction results, lack of wisdom (attack) (attack) in those anti-deal and pro-deal, knowledge of U.S. tactics, wisdom of military action, bad concessions (attack), wisdom of power, wisdom of those anti-deal, and knowledge of North Korea’s tactics. In terms of justice, appeals
were made to the benefits of a deal. In terms of fortitude, appeals were made to U.S. power and lack thereof, and lack of deal safety. In terms of temperance, appeals were made to patience in negotiations. This article primarily acclaimed the wisdom in the courses of action of deal stakeholders and conveyed information to facilitate understanding the subject. Secondarily, the article attacked the wisdom in the courses of action of deal stakeholders.

Senator Marco Rubio wrote an article for USA Today advocating the wisdom of more and tougher sanctions as the “best tool” in dealing with the Iran nuclear program (Rubio, 2015). Rubio mentions Speaker of the House John Boehner’s invitation to Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu to address a joint session of Congress as coming at a “key moment for both the U.S. and Israel [acclaim: prudence].” He argues that “[m]ore than a decade of U.S. and European efforts to dissuade Iran from developing nuclear weapons” is “coming to a head [acclaim: prudence].” The Iranian government “refuse[s] to compromise,” continues the “repression of the Iranian people and support for terrorist groups continue unabated [attack: prudence/justice].” Rubio notes that the White House calls Prime Minister Netanyahu’s visit to Washington “inappropriate [attack: prudence].” But he counters that the “American people should also be able to hear from our Israeli allies, especially since Israel will be the nation most directly and immediately impacted by the consequences of a nuclear Iran [acclaim: justice]” so that we can be “clear-eyed about the predicament of our allies and the intentions of our adversaries [acclaim: justice].” Rubio reminds his readers that the supreme leader of Iran once wrote about “the destruction of the “barbaric, wolf like, & infanticidal regime of Israel [attack: prudence/justice]” and that Israelis “endured weeks of rocket attacks by Iranian-backed terrorists in Gaza” during which as a result “two Israeli soldiers were killed by Iran's proxy, Hezbollah [attack: fortitude/justice].” Thus, for Israel he posits, any deal with Iran is a “matter of
life and death [acclaim: prudence/justice].” In contrast, Rubio argues, the outcome of the negotiations with Iran for President Obama is a “legacy issue [acclaim: prudence].” He goes on to claim that it is “unfortunate” that the White House “is focused on derailing Prime Minister Netanyahu’s visit and denigrating the very real bipartisan concerns in Congress rather than achieving a deal with Iran that will permanently dismantle Iran's nuclear program [acclaim: prudence].” Rubio concludes by claiming that “Iran's behavior thus far” proves that “additional pressure is the best tool we have to avoid the nightmare outcome of an Iran with nuclear weapons [acclaim: prudence].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals (acclaims) to the wisdom of tougher sanctions, wisdom of Netanyahu’s speech and lack thereof, knowledge of U.S.-Iranian relations, Iranian actions as unwise (attack), knowledge of a deal’s effect on Israel, and knowledge of Obama’s motivations and tactics. In terms of justice, appeals were made to unfair (attack) Iranian actions, fairness (acclaim) of Netanyahu’s speech, and the fairness of a deal’s effect on Israel. In terms of fortitude, appeals were made to Iran’s actions as unsafe (attack). This article primarily attacked the wisdom in the courses of action of deal stakeholders and secondarily, the article conveyed information to facilitate understanding of the subject.

As the time drew near for the permanent deal with Iran over its nuclear program to be signed, some were making their final claims as to why the deal should not be. These included claims that Iran was somehow cheating on the temporary deal. Oren Dorrell wrote a report of a group who claimed to have knowledge about a secret nuclear site in Iran(Dorell, 2015), which if true, would establish Iran’s duplicity. The title of the piece refers to a “dissident [acclaim: prudence]” group which consists of Iranians who are working to remove those in power from the current Iranian regime. This group claims to have knowledge of a “secret nuke site in Iran
This came “as U.S. negotiators signaled they're ready to make a concession to reach a deal with Iran on its disputed nuclear program.” The group, known as the National Council of Resistance of Iran, “showed satellite imagery and photographs of what it said was a secret facility buried several stories under a military base on the outskirts of Tehran.” Dorrell reports that the facility appears to be “protected by vault-like doors and anti-radiation shielding” wherein, it is claimed, “research and development” takes place and “advanced machinery produces enriched uranium.” However, the group contends that the “secrecy of the program and its underground location” signals that “its purpose is "for a nuclear weapons project.” The article quotes group member Soona Samsami who “called on the United States to demand that Iran provide the United Nations nuclear watchdog agency immediate access to the site” and that they “must make continuing talks dependent on letting the IAEA (International Atomic Energy Agency) to immediately visit this site.” Dorrell reports that the group’s allegations “could not be confirmed, and U.S. officials did not respond to requests for comment.” The United States and other Western nations have “cited evidence that Iran has harbored a secret weapons program” in the past but Iran always “denies it.” The article calls these allegations “new” and that they came “a day after U.S. negotiators meeting with their Iranian counterparts in Geneva said they had discussed a major U.S. concession.” During negotiations, Iran “insisted that any steps it takes must be matched by significant and rapid relief from stringent economic sanctions imposed by the West.” To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals (acclaims) to knowledge of and access to Iran’s secrets, wisdom of making talks dependent on access to Iran’s secrets, lack of knowledge (attack).
confirming Iran’s secrets, and the knowledge of new allegations against Iran. In terms of justice, appeals (acclaims) were made to deal concessions, fairness of making talks dependent on access to Iran’s secrets, unfairness (attack) of accusations against Iran, and the fairness (acclaim) of Western concessions. This article primarily acclaimed knowledge the author felt necessary about the subject and also acclaimed the wisdom in the courses of action of deal stakeholders. Secondarily, the article acclaimed the fairness of deal stakeholders and their views.

Michele Chabin wrote a piece in USA Today focusing upon Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu’s apparently singular stance against the deal (Chabin, 2015). As the article reads, it becomes apparent that the title, “remains alone,” is an appeal to the lack of prudence of the Prime Minister. Chabin describes how Israelis

interrupted their frenetic preparations for today's Purim holiday to watch Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's impassioned address to the U.S. Congress explaining the dangers of a nuclear deal with Iran [attack: fortitude/justice].

However, “many” saw his speech as more of “an attempt to woo Israeli voters in the elections” rather than an attempt to “persuade American lawmakers to oppose an agreement President Obama is negotiating with Iran [acclaim: justice/prudence].” The article quotes Isaac Herzog, head of the Zionist Union Party and Netanyahu's main rival in the elections, who says that Netanyahu “knows how to give a speech [acclaim: prudence]” but that there is “no doubt [that] his speech will not stop the Iran deal [acclaim: prudence/fortitude].” He goes on to say that the “painful truth” is that “Netanyahu remains alone. And the negotiations with Iran will continue without any Israeli involvement [attack: fortitude].” Reuven Hazan, a political scientist at Hebrew University, is quoted supporting Herzog saying that the speech was “predominantly inspired by domestic political concerns and not necessarily Israel's security [attack: justice].”
One particular viewer of Netanyahu’s speech, Avi Marciano, expressed the idea that “Israel “will pay the price” for Netanyahu's refusal to cancel the trip after Obama objected to it so close to the elections” explaining that “[s]ometimes you have the right message, but if you deliver it the wrong way, it can come back to haunt you [acclaim: justice].” In contrast another viewer, Ronit Vazana, said that she was “filled with pride when U.S. lawmakers gave Netanyahu several standing ovations” arguing that “[i]f our leaders don't protect us, who will [acclaim: fortitude]?” Vazana also posited that “[i]f something isn’t done now, Iran will have nuclear weapons in a year or two [acclaim: prudence].” Another viewer, Eric Gurevitz, also thought that Netanyahu was “looking out for his own political interests” and yet was “pleased the prime minister went [acclaim: prudence].” Gurevitz also expressed that idea that “[a]ny deal that doesn't take away Iran's nuclear weapons potential isn't good enough for us and shouldn't be good enough for the rest of the world [acclaim: prudence].” Chabin ends her article with discussion from Yoel Guzansky, an expert on Iran's nuclear program at the Institute for National Security Studies in Tel Aviv, who stated that “what worries Israelis most is that Iran won’t abide by any deal [attack: justice].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals to Netanyahu’s lack of wisdom (attack), Netanyahu’s wisdom (acclaim), knowledge of Netanyahu’s motivations, knowledge of the effects of Netanyahu’s speech, and knowledge of Iran’s nuclear progress and its effect on the world. In terms of justice, appeals were made to the deal being unfair (attack), fairness (acclaim) of Netanyahu’s motivations and lack thereof (attack), fairness (acclaim) of repercussions of Netanyahu’s speech, and distrust (attack) (attack) of Iran. In terms of fortitude, appeals were made to the deal being unsafe (attack), lack of hope (attack) in the effects of Netanyahu’s speech, and hope (acclaim) due to Netanyahu’s speech. This article primarily
acclaimed the wisdom in courses of action of deal stakeholders and their views. Secondarily, this article attacked the trustworthiness of Iran.

Erin Kelly wrote an article in *USA Today* concerning the type of verification that the Obama administration would use to make sure that Iran was keeping its side of the bargain in the Deal(Kelly, 2015). The title is an appeal *acclaim* to *fortitude* and *prudence* (requiring proof). In this regard President Obama is quoted as saying that his administration would “walk away from negotiations with Iran over its nuclear program unless the United States can verify that Iran is not developing nuclear weapons *acclaim: prudence & justice*.” Adding that

[i]f we cannot verify that they are not going to obtain a nuclear weapon -- that there's a breakout period so that even if they cheated we would be able to have enough time to take action -- if we don't have that kind of deal … If there's no deal then we're not going to take it … then we walk away *acclaim: prudence & justice*.

Kelly notes that Obama “wants to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons while still allowing the country to enrich uranium to use for energy production” but in order to do so Iran needs to provide “unprecedented transparency *acclaim: prudence and justice*.” She also notes that talks with Iran “have not cost the United States anything *acclaim: justice*” and that they are “not losing anything through these talks *acclaim: justice*.” In an interview on Face the Nation, Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu said that he believes that he and Obama “have the same ultimate goal in trying to ensure that Iran doesn't develop nuclear weapons *acclaim: prudence*” but that he “doesn’t trust that inspections will prevent the Iranians from cheating and developing weapons *attack: justice*.” The article reiterates that Netanyahu gave a speech to Congress “warning U.S. lawmakers against a deal with Iran *acclaim: prudence*.” Kelly reminds readers that Iran has been accused of “fomenting trouble in Syria, in Lebanon, in Gaza, in
Yemen [acclaim: prudence].” The article says that those against the deal in Congress, especially Republicans, were “working to put together a veto-proof majority to support a measure giving Congress the authority to approve or disapprove of any deal [acclaim: prudence and justice].” However, many Democrats agreed that “Congress has a role in whatever deal may be reached [acclaim: prudence and justice]” because Congress “passed the sanctions […] so Congress has very much an interest in the sanctions [acclaim: justice and prudence].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals (acclaim) the wisdom of Obama, deal being unwise (attack), knowledge (acclaim) of Iran’s actions, knowledge (acclaim) of anti-deal actions, and the wisdom of Congressional involvement. In terms of justice, appeals were made to the fairness (acclaim) of Obama and his tactics, distrust (attack) of Iran, fairness (acclaim) of anti-deal actions, and the fairness of Congressional involvement. In terms of fortitude, appeals (acclaims) were made to the power of Obama. This article primarily acclaimed the wisdom and fairness in the actions and views of deal stakeholders. Secondarily, the article acclaimed the efforts of verification (trust) in the deal. The next publication with the most pertinent articles was the New York Times.

The New York Times

The pertinent articles found in the New York Times outnumbered those found in USA Today by almost two to one. The New York Times also contained the most acclaims, attacks, and defenses in all virtue categories as compared with the other publications in this overall study. The next closest publication, the Washington Post, has about half as many functional theory appeals even though there are a similar number of pertinent articles. This phenomenon is most likely due to the amount of verbiage contained in each article. As with USA Today, the New York Times adhered to the common pattern in which acclaims outnumbered attacks which
outnumbered defenses. This publication also adhered to the pattern wherein appeals to *prudence* were greater in magnitude than appeals to *justice*, followed by appeals to *fortitude*, and lastly appeals to *temperance*.

**Table 10: NYT General Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Theory Categories</th>
<th>Overall Total</th>
<th>Aristotelian Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prudence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acclams</strong></td>
<td>1027</td>
<td>691 (~67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attacks</strong></td>
<td>424</td>
<td>254 (~60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defenses</strong></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>38 (~57%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The previous table shows the general outcome of functional theory categories of acclaims, attacks, and defenses, and their relationship to *prudence*, *justice*, *fortitude*, and *temperance* as well as overall totals for samples from this publication.

**Table 11: NYT Themes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW YORK TIMES THEMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total theme references: 1,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acclams</strong>: 989 (~67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attacks</strong>: 415 (~28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defenses</strong>: 71 (~5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The previous table shows major findings in the *New York Times* with respect to themes.
As the table for themes revealed in the *New York Times* shows, the majority of articles found and used in this study focused more on acclaiming (conveying) information that the authors felt would facilitate understanding. Also, significant acclamations were made pertaining to the wisdom and fairness in the actions and views of deal stakeholders. Most attacks that were made in this publication were made concerning the wisdom and fairness in the actions and views of deal stakeholders. Also, significant attacks were made pertaining to trust in deal stakeholders. Although relatively nominal as a category, most defenses pertained to the wisdom in the actions and views of deal stakeholders. Also, noteworthy are defenses relating to trust in deal stakeholders.

**New York Times Analysis Examples**

The following articles for this source are presented in chronological order according to the research period (indicated previously). The examples given in each article represent the general narrative of each article and thus the general sense of values represented. The following results contain indications of functional theory categories as well as values, both designated within brackets. Each example is followed by a summary according to theme relationship.

Mark Landler wrote an article for the *New York Times* in which he addressed Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu’s views about the Iran deal (Landler, 2013a). The title reveals Netanyahu’s attack on the *wisdom* of the deal as a “possible trap.” Netanyahu described that deal as an “effort to blunt a diplomatic offensive by Iran” and that he planned to “warn the United Nations […] that a nuclear deal with the Iranian government could be a trap similar to one set by North Korea […] years ago [acclaim: prudence].” The report states that the Israeli government, through Netanyahu, set the terms for what would be acceptable to Israel in any agreement concerning Iran's nuclear ambitions [acclaim: justice].” One “Israeli official” is
quoted saying “[a] bad agreement is worse than no agreement at all [acclaim: prudence].”

However, President Rouhani of Iran “signaled a willingness to negotiate [acclaim: prudence]” and the Obama administration is reported to be “intrigued by the possibility of resolving a problem [acclaim: prudence].” This, in turn, made Israelis feel “deeply unsettled [attack: prudence].” Another “Israeli official” is quoted saying “Iran must not be allowed to repeat North Korea's ploy to get nuclear weapons [acclaim: prudence].” “Just like North Korea before it,” the official said, "Iran professes to seemingly peaceful intentions [acclaim: prudence] […] it talks the talk of nonproliferation while seeking to ease sanctions and buy more time for its nuclear program [acclaim: prudence].” Netanyahu recalled the “history of North Korea’s negotiations […] when the North Korean government, in what was then seen as a landmark deal, agreed to abandon its nuclear weapons program in return for economic, security and energy benefits [acclaim: prudence].” “A year later,” Netanyahu went on, “North Korea tested its first nuclear device [acclaim: prudence].” The article states that the Israeli officials “warn something similar could happen if the United States were to conclude too hasty a deal with Mr. Rouhani [attack: prudence].” In repeat, officials stated that “[a]s Iran is doing today, the North Koreans insisted on a right to a peaceful nuclear energy program [acclaim: prudence].” Landler states, however, that “[t]here are differences between the two cases [acclaim: prudence].” Firstly, Landler continues, “[a]t the time that it concluded the deal in 2005, North Korea said it had already produced a nuclear bomb [acclaim: prudence],” whereas “American intelligence experts believe Iran is still many months, if not years, away from having such a weapon [acclaim: prudence].” Landler does concede that it is a “troubling precedent” wherein a “rogue nation repeatedly extract[s] concessions from the United States and other countries, only to renege later and fire missiles or test nuclear devices [attack: prudence].” Landler suggests that Netanyahu’s “explicit
comparison of Iran to North Korea” is a “rhetorical device devised to undermine Mr. Rouhani's image as a moderate leader [attack: prudence].” The author notes that at the time North Korea’s leaders had yet to travel to the United Nations to “plead their country's case to the world [acclaim: prudence].” Landler posits that Netanyahu “recognized that he would be labeled a naysayer for his pessimism [attack: fortitude],” and yet felt “morally impelled to stake out this position [acclaim: prudence].” The White House, for its part, “sought to allay the fears of Israel officials, assuring them [defense: prudence]” that they are “not planning to prematurely ease the economic sanctions [defense: justice]” but that the world should “judge Mr. Rouhani by his actions, not his words [acclaim: prudence].” A moment that Landler calls Netanyahu’s “most dramatic” was when he “brandish[ed] a simple drawing that he said demonstrated how close Iran was to producing a nuclear bomb [acclaim: prudence].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals to the deal being untrustworthy (attack), knowledge (acclaim) of North Korea’s tactics, knowledge that a bad deal is worse than none at all, Iran’s wisdom, Obama’s wisdom, wisdom of stopping Iran, knowledge of contrast between Iran and North Korean tactics, lack of wisdom (attack) in Netanyahu’s tactics, wisdom (acclaim) of Netanyahu’s efforts and tactics, and the safety of and trust in the deal. In terms of justice, appeals were made to Netanyahu’s fair (acclaim) demands. In terms of fortitude, appeals were made to lack of hope (attack) in Netanyahu’s efforts. This article primarily attacked the trustworthiness and safety of the deal and deal proponents. Secondarily, the article reported on defenses made of the wisdom in the deal and its proponents.

The Editorial Board of the New York Times published a piece that addressed the apparent progress being made during the Iran talks("A thaw in Geneva?," 2013). The use of the word “thaw” in the title suggests an appeal to temperance (patience) and prudence. The article
posits that the signs of progress “reinforced the hope [acclaim: fortitude]” that negotiators “may finally be serious about resolving [acclaim: temperance]” the nuclear Iran issue. Until international sanctions were “lifted,” Iran “had previously resisted putting forth specific ideas [attack: prudence].” The article argues that “for now at least, the participants see value in giving serious consideration to what has been put on the table instead of trying to sabotage it with strategically placed leaks [acclaim: prudence].” Prior to these talks the article states, Iran had “rejected previous administration requests for this kind of direct exchange, which is needed if the two sides are to reduce the enormous mistrust that has built up over 30 years [acclaim: prudence].” But a “phone call last month between Hassan Rouhani, Iran's more moderate president, and President Obama broke the ice and opened the way [acclaim: prudence].” The board calls “encouraging,” a “rare joint statement praising Iran's proposal as an ‘important contribution [acclaim: prudence].’” American and Iranian negotiators agreed to further “negotiating sessions” to “develop practical steps to a deal [acclaim: prudence].” The board refers to the comments of other American and European officials as “upbeat” when describing the talks as “substantive and forward-looking [acclaim: prudence and fortitude].” Russia's deputy foreign minister, Sergei Ryabkov is quoted saying however that it would be “foolhardy” to “ignore that the two sides are far apart and that there was no guarantee of further progress [attack: prudence and fortitude].” “The gulf between them on the nuclear issue has been wide and deep for a long time [acclaim: prudence],” the article says. During negotiations Mr. Rouhani and his aides “repeatedly asserted that Iran has no intention of producing weapons [acclaim: justice].” But in contrast Iran has a “history of hiding its program, in whole or in part” and thus “requires strict limits and monitoring [acclaim: justice].” The article argues that “[a] certain patience is needed” to “bring [talks] to a constructive end [acclaim: temperance].” “Hard-liners”
are trying to “undercut” talks, the article says \textit{[attack: justice]}. The hard-liners include Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu of Israel and members of Congress who are “warning against trusting Iran [and] threatening new and harsher sanctions \textit{[acclaim: justice]}.” To summarize: in terms of \textit{prudence}, this article made appeals to (acclaims) the \textit{productivity} of negotiations, Iran’s \textit{unwise (attack)} tactics, \textit{knowledge (acclaim)} of U.S.-Iranian relations, Obama’s \textit{wisdom}, the \textit{wisdom} of Iran’s participation, the \textit{wisdom} of extending talks, and lack of \textit{knowledge (attack)} in objective difficulties. In terms of \textit{justice}, appeals were made to (acclaim) Iran’s \textit{fair} intentions, \textit{fairness} of limits and sanctions on Iran, and \textit{unfairness (attack)} of anti-deal tactics. In terms of \textit{fortitude}, appeals were made to \textit{hope (acclaim)} in a deal and lack thereof (attack). In terms of \textit{temperance}, appeals were made to the \textit{patience (acclaim)} of negotiators. This article primarily acclaimed the wisdom in the actions of deal stakeholders and their views. Secondarily, the article acclaimed (conveyed) the information the author felt was needed to understand the subject.

Robert Worth published an article in the \textit{New York Times} about Saudi Arabia’s move to reject a seat on the United Nations Security Council in protest of the Iran deal\cite{Worth_2013}. The words “reject” and “protest” designate appeals (\textit{acclaims}) to \textit{prudence} and \textit{justice} in the title. Worth calls the seat “highly coveted” and Saudi Arabia’s move a “decision that underscored the depth of Saudi anger over what the monarchy sees as weak and conciliatory Western stances toward Syria and Iran \textit{[attack: justice]}.” The article calls the move “unprecedented \textit{[acclaim: prudence]}.” Worth says that “[s]ome analysts” call the move a “self-destructive temper tantrum \textit{[attack: prudence]}.” “Self-destructive” because, the article states, the “usefulness of a seat” could come into play as “Russia and China have repeatedly drawn Saudi anger by blocking all attempts to pressure Syria's president, Bashar al-Assad \textit{[attack: prudence]}.” Worth suggests that Saudi officials “fear that a nuclear deal between Iran and the West […] could come at their expense,
leaving them more exposed to their greatest regional rival [attack: prudence].” However, Worth notes, the “Saudis have long resisted taking a seat on the Security Council, believing it would hamper their discreet diplomatic style [acclaim: prudence].” But the Saudis wanted the “sudden about-face” to come across as a “slap to the United Nations and the United States [acclaim: prudence].” The article states that while officials at the United States Mission to the United Nations had “no immediate comment [acclaim: prudence],” Russia was “sharply critical of the Saudi gesture [attack: prudence].” The Russian Foreign Ministry was “surprised by Saudi Arabia's unprecedented decision [acclaim: prudence].” Worth states that the “Kingdom’s arguments […] arouse bewilderment and the criticism of the U.N. Security Council in the context of the Syria conflict is particularly strange [attack: prudence].” The Saudi political elite showed “shock and dismay [attack: prudence]” about the decision. Spokesman for the Saudi Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Osama Nugali was in the process of “celebrating” the Kingdom’s election to the security council which was “sought for two years” [acclaim: temperance] along with other “prominent” Saudis who “congratulated the Kingdom” [acclaim: prudence]. Worth says that “many experts […] assumed that Saudi Arabia's pursuit of a Security Council seat signaled a new desire to be more public and assertive in its stances toward the Syrian civil war and the Arab-Israeli conflict [acclaim: prudence].” Saudi ambassador to the United Nations, Abdallah Y. al-Mouallimi, the article states, was “clearly elated after the General Assembly vote [acclaim: justice].” Mouallimi said, “[w]e take this election very seriously as a responsibility to be able to contribute to this very important forum to peace and security of the world [acclaim: prudence].” He went on to say that the Saudi election was a “reflection of a longstanding policy in support of moderation and in support of resolving disputes by peaceful means [acclaim: prudence].” After announcement of negotiations towards an Iran deal, Saudis “struck a far
different tone, calling for changes to enhance the Security Council's contribution to peace

[acclaim: prudence]” but did not say “what those should entail [acclaim: prudence].” The article quotes the Saudis saying that

[a]llowing the ruling regime in Syria to kill and burn its people by the chemical weapons, while the world stands idly, without applying deterrent sanctions against the Damascus regime, is also irrefutable evidence and proof of the inability of the Security Council to carry out its duties and responsibilities [attack: justice].

They also “accused the Security Council of failing to find a “just and lasting solution” to the Israel-Palestinian conflict, and of failing to free the Middle East of “all weapons of mass destruction [attack: justice].” Worth quotes a source he refers to as a Saudi “political insider” saying that the move to reject the seat was “very bad for the image of the country [attack: prudence].” “It's as if someone woke up in the night and made this decision [attack: prudence]” the quote says. However, Worth says, “some others in Riyadh” were “not entirely surprised” considering the Kingdom’s “ambivalence about assuming a position that would strain friendships and alliances” and the “volatility of the Security Council's recent decisions [acclaim: prudence].”

Worth says that the Kingdom has “seen its reputation suffer” due to the “perception that it was combating the Democratic aspirations of its people [acclaim: prudence].” This, the article states, was indicated by a “poll” which suggested that Saudi Arabia’s “popularity had declined [acclaim: prudence].” Bernard Haykel, a professor of Middle East studies at Princeton University and an authority on Saudi Arabia, is quoted saying that “being on the U.N.S.C. would mean they [Saudis] could no longer pursue their traditional back seat and low-key policies and therefore decided to give it up [acclaim: prudence].” “[A] seat on the U.N.S.C.,” Haykel said, “may have also meant that Saudi Arabia would be more constrained in backing the Syrian
opposition [acclaim: prudence].” Worth says that “Diplomats at the United Nations did not believe the Saudi decision would be reversed, given its unequivocal and accusatory language [acclaim: prudence].” However, the article says, the Saudis have not “officially notified the United Nations of their decision [acclaim: prudence].” Afaf Konja, a spokeswoman for John W. Ashe, the ambassador for Antigua and Barbuda, who is the current president of the General Assembly, said that they had “not received formal notification nor had held any meetings [acclaim: prudence].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals to Saudi Arabia being wise and unwise (attack), knowledge of history of U.N. seating and decisions, Russia and China and the West as unwise (attack), knowledge of Saudi Arabian tactics and commitment, wisdom of the U.S. and the U.N., the wisdom of Saudi Arabian involvement, wisdom of changing U.N. tactics, and knowledge of world perception of Saudi Arabia. In terms of justice, appeals were made to Saudi Arabia being fair, the West as unfair (attack), the fairness of Saudi Arabia getting a seat, and the unfairness (attack) of the U.N. In terms of temperance, appeals were made to the patience of Saudi Arabia. This article primarily attacked the wisdom in the actions of deal stakeholders and their views. Secondarily, the article acclaimed (conveyed) the knowledge about the subject to promote understanding.

Jodi Rudoren wrote an article for the New York Times focusing on Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu’s alleged frustration concerning the Iran negotiations(Rudoren, 2013). The title to this piece refers to Netanyahu’s alleged inability to speak wisely to the issue concerning the Iran negotiations. The author states that Netanyahu is doing “what he is best known for, and perhaps best at [acclaim: prudence and fortitude]” in “condemning” the agreement as a “very dangerous and bad deal [attack: prudence].” The article argues that Netanyahu’s remarks “highlighted the growing gulf and heightened tensions [acclaim: prudence]” between those for
and those against the deal. There are “limited tools left for Mr. Netanyahu,” the article states, in regards to the Iran deal which he views as an “existential threat.” Therefore, Netanyahu can only serve as a “hawkish scold.” Dan Gillerman, a former Israeli ambassador to the United Nations, is quoted saying that he does not see any “magic wand that [Netanyahu] can produce.” He calls it a “very difficult and trying time for the Israeli prime minister.” Netanyahu’s opposition “raised anew the specter of an Israeli military strike on Tehran, experts here say such an attack is all but impossible to imagine while negotiations proceed -- and without American support.” The author argues that by “taking his case directly to Capitol Hill [Netanyahu] poisoned his relationship with the White House early on [which] could be too risky with the fate of Iran's nuclear ambitions in the balance.” Secretary of State John Kerry, Rudoren says, was “clearly frustrated” and therefore “criticized” Israel. Itamar Rabinovich, a former Israeli ambassador to the United States, is quoted saying that “[t]he more he's unhappy about Iran, the less likely he is to move on the Palestinians” in effect, saying “I'm not happy with what I hear about Geneva, and I definitely am not going to please you by giving you, the secretary, or you, the president, the deal on the Palestinians you so much want.” However, Hanan Ashrawi, a member of the Palestinian Liberation Organization's executive committee, “denounced Mr. Netanyahu's statements on Iran as “arrogant,” “childish” and “an insult” to Mr. Kerry, and said they reflected a relentless focus on Israel's security that has prevented progress in the peace talks.” Ashrawi further calls Netanyahu’s a “temper tantrum response” wherein his words are
just an extension of that mentality […] I want to do what I want to do, I want to get away with everything, and I want to dictate to everyone, including the U.S., how they should behave regarding Israel's security the way Israel exclusively defines it [attack: justice].

Netanyahu argues that “like a tiny hole in a tire, even a limited lifting of sanctions against Iran threatens to unravel the entire package [acclaim: prudence].” Rudoren posits that Netanyahu has a “track record” of using “fear” and other “such hardline stances to force the West's hand on Iran [attack: prudence]” and that his statements are an “overreaction to what Mr. Kerry and others have made clear they see as only a small, first diplomatic step [acclaim: prudence].” Amos Yadlin, the director of the Institute for National Security Studies in Tel Aviv, argues that Netanyahu “thinks that this is the final agreement -- it is not” and says that “[t]he real judgment of whether it's a bad deal or an acceptable deal will be in the end of the negotiating period [acclaim: prudence].” Yadlin said that Netanyahu “seemed to be “crying wolf too early,” adding, “[y]ou should keep the wolf for the final agreement [acclaim: prudence].” Efraim Halevy, a former head of the Israeli intelligence agency Mossad, seemed to agree that ““the endgame” was what mattered, but noted that “the more you enter stages, the less you can be certain that you will get what you need in the end [acclaim: prudence].” Halevy also posited that the ““reversibility” of the provisions” is a “key question […] of the provisions of an agreement that would lift some sanctions on Iran in exchange for a freeze of uranium enrichment [acclaim: prudence and justice].” Further Halevy said,

[o]nce you begin to relieve sanctions, to reimpose them is not a light matter -- getting the sanctions in place took a long time […] [w]hereas reversing the enrichment doesn't take time, you simply get the machines going again within hours [acclaim: prudence and justice].
The author notes that Netanyahu responded to Washington by saying they “may be entering another era of disagreement and distrust (attack) [acclaim: prudence].” Even after “repeated promises by the Obama administration” Netanyahu “told the American lawmakers […] -- twice - - that he was “absolutely stunned” to learn that a deal was in the works [attack: justice].” A “photo opportunity” was cancelled “amid the friction [acclaim: prudence].” President Obama, for his part, “underscored his strong commitment to preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon [acclaim: justice].” Jonathan Spyer, a senior research fellow at the Interdisciplinary Center in Herzliya, Israel, is quoted saying that there is a “fundamental difference of understanding between this Israeli government and this U.S. administration, and it's reflecting in the reality that's emerging on a variety of tracks [acclaim: prudence]” and that the “Israeli government, even though it won't say so openly, regards this administration as bungling across the Middle East [attack: prudence].” Rudoren says that the way that Netanyahu chose to deal with this “is to state his case bluntly rather than adhere to another view which he regards as fundamentally flawed and dangerous [acclaim: prudence].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals to the wisdom (acclaim) of Netanyahu and lack thereof (attack), the deal as wise (acclaim) and unwise (attack), knowledge (acclaim) of tensions between those pro-deal and those anti-deal, knowledge of Netanyahu’s tactics and situation, knowledge of Israel’s situation, knowledge of the negotiating process, benefits of a deal, bad concessions (attack), knowledge of U.S.-Israeli relations, wisdom of cancelling a photo op, and Obama as unwise (attack). In terms of justice, appeals were made to Israel as unfair (attack), Netanyahu as fair (acclaim) and unfair (attack), benefits (acclaim) of a deal, bad concessions (attack), and the unfairness (attack) of a deal. In terms of fortitude, appeals were made to the power (acclaim) of
Netanyahu. This article primarily attacked the wisdom and fairness in the actions and views of deal stakeholders.

Mark Landler addresses the preliminary agreement made between negotiators in the Iran deal (Landler, 2013b). The title suggests an appeal to *wisdom* by “open[ing] up” a door. Landler suggests that since President Obama’s “popularity and second-term agenda have been ravaged by the chaotic rollout of the health care law *prudence*, the Iran nuclear deal is “more than a welcome change of subject *prudence*.” The article calls this a “seminal moment” that “presents Mr. Obama with the chance to chart a new American course in the Middle East for the first time in more than three decades *prudence*.” A final agreement, Landler states, “won’t be easy, and huge challenges remain ahead *temperance*.” But this “diplomatic accord,” the article says, “after 34 years of estrangement […] opens the door to a range of geopolitical possibilities available to no American leader since Jimmy Carter *prudence* and *temperance*.” Vali R. Nasr, the dean of the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, is quoted calling the deal “historic” a “seismic shift” that “rearranges the entire chess board *prudence* and *justice*.” The article stated that Obama promised to “pursue “aggressive personal diplomacy” with Iranian leaders, and rul[ed] out the concept of leadership change *prudence*.” This tactic, Landler argues, “sought to avoid being consumed by the Middle East, in part so he could shift America's gaze to Asia *prudence*.” Landler says that Obama “tended to view Iran through two narrower prisms: his goal of curbing the spread of nuclear weapons and his desire to avoid entangling the United States in another war in the region *prudence*.” Obama is portrayed as “huddled in the Oval Office with Secretary of State John Kerry over the fine points of a proposal *prudence*.” The deal, Landler states, could provide a “broader diplomatic opening” that could
“alter other American calculations in the region [wherein] Iranians could be helpful in brokering a postwar settlement with the Taliban [acclaim: prudence].” The “prospect of such a long-term strategic realignment” the article posits, is “precisely what has so alarmed American allies [who have] condemned the deal as a “historic mistake [attack: prudence].” There has been “opposition from lawmakers […] who complain that the deal eases pressure on Iran without extracting enough concessions [attack: justice].” Senator Charles E. Schumer, Democrat of New York stated that it was “not the goodness of the hearts of the Iranian leaders, that brought Iran to the table” and that he “would support a push in the Senate to pass additional sanctions against Iran [acclaim: prudence].” However, Obama “warned that new sanctions would “derail this promising first step, alienate us from our allies and risk unraveling the coalition that enabled our sanctions to be enforced in the first place [attack: prudence].”” Administration officials were in the process of calling “lawmakers to defend the deal and head off the legislation while Mr. Obama called Mr. Netanyahu to hear his concerns before the next round of talks [acclaim: prudence].” The article suggests that Obama was in a “predicament [acclaim: prudence]” and that “some experts” were saying that “tensions over Iran would only deepen because the administration would be determined to prevent the deal from unraveling [acclaim: prudence].” Elliott Abrams, a foreign policy official in the Reagan and George W. Bush administrations, argued that the administration was a “hostage to Iran's behavior [acclaim: prudence].” Landler states that administration officials made the mistake of assuming that “Mr. Netanyahu would be able to separate his anger about the Iran deal from any decision about whether to make concessions to the Palestinians [acclaim: prudence].” Bruce O. Riedel, a former administration official who is now a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, was quoted saying that a “big casualty of this deal” might be the Palestinians due to ignoring the “strong objections of Israel”
therefore its “going to be very hard to persuade Netanyahu to do something on the Palestinian front [acclaim: prudence].” But, the author states, “resolving the threat of Iran's nuclear program might be worth taking that chance [acclaim: prudence].” The “secret negotiations” that took place “risked angering European allies [acclaim: prudence].” But the talks “fleshed out many of the principles that wound up in the interim agreement [acclaim: prudence].” Landler says that Obama “became well-versed in the minutiae [acclaim: prudence]” and that he was able to “tick off the elements of sanctions relief [acclaim: prudence].” He needed to be able to explain “the provision that will allow Iran to enrich uranium, a privilege it does not currently have from the United Nations [acclaim: prudence].” Part of Obama’s decision involved

whether to treat Iran's nuclear program as a discrete problem to be solved, freeing him up to focus more on Asia, or as the opening act in a more ambitious engagement with Iran that might give it a role in Syria, Afghanistan and other trouble spots [acclaim: prudence].

Landler says that the White House was “careful to cast the coming negotiations narrowly [acclaim: prudence].” Tom Donilon, the former national security adviser to Mr. Obama, who coordinated Iran policy before leaving the White House in July, called the Iran deal a “multifaceted, multiyear process to address a serious security concern [acclaim: prudence].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals to knowledge (acclaim) of Obama’s political situation, the deal as wise (acclaim) and unforeseeable (attack), the wisdom (acclaim) of Obama and his tactics, Kerry as wise (acclaim), benefits (acclaim) of a deal, wisdom of new sanctions and lack thereof (attack), knowledge of Netanyahu’s situation, knowledge of U.S.-European relations, and productivity of negotiations. In terms of justice, appeals were made to the fairness of the deal, and unfair (attack) concessions. In terms of temperance, appeals were
made to patience for stakeholders in the deal, and the patience of those pro-deal. This article spent a relatively equal amount of time acclaiming, attacking, and defending the wisdom in the actions and views of deal stakeholders.

Michael Gordon’s piece in the New York Times from December 2013 addresses the issue about Iran enriching uranium (Gordon, 2013). The title attacks the wisdom of letting Iran enrich uranium. The Republican chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Ed Royce of California, is quoted saying that negotiators “should require that Tehran stop enriching uranium” and by doing so they would be “laying down a marker [acclaim: prudence].” Concerning “whether a final agreement would allow Iran” to enrich uranium, he said, should be based on the fact that Iran “can't be trusted” and that “verification efforts can never be foolproof [acclaim: prudence].” Gordon suggests that Royce’s comments “effectively shifted the terms of the debate [acclaim: prudence].” The author reminds his readers that the interim agreement “is for six months, but it can be renewed for an additional six months by mutual consent [acclaim: prudence].” The “goal,” Gordon says, is to “buy time so that a more sweeping agreement can be negotiated [acclaim: prudence].” The pre-agreement, so to speak, “outlines some of the provisions of such a follow-on agreement, saying that Iran could continue to enrich uranium “under mutually agreed parameters” and under “enhanced monitoring [acclaim: prudence].”” Secretary of State John Kerry is quoted saying that he “did not know if a comprehensive agreement could be achieved, but that the United States had an obligation to try [acclaim: justice]” and that “imposing new penalties would poison the atmosphere [attack: prudence].” Further, Kerry stated, the “scope of any future Iranian enrichment activity need[s] to be “mutually agreed” [upon] and would be linked to legitimate civilian needs [acclaim: justice].” The agreement is “in the best interest of the United States [acclaim: justice],” he continued.
Along those lines, Kerry is quoted saying that the “national security of the United States is stronger under this first-step agreement than it was before” and that “Israel and Persian Gulf Arab states were also more secure [acclaim: justice].” Gordon states that the Obama administration would “go to Congress for tougher sanctions if the effort to negotiate a comprehensive nuclear accord with Iran faltered [acclaim: justice and prudence].” Kerry reiterated that he was “committed to asking […] for additional sanctions if we fail [because] We will need them [acclaim: justice].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals to bad concessions (attack), the wisdom (acclaim) of Congress setting negotiating limits, knowledge (acclaim) of Iran’s duplicity, knowledge (acclaim) of the terms of the political debate about the deal, knowledge of the deal’s aims and details, knowledge of concessions, wisdom and lack of wisdom (attack) in new sanctions. In terms of justice, appeals were made to the fairness (acclaim) of trying for a deal, Iran’s rights (acclaim), the deal being fair and safe (acclaims), the fairness of new sanctions. This article primarily acclaimed the fairness of deal stakeholders and their views. The article also acclaimed information needed to better understand the subject.

Mark Landler wrote an article for the New York Times in which a bill before Congress was discussed (Landler, 2014a). The title of this piece appeals to (acclaims) the wisdom of the situation that is generated by the proposal of a bill before Congress. The sponsors of the bill are quoted describing it as a ‘diplomatic insurance policy’ that will help President Obama cut a better nuclear deal with Iran [acclaim: prudence].

However, the White House judges it as a “deal-killer that could put the United States on a path to war [attack: prudence].” The bill, called the Nuclear Weapon Free Iran Act of 2013, Landler describes as
enshrouded in a fog of overheated talk, as the White House, Congress and a growing legion of lobbyists clash over the wisdom of passing new sanctions against Iran while pursuing diplomacy [attack: prudence].

Landler argues that “the question of whether sanctions would cause Iran to leave the bargaining table cannot be answered in Washington [acclaim: prudence].” Rather, he states, “that decision is up to the Iranians, who have talked tough about sanctions but have plenty of reasons not to walk away [acclaim: prudence].” Landler continues that “where the legislation may have an effect, and why it so worries the White House” is where it “lays down the contours of an acceptable final nuclear deal [attack: prudence and justice].” The author quotes some “administration officials” who argue that “many of those conditions are unrealistic, it basically sets Mr. Obama up for failure [attack: prudence and justice],” they say. The article goes on to point out that the White House under pressure [… ] released technical details of how it is carrying out an interim deal with Iran [which] contained few surprises, though it raised enough questions [which were] likely to feed the doubts of skeptics [acclaim: prudence].

The senate bill, would “require Mr. Obama to certify, every 30 days, that a host of conditions have been met in order to defer the new sanctions [acclaim: prudence and justice].” Landler says that White House “officials […] zeroed in on three of the conditions [attack: justice].” Daryl G. Kimball, executive director of the Arms Control Association, is quoted saying that “arguing for a zero-enrichment capacity, with a complete dismantling of Iran’s nuclear facilities [is] not attainable, and it’s not necessary to prevent Iran from getting a weapon [attack: prudence and justice].” The Joint Plan of Action that Iran signed, Landler states,
foresees a final deal that would allow Iran a “mutually defined enrichment program with mutually defined parameters” -- enough centrifuges, in other words, to enrich uranium to a level adequate to fuel a civilian nuclear reactor [acclaim: prudence].

Those for the bill, the article says, “deny it would deprive Iran of the right to modest enrichment [defense: prudence and justice].” The “language on enrichment” in the bill was “intentionally vague to mollify both Republicans […] and Democrats [defense: prudence and justice].” David Albright, an expert on Iran's nuclear program at the Institute for Science and International Security, is quoted saying that there is “no language that says a centrifuge is prohibited or allowed [acclaim: prudence and justice].” This apparent “ambiguity” in the language, Landler says,

reflected the fact that the lawmakers who sponsored the bill are doing it in a bipartisan way, but they have disagreements on what the end state should look like [acclaim: prudence and justice].

Albright continued that the “provision on ballistic missile testing could pose a problem [acclaim: prudence]” because the bill “merely echoes prohibitions on such tests that are in United Nations Security Council resolutions [acclaim: prudence].” “Iran's missile program,” Albright said, “was not part of the interim deal, and introducing it now […] would inject a combustible element into an already fraught negotiation [attack: prudence and justice].” The “requirement that Iran not engage in terrorism against Americans seems self-evident [acclaim: prudence],” Landler says. The United States is “not about to make a deal with a country that attacks its citizens [acclaim: prudence and justice].” The language in the bill is also “vague on the time frame [acclaim: prudence].” The author says that Iran “was certainly guilty of terrorism against Americans in the
past -- and broad in its scope, including Iranian proxies like Hezbollah [attack: justice].”

Recently, Iran’s foreign minister, Mohammad Javad Zarif,

placed a wreath […] at the grave of a Hezbollah commander, Imad Mughniyeh, who was accused of being a mastermind of the 1983 bombing of the Marine Corps barracks in Beirut, Lebanon [attack: justice].

Thus, Landler says, “any future attack by Hezbollah would be grounds to cut off diplomacy with Iran [acclaim: prudence and justice].” However, proponents of the bill say it “would give Mr. Obama leeway to waive the sanctions [acclaim: prudence].” But administration officials “counter that the sanctions would still kick in legally -- a violation, at least in spirit, of the agreement [attack: prudence and justice],” and they

shake their heads at a provision that would commit the United States to support Israel, militarily if necessary, if it decided to strike Iran's nuclear facilities in legitimate self-defense [attack: prudence and justice], the author says.

But proponents say that “the provision is nonbinding and merely repeats an expression of solidarity with Israel that passed the Senate last year [defense: prudence and justice].” Albright is quoted saying that he “believed that the Senate and White House could still negotiate a final version of the bill that would allay the administration’s concerns [acclaim: prudence].” But Landler says that the White house “seems uninterested [attack: prudence].” The author says that the bill “might not torpedo the negotiations” or “it might give Iran an excuse to leave the table [acclaim: prudence].” R. Nicholas Burns, a former State Department official, is quoted saying that the “idea that the Senate would intervene in the middle of a negotiation to alter the outcome of the negotiation is not sensible [attack: prudence and justice].” “We can only have one
president negotiating with Iran, not 525 presidents negotiating [acclaim: prudence],” he said. To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals to knowledge (acclaim) of a bill debate on the Iran deal, the bill being wise (acclaim) and unwise (attack), knowledge (acclaim) of the political situation surrounding the bill, knowledge (acclaim) of Iran’s motivations, benefits (acclaim) of a deal, the wisdom (acclaim) of cutting off diplomacy with Iran, the lack of wisdom (attack) in new sanctions, lack of wisdom (attack) in helping Israel militarily, Obama’s lack of wisdom (attack), and lack of wisdom (attack) in Congressional involvement. In terms of justice, appeals were made to the bill being unfair (attack), Iran’s rights (acclaim), Iran’s unfair (attack) actions, the fairness (acclaim) of cutting off diplomacy with Iran, the unfairness (attack) in new sanctions, lack of fairness (attack) in helping Israel militarily, and the unfairness (attack) of Congressional involvement. This article primarily attacked the wisdom in the actions and views of deal stakeholders. Secondarily, the article supplied contextual understanding of the subject. Thirdly, the article attacked the fairness in the actions and views of deal stakeholders.

Carl Levin and Angus King addressed the debate surrounding preventing Iran from getting nuclear weapons in their article published by the New York Times (Levin & King, 2014). The title appeals to (acclaims) the wisdom of the deal being upheld. The authors posit that there are “two ways to keep Iran from developing a nuclear weapon, negotiations or military action [acclaim: prudence].” They continue that “after 34 years of mostly diplomatic silence between Iran and the United States” we are now “in the midst of negotiations with the potential to eliminate the threat of a nuclear-armed Iran [acclaim: prudence and temperance].” Levin and King note that “‘some’ members of Congress are “circulating proposals that seek to impose additional sanctions in the middle of the negotiations [attack: prudence and justice].” “This step,” they argue, “risks scuttling the process and could have damaging ramifications for the
United States as well as our regional allies and partners, especially Israel [attack: prudence and justice].” However, they contend, “increasingly stringent economic sanctions that have been imposed on Iran over the last three decades worked [acclaim: prudence and justice].” Iranian president Hassan Rouhani “came to office […] promising an improved economy, and he seems to have quickly realized that the only way to deliver on this promise is by achieving relief from the sanctions [acclaim: prudence],” the authors say. Iran “finally [came] to the table” and if the sanctions have “worked” then “won't additional sanctions work even better [if we] increase the pressure, won't we get a more favorable outcome [acclaim: prudence]?” “That logic,” the authors argue, “would make sense only if Iran were a politics-free zone where a consensus existed in support of negotiations to end the country's nuclear program [acclaim: prudence]” but “all evidence -- from public statements as well as available intelligence suggests that there is no such consensus [acclaim: prudence].” Levin and King say that there exist

hardline elements within the Iranian government and military who don't like the idea of negotiations, are not terribly worried about new sanctions (oligarchs always get what they need anyway), and feel that the nuclear program is a matter of national pride and, perhaps, national survival [acclaim: prudence and justice].

The authors continue that if we

impose additional sanctions under these circumstances (or threaten to impose additional sanctions) [it] could be an “I told you so” moment for these hard-liners, providing the very excuse they're looking for to kill the negotiations and, with them, what is probably the best chance we have of resolving this incredibly dangerous situation without resorting to military action [attack: prudence and justice].
However, the “potential upside of legislating further sanctions,” the article states, is “the hope that increased pressure might elicit more concessions or push Iran to conclude a more favorable deal [acclaim: prudence].” The authors call this scenario “unlikely [acclaim: prudence]” but the potential downside more likely and more dangerous: Iran's decision makers could conclude that the United States government was not negotiating in good faith -- a view that Iranian hard-liners already espouse [attack: prudence and justice].

This, the authors say, “could prompt Iran to walk away from the negotiations or counter with a new set of unrealistic demands while redoubling its efforts to produce nuclear weapons [attack: prudence and justice].” Thus, Iran “could actually accelerate its quest for atomic weapons, leaving a stark choice: Either accept the possibility of a nuclear-armed Iran, or use military force to stop it [acclaim: prudence and justice].” Even “worse,” say Levin and King, such a move “could alienate our international partners [attack: prudence and justice].” Sanctions, they argue “have been effective largely because of the active participation of many countries [acclaim: prudence],” if “the United States alone [were not to] buy Iranian oil” it would have “little effect on Iran's economy” as opposed to “when the European Union stops, and other major oil customers of Iran such as China, Japan, South Korea, India and Turkey significantly reduce their purchases (which they have) [acclaim: prudence].” The article says that “countries that have joined America in ratcheting up the economic pressure on Iran support the interim agreement [acclaim: prudence and justice]” and “legislation to impose additional sanctions by the United States could be interpreted by our partners as undermining the negotiations [attack: prudence and justice].” Therefore, such legislation “could have the adverse effect of lessening the international community's economic pressure on Iran, spooking our partners and diminishing their
commitment to the cause [attack: prudence].” Levin and King argue that the Iranians “have six months to prove they are serious about this process [acclaim: prudence and temperance]” and if they fail this test, the United States will surely act immediately to impose additional sanctions, and our international partners, understanding that we have given a negotiated approach a chance to succeed, are likely to join us [acclaim: prudence and justice].

In conclusion, Levin and King state that as to “whether Iran can be persuaded to peacefully give up its nuclear weapons ambitions,” it is “very much in our interest to give this diplomatic process every chance to succeed [acclaim: prudence].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals to the wisdom (acclaim) in supporting the deal, the wisdom (acclaim) and lack of wisdom (attack) in new sanctions, the wisdom (acclaim) of sanctions, the knowledge (acclaim) of Iran’s political and economic situation, knowledge of U.S.-Iranian relations, lack of wisdom (attack) in alienating international partners, knowledge (acclaim) of sanction details and cooperation, and the wisdom (acclaim) of a pro-deal plurality. In terms of justice, appeals were made to unfairness (attack) of new sanctions, the fairness (acclaim) of sanctions, Iran’s rights (acclaim), lack of fairness (attack) in alienating international partners, and trust (acclaim) in a pro-deal plurality. In terms of temperance, appeals were made to patience (acclaim) in supporting the deal. This article primarily acclaimed (conveyed) contextual understanding of the subject and the wisdom in the actions and views of deal stakeholders. Secondarily, the article attacked the wisdom in the actions and views of deal stakeholders.

Steven Erlanger reported on a meeting between Secretary of State John Kerry and Iran’s foreign minister, Mohammad Javad Zarif about the nuclear deal(Erlanger, 2014). The title makes an appeal to (acclaims) the wisdom of the negotiators and the situation of the negotiations themselves. Erlanger calls this “another sign of serious efforts to solve the crisis around Iran's
nuclear program [acclaim: prudence].” Zarif is quoted saying that “Iran “will go to those negotiations with the political will and good faith to reach an agreement [acclaim: justice].”” Kerry was said to reiterate “the importance of both sides negotiating in good faith [acclaim: justice]” and that he “urged Iran to keep to “its commitments” [acclaim: justice].” Kerry told Mr. Zarif that the United States would continue to enforce existing sanctions [and] emphasized that Washington would keep its commitment not to create new sanctions while the temporary, six-month deal was in force [acclaim: justice].

Zarif said that Iran “wanted to negotiate seriously for as long as necessary, which could take longer than six months, and he offered to begin a dialogue on human rights issues with the European Union [acclaim: prudence and justice].” Erlanger said that “Iran and the world were at a crossroads, despite decades of mistrust on both sides [acclaim: justice and temperance].” Zarif was quoted saying that the “opportunity is there, and we need to seize it [acclaim: prudence].” Erlanger said that Iran was “fully cooperating with the International Atomic Energy Agency, the organization that monitors compliance with the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, which Iran has signed [acclaim: justice].” Meaning that they were “complying so far but that important questions about its nuclear program, which Iran insists has no military component, remained to be clarified [attack: prudence and justice].” Zarif, for his part, said that he was prepared to “address” these “important questions [acclaim: prudence and justice].” The author states that Iran “agreed to halt its enrichment of uranium to 20 percent” in exchange for the European Union and the United States to “lift certain sanctions temporarily and return $4.2 billion of Iran's assets [acclaim: justice].” “A comprehensive deal,” Erlanger says, is “expected to be difficult to achieve [acclaim: prudence]” but Iran and the United States
seem committed to trying -- Iran to end its isolation and the sanctions imposed upon it, and Washington to solve at least one big Middle East problem and avoid the possibility of military action to prevent the development of an Iranian bomb. **[acclaim: temperance, justice, and prudence]**.

“Failure of the talks,” says Erlanger, “would bring the military option quickly back to the fore.**[acclaim: prudence].**” Erlanger stated that Senator John McCain who was critical of the Obama administration's policy in the Middle East and said Iran had a long history of deception around its nuclear program, advised a policy of “don't trust, but verify” with Iran.**[acclaim: prudence and justice].**

Defense Minister Moshe Yaalon of Israel, was quoted

...castigat[ing] Iran as being dedicated to a nuclear weapon and acting to deceive, and he repeated Israel's warning that it would not allow Iran to get a nuclear weapon, a commitment also made by President Obama.**[acclaim: prudence and justice].**

Jennifer Psaki, a State Department spokeswoman, was quoted reiterating Kerry’s “well-known and previously stated facts about what is at stake for both sides if this process fails, including the consequences for the Palestinians.**[acclaim: prudence].**” To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals to the wisdom (acclaim) of negotiators and negotiations, the wisdom of a deal, the lack of knowledge (attack) on Iran’s nuclear activities, knowledge (acclaim) of a deal’s difficulty, deal benefits (acclaim), wisdom of distrust (attack) of Iran, and the wisdom (acclaim) of stopping Iran. In terms of justice, appeals were made to the fairness (acclaim) of negotiations and negotiators, distrust (attack) in Iran’s nuclear activities, deal benefits (acclaim), and the fairness (acclaim) of stopping Iran. In terms of temperance, appeals (acclaims) were
made to the *patience* of deal stakeholders. This article primarily acclaimed (conveyed) contextual understanding of the subject. It also acclaimed fairness in the actions and views of deal stakeholders.

Mark Landler wrote a piece for the *New York Times* in which he addressed a meeting between President Obama and his counterpart in France during Iran negotiations (Landler, 2014b). The title attacks the *wisdom* and *justice* of France doing business with Iran at that time. Landler quoted Obama saying that he “vowed […] to come down on companies that evade sanctions against Iran “like a ton of bricks [*acclaim: justice*].”” This meeting, Landler states, came “after a delegation of French corporate executives traveled to Tehran looking for business opportunities amid diplomatic efforts to reach a nuclear deal [*acclaim: prudence*].” The executives’ visit, the article says,

...crystallized fears that the interim nuclear agreement with Iran is setting off a horse race to get back into that country, and could fracture the international sanctions regime cobbled together by the United States and Europe [*attack: justice*].

Though administration “officials complained publicly and privately,” Obama “delivered the most pointed warning yet [*acclaim: justice*].” Obama, quoted in the article, noted that businesses “may be exploring, […] some possibilities to get in sooner rather than later if and when there is an actual agreement to be had [*acclaim: prudence*]” but they do so “at their own peril right now because we will come down on them like a ton of bricks [*acclaim: justice*],” he said. The French president “warned the companies not to sign commercial agreements with Iran before sanctions were lifted [*acclaim: prudence and justice*]” but also said that the French government had “no control over whether French businesses made a private trip, noting, “The president of the republic is not the president of the employers' union in France [*acclaim: prudence*].”” The author
calls this scenario a “rare moment of tension” wherein “both leaders tried to project an image of trans-Atlantic harmony, celebrating a rejuvenated French-American partnership on issues from Iran and Syria to counterterrorism operations in North Africa [acclaim: prudence].” However, this “partnership,” the author says, has “done little to ease […] bloodshed and deepening despair [attack: justice].” President Obama said that it was a “horrendous situation on the ground in Syria” that was causing “enormous frustration here [acclaim: prudence].” The author said that Obama was “skeptical that further military intervention would solve the problem, although he appeared to be groping for other options [attack: prudence]” calling the situation “fluid” but “continuing to explore every possible avenue to solve this problem [acclaim: prudence and justice].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals to the wisdom (acclaim) and lack of wisdom (attack) of France, knowledge (acclaim) of the French-Iranian economic situation, knowledge of French governmental authority, knowledge of U.S.-French relations, Obama’s wisdom (acclaim) and lack of wisdom (attack). In terms of justice, appeals were made to France being fair (acclaim) and unfair (attack), fairness (acclaim) of Obama, the unfairness (attack) of the situation in Syria. This article primarily attacked the fairness in the actions and views of deal stakeholders. Secondarily, the article acclaimed (conveyed) the knowledge needed to understand the context of the subject.

Thomas Erdbrink published a piece in the New York Times wherein the real possibility that there would be no deal with Iran was discussed from the European Union’s perspective(Erdbrink, 2014a). The title appeals to (acclaims) the wisdom of the potential outcomes concerning the deal with Iran. The European Union's foreign policy chief, Catherine Ashton was quoted saying that there was “‘no guarantee’ that Iran and world powers would be able to reach a final, comprehensive agreement over Iran's nuclear program [acclaim:
prudence].” Ashton was part of the team from the European Union that helped to negotiate an interim agreement with Iran concerning its nuclear program. “After more than a decade of talks,” Erdbrink says, it was a “breakthrough [acclaim: temperance].” The author describes it as a “six-month, renewable agreement [which] obliged Iran to stop enriching uranium to high levels and to reduce its stockpile of near-weapons-grade uranium [acclaim: justice]” in return for “some economic sanctions” being lifted [acclaim: justice]. Even so, the author states, Ashton tried to “temper optimism about a final deal [acclaim: temperance].” Ashton is quoted describing the interim agreement as “really important, but not as important as a comprehensive agreement [acclaim: prudence].” Due to the “‘difficult’ and ‘challenging’ nature of the process,” she said, “‘there is no guarantee that we will succeed [acclaim: prudence].’” Iran’s foreign minister, Mohammad Javad Zarif, Erdbrink says, “emphasized that his negotiators would agree only to a deal that respected Iran’s ‘rights,’ a reference to the nation’s ability to enrich uranium independently on its own soil [acclaim: justice].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals to the knowledge (acclaim) of the productivity of negotiations. In terms of justice, appeals were made to deal benefits (acclaim), and Iran’s rights (acclaim). In terms of temperance, appeals were made to the patience (acclaim) of pro-deal stakeholders. This article primarily acclaimed fairness in the actions and views of deal stakeholders. It also acclaimed (conveyed) the information the author felt was needed to understand the subject.

“Inching Forward With Iran,” ("Inching Forward With Iran," 2014)is an article published in the New York Times dealing with the progress being made in talks with Iran over its nuclear program. The title appeals to the slow but sure progress [acclaim: temperance] of the talks. The author calls the negotiations “between major powers and Iran” about the latter’s nuclear program, without a doubt “productive [acclaim: prudence]” and that “all the nations involved
appear committed to reaching a deal that will go beyond [the] interim agreement and produce a permanent one [acclaim: prudence].” The author suggests that it would be “naïve to understate how hard it [would] be to remove the threat of Iran’s producing a nuclear weapon and begin to ease three decades of hostility between Tehran and Washington [acclaim: prudence].”

“[S]ignificant gaps remained on core issues,” the author states. The interim deal is described as a “six-month agreement under which Iran suspended some nuclear activities in exchange for modest relief from sanctions that have hurt Iran’s economy [acclaim: prudence and justice].”

The author calls it “reassuring” that at that point “both Iran and the major powers appear to be fulfilling their commitments under that interim agreement [acclaim: justice and prudence].” The “powers” want Iran to “permanently pare back its nuclear activities so that it will not be able to quickly produce a nuclear bomb [acclaim: justice]” in return for “more sanctions relief for Iran’s battered economy [acclaim: justice].” However, the supreme leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei was quoted saying that Iran “[would] not cede any of [their] gains in nuclear research and development [acclaim: justice and prudence].” The author says that there are “hardline forces” that are “working to undermine any deal [attack: prudence and justice].” In example, the author says that “Israel and some members of Congress insist that “Iran must abandon all nuclear enrichment activities, even for non-weapons purposes [acclaim: justice and prudence].” This, the author says, “would be ideal, but it is unrealistic, and insisting on it would scuttle any chance of an agreement [attack: prudence].” The “hard-liners know this,” the author says, “which puts them in the curious position of making a huge political fuss about Iran’s nuclear program while blocking any realistic diplomatic solution [attack: prudence].” This “could cause problems for President Obama as he tries to push talks forward [acclaim: prudence],” says the author. It also states that if the “major powers” and Iran can make a deal, “they will create an opportunity for
dealing with other important challenges, including Afghanistan, drug trafficking, Syria, and Iran’s support for extremist groups [acclaim: prudence].” The “consequences of failure,” the author concludes, are “equally enormous [acclaim: prudence].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals to knowledge (acclaim) of the productivity of negotiations, knowledge of U.S.-Iranian relations, deal benefits (acclaim), trust (acclaim) in the U.S. and Iran, lack of wisdom (attack) in those anti-deal, knowledge (acclaim) of Obama’s situation, and the wisdom (acclaim) of a deal. In terms of justice, appeals were made to deal benefits and concessions (acclaims), trust in the U.S. and Iran (acclaims), Iran’s rights (acclaim), and the unfairness (attack) of those anti-deal. In terms of temperance, appeals were made to patience (acclaim) concerning the productivity of negotiations. This article primarily attacked the wisdom in the actions and views of deal stakeholders. Secondarily, the article acclaimed (conveyed) information the author felt would facilitate understanding of the subject.

Rick Gladstone wrote an article in the New York Times which dealt with the United States actions to enforce sanctions on Iran (Gladstone, 2014). The title appeals to (acclaims) the justice of the sanctions and their implementation. Gladstone says that the United States government “escalated enforcement of its Iran sanctions [acclaim: justice]” by offering a “$5 million bounty [acclaim: justice].” There were also other announcements which the author says signaled the first significant enforcement of American sanctions directed at Iran in about three months, and seemed aimed at dispelling what Obama administration officials have called a misimpression that economic relations with Iran are moving toward normalization [acclaim: prudence and justice].

Administration “officials,” Gladstone says, “emphasized that most restraints on dealings with Iran remain in place [acclaim: prudence and justice].” The bounty and other “actions” were
intended to deter future sanctions evasion and prevent Iran from procuring sensitive technologies while we negotiate a comprehensive solution that will prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon and ensures its nuclear program is exclusively peaceful.

[acclaim: justice], the U.S. Treasury was quoted saying.

Gladstone describes the “reaction from Iran” as “arrogant bullying by the United States and other Western powers [attack: justice].” The Treasury Department is further quoted “announc[ing] what it described as a landmark $152 million settlement of sanctions violations by Clearstream Banking […] for having permitted Iran to evade restrictions on dealings with American banks [attack: justice]” and “a $9.5 million settlement with the Bank of Moscow, which was accused of illicitly moving money through the American banking system on behalf of Bank Melli, an Iranian bank hit with sanctions [attack: justice].” In all, Gladstone says, the Treasury “announced that it had penalized companies and individuals in eight countries [acclaim: justice].” The author states that these announcements were “intended partly as a message to dispel conjecture that the sanctions were unraveling [acclaim: prudence and justice].” He also says that “some critics accused the administration of being willing to play down sanctions violations so as to not jeopardize the success of the nuclear negotiations [attack: justice].” Mark Dubowitz, executive director of the Foundation for Defense of Democracies, was quoted saying that the Obama administration was “trying to counter charges that it is willing to overlook all Iranian provocations in order to ensure that nothing interferes with a nuclear deal” and that this “may be part of that pushback strategy [acclaim: justice].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals to the wisdom (acclaim) of sanctions, and knowledge of the productivity (acclaim) of sanctions. In terms of justice, appeals were made to the fairness (acclaim) of sanctions, the unfairness (attack) of the West, and the fairness (acclaim) and unfairness (attack)
of Obama. This article primarily acclaimed fairness in the actions and views of deal stakeholders. Secondarily, the article defended the trustworthiness of Obama and his administration.

Kenneth Pollack wrote a piece for the *New York Times* entitled “The Right Way to Press Iran,” (Pollack, 2014). The title appeals to (acclaims) the wisdom of an approach to pressure Iran. The article says that the United States and its allies have “finally begun to work out the terms of a nuclear deal with Iran [acclaim: prudence] […] that forecloses Iran's pursuit of nuclear weapons” which would be “enormously beneficial [acclaim: prudence and justice].” Pollack describes that interim agreement as one in which “Iran agreed to pause its nuclear program in return for some modest relief on sanctions [acclaim: justice].” Focus on the technical details of the deal, the author says, is “not the key[s] to getting the best deal with Iran [acclaim: prudence].” The technical details are “important,” he says, but they “should not be the White House's highest priority [acclaim: prudence].” Rather, Pollack argues, the Obama administration should focus on three other factors: conducting intrusive inspections, designing a mechanism to easily reimpose sanctions if Iran cheats, and extending the duration of the agreement [acclaim: prudence and justice].

“International inspectors,” he continues, “must be a constant presence at Iran's nuclear sites and they need to be able to go anywhere and see anything -- immediately and without being blocked by the government [acclaim: justice].” “Given Iran's history of lying about its nuclear program,” the United States, Pollack says, “needs what it had in Iraq: the right of the inspectors to have completely unfettered access [acclaim: prudence and justice].” “Highly intrusive inspections can only be as effective as their enforcement mechanism [acclaim: prudence],” Pollack says. He also posits that the “history of arms control and arms limitation agreements suggests that states abide by them when they believe it is likely that they’ll get caught and might pay a heavy price for
getting caught [acclaim: prudence].” Pollack continues that in “Iraq, Libya and Iran today, that punishment [has] taken the form of powerful sanctions [acclaim: prudence].” In reference to the 1994 nuclear agreement with North Korea, Pollack says that it “didn't work because it was predicated mostly on offering Pyongyang carrots that could be withheld, while the threatened sticks were ephemeral and inadequate [acclaim: prudence].” The “biggest diplomatic obstacle America is likely to face after signing a comprehensive agreement with Iran,” the author says is “getting the United Nations Security Council (and the European Union) to reimpose sanctions if Iran were to ever restart its prohibited nuclear programs -- especially if the evidence of cheating was ambiguous [acclaim: prudence and justice].” “Intrusive inspections are not enough” therefore, he posits, the West needs to have a “‘snap-back’ mechanism to be able to quickly and easily reimpose the sanctions if the United States and its allies decide that Iran is violating the agreement [acclaim: prudence and justice].” The “best way to create such a mechanism,” he says, is “to suspend the United Nations and European sanctions rather than lifting them outright [acclaim: prudence].” Pollack suggests that a “new resolution could be passed every six months that would suspend all of the effects of the sanctions for six months, renewable in perpetuity [acclaim: prudence].” This would avoid the difficult process of going to the Security Council and getting a new sanctions resolution passed by a majority of the 15 members without any (Russian or Chinese) vetoes [which is] diplomatically impossible no matter how convincing the evidence [acclaim: prudence], he says.

The author further argues that there is “considerable evidence that Iran's president, Hassan Rouhani, is sincere in his desire for a nuclear deal [acclaim: prudence].” Rouhani, Pollack says, “will be president of Iran for another seven years at most and it is impossible to know who will
succeed him [acclaim: prudence],” therefore the United States “must […] seek an enduring deal, one that will last beyond Mr. Rouhani’s term in office [acclaim: prudence].” The author says that he has heard “rumors” that “Washington may be ready to agree to as little as 10 years [acclaim: prudence].” However, he argues “twenty years would be better [and] 30 or 50 would be better still [acclaim: prudence].” The Iranians, he thinks, would “probably object to all of this” and would “protest that intrusive inspections violate their sovereignty [attack: prudence and justice].” They might also argue that the “Joint Plan of Action specified the lifting of sanctions, not merely their suspension [acclaim: prudence and justice]” and that “Western officials suggested to them in private that the agreement would only last for 10 to 12 years [acclaim: prudence and justice].” But, Pollack contends, the United States would have “both legal and practical leverage with which to push back [acclaim: prudence and justice].” The Joint Plan, he says, “stated that in the final, comprehensive agreement, Iran would be treated as a normal nuclear power after the terms of that treaty had ended” and contains “implicit acceptance by Iran that it would not be treated as a normal nuclear power until then [acclaim: prudence and justice].” The Iranian government “desperately needs to rid the economy of the burden of the sanctions [acclaim: prudence],” says Pollack and “suspension serves all of Iran's real needs [acclaim: prudence and justice].” Suspension, the author contends, “creates exactly the kind of deterrent that has made the difference between success and failure in previous nuclear deals [acclaim: prudence]” and Iran’s leaders have “already demonstrated that they are willing to sacrifice principles for practical benefits [acclaim: prudence].” Pollack suggests that there is “no reason to believe that they cannot be convinced to do the same in a comprehensive agreement [acclaim: prudence].” “Intrusive inspections coupled with sanctions suspension,” he concludes, “will grant them the economic revival, even prosperity, that they crave while giving America and its allies the
greatest assurance that a future Iranian leadership won't resume a prohibited weapons program [acclaim: prudence].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals to the wisdom (acclaim) of sanctions, the wisdom of a deal and its details, deal benefits, knowledge of the contrasts with North Korea, the wisdom of suspension over lifting sanctions, the wisdom of a snap-back mechanism, knowledge of Iran’s wants and political situation, wisdom of as long of a deal as possible, wisdom of intrusive inspections, the wisdom and lack of wisdom (attack) of the West, and Iran’s wisdom (acclaim). In terms of justice, appeals (acclaims) were made to deal benefits and concessions, the fairness of a deal, the fairness and lack of fairness (attack) of the West, Iran’s rights (acclaim), and the fairness of suspension over lifting of sanctions. This article primarily acclaimed (conveyed) information the author felt facilitates understanding of the subject. Secondarily, the article acclaimed the wisdom and fairness in the actions and views of deal stakeholders.

David Sanger and William Broad published an article in the New York Times that covered the news that Iran was providing information on its nuclear program (Sanger & Broad, 2014). The title appears to be appealing to (acclaims) patiently waiting [temperance] for Iran to open up and eventually reveal all the West wants to know about its nuclear program. The article states that international nuclear inspectors were “demanding that Iran turn over evidence of experiments that they suspect could have been part of a secret effort to solve the complex science of detonating a nuclear weapon [acclaim: justice]” and that the International Atomic Energy Agency was “finally beginning to see the information it had long sought [acclaim: justice].” Iran, apparently, had “insisted that the detonators were for non-nuclear purposes [acclaim: justice].” The article refers to a
disclosure buried in a report by the atomic agency that detailed major progress Iran had made in diluting most of its stockpile of medium-enriched uranium, nuclear fuel that the West has long feared could be converted relatively quickly into weapons-grade material [attack: justice].

“Getting Iran to dilute that uranium,” the authors contend, was the “biggest single accomplishment of the interim deal” which resulted in “creating room for the current negotiations [acclaim: prudence].” The issue concerning detonators was “one of many questions about a suspected secret weapons-design program buried inside university laboratories and institutes [acclaim: prudence],” the authors say. The “suspicions” in this regard they say “heightened nearly a decade ago, when evidence emerged from a laptop computer smuggled out of the country by an Iranian scientist recruited by Western intelligence agencies [acclaim: prudence].” The data provided from that laptop, the article says, “included diagrams, videos and other results that appeared to strongly suggest interest in weapons design [acclaim: prudence].” However, the authors state, there were “disagreements in the intelligence agencies of different countries about whether, and how intensely, it was resumed [acclaim: prudence].” Talks about Iran’s work on weapons was taking place “on a separate track from the talks between Iran and the major powers about its nuclear enrichment program [acclaim: prudence],” says the article. Iranians “continue to block access to the scientist that the United States, Israel and others say ran many of the main weapons-research operations, Mohsen Fakrizadeh [attack: justice],” the authors say. Other Iranian researchers who may have been involved in the program had been “assassinated […] in operations that have been attributed to Israel [acclaim: prudence].” The report was “issued at a moment when negotiators have reached a roadblock with Iran over how much it is willing to dismantle its nuclear fuel-making infrastructure [acclaim: prudence],” the
article says. Iran appears to be “complying with all the elements of its interim agreement
[acclaim: justice],” the authors say. The report “showed that Iran had “halted nuclear activities in
the areas of greatest proliferation concern and rolled back its program in other key areas
[acclaim: justice].” The authors say that Iran “provided “additional information and
explanations,” including documents, to substantiate its claim that it had tested the detonators for
“a civilian application [acclaim: prudence].”” The authors conclude by saying that it is
“important that Iran continues to engage with the agency to resolve all outstanding issues”
related to the nuclear program [acclaim: prudence].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, this
article made appeals (acclaims) to deal benefits, knowledge of Iran’s nuclear actors and activities,
the wisdom of negotiations, knowledge of Israel’s actions against Iran, and the wisdom of Iran’s
actions. In terms of justice, appeals (acclaims) were made to fairness of inspectors, and the
trustworthiness, fairness, unfairness (attack) and distrust (attack) of Iran. In terms of
temperance, appeals (acclaims) were made to patience for deal stakeholders. This article
primarily acclaimed (conveyed) the information the author(s) felt necessary to facilitate
understanding of the subject. Secondarily, the article acclaimed the wisdom in the actions and
views of deal stakeholders.

In this article, David Sanger describes a report given by the Iranian government on itself
concerning its ability to create a nuclear weapon and the timeframe it would require to do
so (Sanger, 2014a). The title appeals to (acclaims) the safety concerns of the West and to the
wisdom behind creating a nuclear weapon. The Iranian government, Sanger says, “published its
first detailed study of how long it estimates it would take its scientists and engineers to assemble
a nuclear weapon, saying that with its current infrastructure, “the required time span is in years
[acclaim: justice and prudence].”” The article says that Iran describes its own report as
“hypothetical” and that the report “was clearly intended to allay fears that Iran has the ability to race for a bomb [attack: justice].” However, “officials” from the United States, “disputed the conclusions, which contradicted both classified assessments by the United States government and many estimates by outside experts [attack: justice and prudence],” the article says. Sanger says the “fact that Iran’s nuclear energy establishment wrote the eight-page report [is] notable [acclaim: prudence].” The author retells Iran’s declarations that “its program is entirely peaceful and that it has never studied what it would take to amass the fuel for a weapon [acclaim: justice].” The Iranian government announced that they “had agreed to change the design of a heavy water reactor near the Iranian city of Arak in ways that would limit [their] ability to forge a second path to a bomb [acclaim: justice]” and American officials “studying the new proposal […] saw it as a hopeful sign [acclaim: prudence].” Sanger says that the State Department “said almost nothing about the content of the discussion, other than that it was “constructive [acclaim: prudence].”’’ The United States, Sanger says, “argues that much of Iran’s infrastructure for producing nuclear fuel must be dismantled to significantly extend the time that Iran would need to produce a weapon [acclaim: justice and prudence].” A “senior official involved in the talks,” is quoted saying that there is a “huge gap” between the “American insistence that we can’t live with the status quo and the Iranian insistence that they want to be able to produce all their own civilian nuclear fuel [acclaim: prudence].” Sanger posits that Iran’s report “punctured the myth about a breakout [acclaim: prudence],” and referred to Secretary of State John Kerry as “the chief mythmaker [attack: justice].” Kerry is quoted saying that it is “public knowledge that we are operating with a time period for a so-called breakout of about two months [acclaim: prudence]” and that this needs to be “extended if the United States and its allies were to have enough warning to react [acclaim: prudence].” Kerry argued for “6 to 12 months more” which
“rattled some Israeli officials, who say they would insist on much more warning time [acclaim: justice and prudence].” Amos Yadlin, the former chief of Israeli military intelligence in Israel, is quoted saying that the “Iranian strategy to reach a nuclear bomb is to do it not as fast as possible” but rather “as safely as possible,” meaning in a way that would not provoke a military response [acclaim: prudence].” Sanger reports that the Iranians “argue that Mr. Kerry is alarmist and that it will take far longer [acclaim: prudence].” Sanger concludes by noting that American “officials” say that “many of those processes [involved] could happen simultaneously, reducing the amount of time needed [acclaim: prudence and justice].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals (acclaims) to the safety of Iranian nuclear abilities, trust and distrust (attack) of Iran, knowledge of Iran’s motivations and tactics, the wisdom of a deal, productivity of negotiations, deal benefits, bad concessions (attack), and the knowledge of Israeli and Iranian wants. In terms of justice, appeals (acclaims) were made to the safety of Iran’s nuclear capabilities, trust and distrust (attack) of Iran, deal benefits, distrust (attack) of Kerry, and the fairness of Israeli and Iranian wants. This article primarily acclaimed (conveyed) the information the author felt was needed to facilitate understanding of the subject. Secondarily, the article acclaimed the wisdom in the actions and views of deal stakeholders.

David Sanger reports on a person who, although absent, had influence over the Iran nuclear talks(Sanger, 2014b). The title seems to be appealing to (acclaims) the wisdom of an absent nuclear expert. Sanger refers to the person as a “mysterious figure” who was “conspicuously missing [acclaim: prudence].” The person’s name is given as Mohsen Fakhrizadeh, who is “considered by Western intelligence officials to be the closest thing Iran has to J. Robert Oppenheimer [acclaim: prudence].” Fakhrizadeh is
identified as the relentless force behind on-again, off-again programs to design a nuclear warhead that could fit atop one of Iran’s long-range missiles [the] keeper of Iran’s greatest nuclear secrets [he seems to] loom[s] over the talks that he never attends [acclaim: prudence], Sanger says.

The article suggests that his absence may be due to Fakhrizadeh “dodging assassins” because “important members of Mr. Fakhrizadeh’s staff as they drove to work” were killed [attack: prudence and justice]. “Fakhrizadeh’s absence,” Sanger posits, underscores a central reality of the increasingly tense negotiations over the Iranian program: If an agreement is reached […] it will be without any real understanding of how close Iran has come to cracking the technologies of building a nuclear warhead [attack: prudence].

Iran has told international nuclear inspectors that “Fakhrizadeh is unavailable to talk, and his empire of laboratories and testing grounds is off limits [acclaim: justice],” the author says. Thus, the article says, “any agreement among the United States and its five negotiating partners will be shrouded by uncertainty about how long it would take for Iran, if it produced or bought bomb-grade fuel, to make a nuclear weapon [attack: prudence].” American negotiators seem to be steering away from forcing a full historical accounting from the Iranians before any accord is signed, arguing that excavating the past is less important than assuring Iran does not have the raw material to make a weapon [acclaim: prudence], Sanger says.

The head of the International Atomic Energy Agency, Yukiya Amano, is quoted saying that “no one should expect a complete historical accounting [acclaim: prudence]” because it is “not possible to find out everything [acclaim: prudence].” “Some documents have disappeared [and]
some people have died [acclaim: prudence],” Amano said. Iran “does not give access [attack: justice]” and there has not been a “specific request” to interview Fakhrizadeh [acclaim: prudence]” but inspectors “would like to have access to the sites, the documents and the people — including him [acclaim: prudence],” the article says. The article mentions Mr. Amano’s predecessor, Mohamed ElBaradei who “negotiated an ineffective “work plan” with Iran to resolve the issues in 2007 [which was] never implemented [attack: prudence].” Sanger says that the “C.I.A. had a sizable team of experts to study Mr. Fakhrizadeh and his network of government facilities and university laboratories [acclaim: prudence].” A laptop called ““The Laptop of Death,” contained documents slipped out of the country by an Iranian technician that contained some of the evidence that Iran was trying to design a weapon [acclaim: prudence],” Sanger says. Iranians claimed the laptop’s content was “fabrications [attack: justice]” yet those documents “remain at the core of the I.A.E.A’s inquiry [acclaim: prudence],” the article says. Amano “waved aside the claim that they were fictitious [acclaim: prudence].” “[L]ong hours” were spent “checking it” and it was “determined [that] the information is broadly credible [acclaim: prudence]” because the data on the laptop is “consistent with other data, independently gathered by the agency itself [acclaim: prudence].” Amano argues that one cannot be “100%” sure but that “it is not nonsense information [acclaim: prudence].” Amano is quoted saying that his agency has “received responses from Iran on only one of the dozen technologies on his list, and those answers have prompted more questions [acclaim: justice].” So, gaining any certainty about how much progress the Iranians have made requires getting inside the laboratories, looking at evidence of suspected experiments and digging into reports that Iranians reportedly wrote memorializing their accomplishments [acclaim: prudence], Amano said.
Olli Heinonen, the former chief inspector of the I.A.E.A, was quoted saying that inspectors “don’t need to see every nut and bolt” but one would be “taking a heck of a risk if you don’t establish a baseline of how far they went [...] because it would be far more difficult to understand Iran’s timelines to a weapon.” Sanger says that getting inside is particularly important because American intelligence agencies, stung by their mistakes in Iraq, have changed their views about the pace and political limits of Mr. Fakhrizadeh’s work.

President George W. Bush apparently released an intelligence assessment that Mr. Fakhrizadeh had been told by Iran’s leaders to stand down at the end of 2003 [and] some of those efforts were resumed in different forms, and under different organizations, but never with the kind of focused effort believed to exist through 2003, the article says.

Robert Einhorn, a nuclear expert who worked on the issue until leaving the State Department, is quoted saying that we “probably have to assume that Iran already has a pretty good understanding of how to make a nuclear explosive design work.” Sanger says that Obama administration officials “say they have no illusions that they will get visibility into many of Iran’s most heavily protected sites, even if a deal is reached.” Further, he says, “verification of the accord is reliant on the American intelligence community’s ability to track covert nuclear activity [...] a record that is littered with failures.”
Iraq’s progress,” Sanger argues, was “famously, and wildly, overestimated 11 years ago, helping create the rationale for war” but American experts “often underestimated how long it would take to make a bomb [attack: prudence].

So, there is the “obvious fear of repeating Iraq, but anyone with a long memory fears making the opposite mistake,” Sanger concludes. To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals (acclaims) to knowledge of Iranian nuclear capabilities and lack thereof (attack), and lack of safety (attack) for Iranian nuclear experts. In terms of justice, appeals (acclaims) were made to lack of safety (attack) for Iranian nuclear experts, Iranian rights, and distrust (attack) of and fairness of the West. This article primarily acclaimed (conveyed) information that the author felt was needed to facilitate understanding of the subject. Secondarily, the article acclaimed the wisdom in the actions and views of deal stakeholders.

The next publication with the most pertinent articles was the Washington Post.

The Washington Post

As previously stated, from the Washington Post and the New York Times a similar number of pertinent articles were obtained. However, the Washington Post contained about half as many acclaims, attacks, and defenses as the New York Times. Again, this may be due to the amount of verbiage contained in each article comparatively speaking from publication to publication. The Washington Post also followed the common pattern found in all these publications wherein acclaims were more numerous than attacks which in turn were more numerous than defenses. The pattern in which appeals to prudence outnumbered appeals to justice, followed by appeals to fortitude, and lastly appeals to temperance was also found in this
publication. There were no attacks or defenses concerning *temperance* found in the samples obtained from the *Washington Post*.

**Table 12: Washington Post General Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Theory Categories</th>
<th>Overall Total</th>
<th>Aristotelian Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prudence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acclaims</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>360 (~65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attacks</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>88 (~58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defenses</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18 (~64%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The previous table shows the general outcome of functional theory categories of acclaims, attacks, and defenses, and their relationship to *prudence, justice, fortitude*, and *temperance* as well as overall totals for samples from this publication.

**Table 13: Washington Post Themes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total theme references: 1,223</th>
<th>Prudence</th>
<th>Justice</th>
<th>Fortitude</th>
<th>Temperance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acclaims: 928 (~76%)</td>
<td>Wisdom: 296 (~32%)</td>
<td>Understanding: 303 (~33%)</td>
<td>Fairness: 93 (~10%)</td>
<td>(nominal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attacks: 255 (~21%)</td>
<td>Wisdom: 139 (~55%)</td>
<td>Fairness: 40 (~17%)</td>
<td>(nominal)</td>
<td>(nominal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defenses: 40 (~3%)</td>
<td>Wisdom: 16 (~40%)</td>
<td>Fairness: 3 (~7%)</td>
<td>Trust: 6 (15%)</td>
<td>Faith: 10 (25%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The previous table shows major findings in the *Washington Post* with respect to themes.
As the table for themes revealed in the *Washington Post* shows, the majority of articles found and used in this study focused more on acclaiming (conveying) the information authors felt necessary to understand the subject followed closely by acclaims of the wisdom in the actions and views of deal stakeholders. Secondly, these articles acclaimed the fairness in the actions and views of deal stakeholders. Thirdly, these articles focused on attacking the wisdom and fairness in the actions and views of deal stakeholders.

**Washington Post Analysis Examples**

The following articles for this source are presented in chronological order according to the research period (indicated previously). The examples given in each article represent the general narrative of each article and thus the general sense of values represented. The following results contain indications of functional theory categories as well as values, both designated within brackets. Each example is followed by a summary according to theme relationship.

David Ignatius wrote an article for the *Washington Post* addressing the initiation of the Iran nuclear talks (Ignatius, 2013). The title appeals to (acclaims) the wisdom of recognizing the importance of the situation. The author says that a “big turn in foreign policy is possible [acclaim: prudence].” Ignatius says that Obama “talked directly with President Hassan Rouhani about quickly negotiating a deal to limit the Iranian nuclear program [acclaim: prudence].” “Some observers” the author says, “see signs of American weakness or even capitulation [attack: prudence].” “They’re mistaken,” Ignatius argues. The United States can be “stronger if it can create a new framework for security in the Middle East that involves Iran and defuses the Sunni-Shiite sectarian conflict threatening the region [acclaim: prudence],” he says. Change “frightens people, especially when it's being pushed by a president who is perceived as weak at home and abroad [acclaim: prudence],” but “tactical finesse,” the author describes it, “matters in big
strategic moments like this [acclaim: prudence].” The author describes what he thinks are similar situations with

the way President Richard Nixon (with Henry Kissinger) shaped the opening to China … and Presidents Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush (with Brent Scowcroft and James Baker) managed the end of the Cold War [acclaim: prudence].

“They made it look easy,” says Ignatius. What the Nixon and Reagan-Bush teams “did well was manage communications […] regular dialogue with the Soviet Union [acclaim: prudence],” the article says. Obama, the author says, “will need a deal that verifies Iranian supreme leader Ali Khamenei’s pledge not to build a bomb - and prevents any quick breakout capability [acclaim: prudence]” while at the same time “accept Iran's right, in principle, to enrich [acclaim: justice].”

The author believes that a future deal holds “a new regional framework that accommodates the security needs [acclaim: justice]” of members. He describes the potential deal as a “great strategic opportunity [that] will require constant, skillful diplomatic guidance [acclaim: prudence].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals (acclaims) to understanding the importance of the situation, benefits and concessions of a deal, Obama’s lack of wisdom (attack), the lack of wisdom (attack) of those anti-deal, wisdom (acclaim) of regular/open dialogue, and the wisdom of a deal. In terms of justice, appeals (acclaims) were made to Iran’s rights, and regional safety. This article primarily acclaimed the wisdom in the actions and views of deal stakeholders. Secondarily, this article acclaimed (conveyed) the information the author felt necessary to facilitate understanding of the subject.

An opinion piece in the Washington Post suggested that a final deal with Iran needed to consider concessions carefully("Final Iran deal needs to balance out the concessions," 2013). The title references a need to balance the deal better, an appeal to [acclaim: justice]. The author
argues that the “fact sheet” on the negotiations was notable for its “omissions [attack: justice]” particularly since the document in question is over 2000 words and stresses only positives. To summarize: In terms of justice, appeals were made to lack of fairness (attack) of concessions and benefits. This article primarily attacked the trustworthiness and fairness of negotiations.

The article “World powers reach nuclear deal with Iran to freeze its nuclear program (Gearan & Warrick, 2013), makes use of the words “deal” and “world powers” and gives the possible indication of an agreement which tends to denote something good, between legitimate authorities wherein both sides benefit [acclaim: prudence and justice]. “World powers” could be seen as constituting an appeal to authority [acclaim: fortitude]. The object of the Deal, freezing Iran’s nuclear capabilities, as presented in the title, might appeal to an already present fear in the minds of informed readers, Iran’s nuclear capability, in the sense that it is now allayed by said Deal [acclaim: justice]. As stated previously in this overall study, policy is defined as the “adoption of a definite course of action.” The reasons for a course of action are based upon the balancing, maintenance, or reaching of a value-standard, even if that standard is left unspoken. Considering the language used in the title such as “deal” and “world powers,” wherein the latter is an appeal to authority and given that the title is an acclaim which proposes a course of action which is arguably better than the prior situation, the value to which the piece appeals (acclaim) is prudence. Prudence, in this context, means practical wisdom or knowledge and understanding of how to act given the situation. The title suggests that those involved, “world powers,” possess the needed knowledge and understanding of the situation in order to act wisely. The first sentence appears to strengthen words used in the title such as the addition of the word “major” to world powers and the addition of “historic agreement” to deal [acclaim: prudence]. These additions arguably further the goal of presenting the policy at hand in a
positive way thus making the deal, as far as functional theory’s axioms are concerned, a
preferable choice. According to the first sentence, Iran (the source of fear) receives a
“temporary” relief from “some” economic sanctions while the major world powers receive a
“freeze” on “key” parts of Iran’s nuclear capabilities [acclaim: justice]. If Iran is perceived as the
source of the fear that has led to the need for a Deal, and the sanctions in place are seen as a
method of controlling Iran, then only a temporary alleviation of some of these sanctions
exchanged for a complete halt of the most important parts of Iran’s program could be seen as a
solution to the fear that lead to the Deal. Further, the Deal could be seen as favoring the major
world powers in that they got what they wanted but Iran only got part of what they wanted. This
could be seen as an appeal to (acclaim) justice. Justice is seen as fairness and righteousness in
the sense that people receive what is due to them, whether in terms of punishment or reward.
Such an appeal argues that the parties involved are acting with justice in terms of the Deal in that
the major powers receive the reward of dispelling fears of Iran’s nuclear program and Iran
receives punishment of having sanctions only temporarily lifted. The second sentence makes
reference to terms such as “sealed at a 3 a.m. signing ceremony in Geneva’s Palace of Nations,
requires Iran to halt or scale back parts of its nuclear infrastructure, the first such pause in more
than a decade,” which appeals to (acclaim) prudence. Terms such as “requires Iran to halt or
scale back parts of its nuclear infrastructure” indicates complete (acclaim) justice for potential
aggressor; “the first such pause in more than a decade” suggests historic achievement to end a
hostile environment [acclaim: prudence]. In the third sentence, “Iranian Foreign Minister
Mohammad Javad Zarif hailed the deal, which was reached after four days of hard bargaining,
including an eleventh-hour intervention,” if the Iranian minister hailed the Deal he must think it
to be fair [acclaim: justice]. Whereas “four days of hard bargaining” indicates long, hard work
(ended with a Deal) [acclaim: temperance]; “11th hour intervention” indicates an authoritative
decision by a wise interlocutor who saved the day, so to speak [acclaim: fortitude and prudence];
inclusion of Secretary of State, foreign ministers from Europe, Russia, and China indicates an
appeal to a wise authority [acclaim: prudence]. The fourth sentence Iranian Foreign Minister
Mohammad Javad Zarif says

   It is important that we all of us see the opportunity to end an unnecessary crisis and open
   new horizons based on respect, based on the rights of the Iranian people and removing
   any doubts about the exclusively peaceful nature of Iran’s nuclear program [acclaim:
   prudence, justice and fortitude], Zarif told reporters in English.

“This is a process of attempting to restore confidence [acclaim: prudence and fortitude].” There
is an emphasis on the importance to see opportunity to end unnecessary crisis, open new
horizons, remove doubts, restore confidence, mentioning that Zarif spoke in English [acclaim:
prudence]. There is also an appeal to (acclaim) justice based on respect and rights of Iranian
people, also ending an unnecessary crisis, and restore confidence. In the fifth sentence there is
reference to a “more comprehensive” deal to come, “freezing” and reversing Iran’s progress,
“western officials familiar with the details [acclaim: prudence and justice]. The sixth sentence
uses the terms Halting and capping, and being “allowed to produce” as appeals to (acclaim)
justice. In the article Obama is quoted saying that “diplomacy opened up a new path toward a
world that is more secure […] a future in which we can verify that Iran’s nuclear program is
peaceful and that it cannot build a nuclear weapon [acclaim: prudence and fortitude].” Sen.
Robert Menendez (D-N.J.), chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee warns that the
deal “did not proportionately reduce Iran’s nuclear program for the relief it is receiving [attack:
justice].” Iran’s “history of duplicity,” he continues, “will demand ongoing, on the ground verification [acclaim: justice and prudence].” Secretary of State John Kerry was referenced using terms like “predawn hours” which suggests hard work; requiring suggests authority [acclaim: temperance and fortitude]; “requiring Iran to prove peaceful nature” and “ensure” suggest trust [acclaim: prudence, justice and fortitude]. His speech was described as “address[ing] Israeli concerns directly;” “It will make our partners in the regions safer;” “It will make our ally Israel safer [acclaim: prudence and fortitude],” he said. The article says that the agreement might “help turn the page from more than three decades of animosity and suspicion between the United States and Iran [acclaim: prudence and fortitude].” Representative Adam Smith (D-Wash.), the ranking Democrat on the House Armed Services Committee called the deal a “positive step” and that it was “vital” that Iran be restrained in a “peaceful way [acclaim: prudence and temperance].” However, “skeptics” provided “heavy opposition” and “demand much greater concessions [acclaim: justice].” The author says “Republican lawmakers characterized the agreement as not going far enough [attack: justice].” Representative Edward R. Royce (R-Calif.), chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee said that he had “serious concerns that this agreement does not meet the standards necessary to protect the United States and our allies [attack: justice].” The authors refer to “others” who “hailed the successful conclusion of a deal that eased a crisis that brought the Middle East to the brink of armed conflict [acclaim: prudence].” Clifford Kupchan, a former State Department official and Iran expert called the deal “a huge win for Obama [acclaim: prudence].” Trita Parsi, president of the National Iranian American Council said that the deal “delivered the U.S. and Iran from the brink of a disastrous war and placed the two countries at the beginning of a brighter, more sustainable path forward [acclaim: prudence and fortitude].” Assuring compliance, the article says, requires “daily
access,” “remote cameras and sensing equipment [acclaim: prudence and justice].” The article stresses that “Iran’s deputy foreign minister hardened his position on Iran’s right to enrich uranium, a matter of deep national pride [acclaim: justice]” and said that they “could not accept any agreement that does not recognize enrichment rights [acclaim: justice].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals (acclaims) to benefits and wisdom of the deal, the wisdom of negotiators, knowledge of Iran’s duplicity, and the safety of the U.S. and its allies. In terms of justice, appeals (acclaims) were made to benefits and fairness and unfairness (attack) of the deal, fairness (acclaim) of the negotiators, Iranian rights, trustworthiness of Iran, fairness of inspections, and stronger concessions. In terms of fortitude, appeals (acclaims) were made to the power of negotiators, faith in the process and the deal, and the safety of the U.S. and its allies. In terms of temperance, appeals (acclaims) were made to the patience of negotiators. This article primarily acclaimed the wisdom and fairness in the actions and views of deal stakeholders. Secondarily, the article attacked the fairness in the actions and views of deal stakeholders.

Anne Gearan wrote an article for the Washington Post that covered Secretary of State John Kerry’s attempts to convince Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu to support the Iran deal (Gearan, 2013). The title appeals to (acclaims) the wisdom of the deal and getting support for it. Gearan says that the Obama administration “set up a choice for Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu … allow the United States and other world powers some breathing room to achieve a satisfactory final deal with Iran, or he can dig in his heels against it [acclaim: prudence].” Netanyahu is quoted calling the deal a “dangerous blunder [attack: prudence].” Kerry assured that the “fundamental sanctions regime remains absolutely in place” and that they were “stepping up our effort of enforcement [acclaim: justice].” The article says that Iran “insists that its program is for peaceful purposes and that it neither wants nor needs
nuclear weapons, which the country's supreme leader has declared are prohibited by Islam [attack: justice].” Retired Marine Gen. John R. Allen was “tasked by the Obama administration with sketching possible security arrangements for Israel [acclaim: prudence],” the article says. Former prime minister Ehud Olmert is quoted saying that “Netanyahu “lost his head” by “declaring war on the United States [attack: prudence].”” Gearan says that the

Israeli military and intelligence establishment appears to be of two minds these days - warning of dangers in allowing Iran to continue its nuclear program while also urging Israel's leaders to work effectively to strengthen the final deal [attack: prudence].

Netanyahu said that it would be “easy to be silent … easy to receive a pat on the shoulder from the international community, to bow one's head, but I am committed to the security of my people [acclaim: justice].” And he warned that “Israel would act alone, if necessary [acclaim: justice].” Efraim Inbar, director of the Begin-Sadat Center for Strategic Studies at Bar Ilan University said that Kerry will “try to convince [Netanyahu] it's only temporary and there is a possibility to change the final agreement [acclaim: prudence].” The article references a “monthly poll” of Israelis wherein “77 percent […] do not think the agreement will lead to the end of what Israel suspects is an Iranian nuclear weapons program [acclaim: prudence].” The same poll asked “who is Israel's greatest ally [and] 71 percent said they think the United States is Israel's most loyal and important ally [acclaim: justice].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals (acclaims) to the wisdom of the deal and lack thereof (attack), knowledge (acclaim) of the deal’s details and process and benefits, understanding Netanyahu’s situation and lack of wisdom (attack), and the safety (acclaim) and lack of wisdom (attack) of Israel. In terms of justice, appeals (acclaims) were made to trust in the deal, unfairness (attack) of nuclear weapons, the
fairness (acclaim) of Netanyahu and Israel’s actions, and trust in U.S.-Israeli relations. This article primarily attacked the wisdom in the actions and views of deal stakeholders. Secondarily, the article defended the wisdom and trustworthiness of the actions and views of deal stakeholders.

Fareed Zakaria wrote an article for the Washington Post warning about the route to an Iran deal (Zakaria, 2014). The title appeals to the fairness [attack: justice] of a bad path to a deal with Iran. Iran, Zakaria says, “did not agree to dismantle anything […] would not destroy any of its existing centrifuges [and] would not shut down its heavy-water reactor at Arak [attack: prudence and justice].” The article states that Iran and the United States have fundamentally different views about an acceptable final deal [acclaim: prudence].” But, he continues, Iran “will provide the world with assurances and evidence that its nuclear program is civilian, not military [acclaim: justice]” and “would allow unprecedented levels of intrusive inspections at all facilities [acclaim: justice].” Officials representing Iran ae quoted saying that they were determined not to accept any constraints on their program […] They speak often about the importance of being treated like any other country that has signed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, which to them means having the unfettered right to enrich uranium to produce electricity [acclaim: justice].

The “American vision of the final deal” is described as “quite different” from Iran’s “and stems from the notion that Iran must take special steps to provide confidence that its program is peaceful [acclaim: Prudence and Justice].” Zakaria says that Iran “will have to come to terms with the fact that their country is being treated differently and for good reasons [acclaim: prudence and justice].” Iran’s nuclear program is described as “suspicious” and that they have
“deceived the world about [their] program in the past [attack: justice].” Georgetown University's Colin Kahl and The Ploughshares Fund's Joseph Cirincione argues that “one could shut down centrifuges without destroying them [acclaim: prudence].” The article concludes with discussion of prepping for success if possible [acclaim: prudence]. To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals to Iran as unwise (attack), knowledge (acclaim) of views of the deal, the wisdom of the U.S., knowledge of Iran’s treatment, and knowledge of the situation. In terms of justice, appeals were made to unfairness (attack) of the deal, unfairness (attack) and fairness (acclaim) of Iran, Iran’s rights, the fairness of the U.S., fairness of Iran’s treatment, and distrust (attack) of Iran. This article primarily acclaimed (conveyed) information that the author felt necessary to facilitate understanding of the subject. Secondarily, the article acclaimed the wisdom in the actions and views of deal stakeholders.

Anne Gearan wrote another article for the Washington Post wherein she covers John Kerry’s stance on sanctions against Iran(Gearan, 2014b). The title appeals to (acclaims) a commitment (fortitude) and the wisdom of doing so. The article says that the United States “will continue to enforce existing sanctions on Iran while bargaining over a deal to rein in Iran's disputed nuclear program [acclaim: justice].” Gearan describes the negotiations with Iran as “politically sensitive at home, where many in Congress oppose the Obama administration's strategy of limited easing of sanctions imposed in protest of a secretive nuclear program that Iran says has no military purpose [acclaim: justice].” Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, Gearan says, “also opposed the interim, six-month deal as a giveaway to Iran [attack: justice].” The article describes the aim of the talks toward a “comprehensive agreement that ends a 10-year diplomatic impasse and ensures that Iran cannot quickly redirect its advanced nuclear development work to build a bomb [acclaim: fortitude].” Kerry and Zarif, the two main
representatives of the United States and Iran respectively, “portrayed the interim deal reached in November very differently for their respective publics [attack: prudence],” the article says. While Kerry “stresses that the deal forces Iran to stop uranium enrichment work considered the most likely to lead to a bomb and degrade its existing stocks of the most potent uranium [acclaim: justice];” Zarif “stresses the economic benefit to Iran and what he calls a recognition of Iran's right to a continued homegrown uranium enrichment program [acclaim: prudence and justice].” Gearan says that Iran does not seem “prepared to give up research on centrifuges used to purify uranium as part of a final nuclear deal [acclaim: justice].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals to the wisdom (acclaim) of Kerry, the deal as unwise (attack), deal benefits (acclaim), Iran’s actions as wise. In terms of justice, appeals were made to the fairness (acclaim) of sanctions, Iran’s trustworthiness, bad concessions (attack), benefits (acclaim) of the deal. In terms of fortitude, appeals (acclaims) were made to the power of Kerry, the power of the deal. This article primarily acclaimed the fairness and wisdom in the actions and views of deal stakeholders. Secondarily, the article acclaimed (conveyed) the information the author felt was needed to facilitate understanding of the subject.

Yuval Steinitz’s piece, “Iran deal could encourage rather than limit nuclear activity”(Steinitz, 2014), addresses concerns that the deal might lead to a new arms race in the middle-east. The title calls into question (attacks) the wisdom of the Iran deal in this regard. “A final deal that allows Iran to retain centrifuges for uranium enrichment,” the article says, “ultimately would allow the development of nuclear weapons in Iran, encourage a Sunni-Shiite arms race in the Middle East and weaken counterproliferation efforts worldwide [attack: prudence].” The author notes that Iran was already suspected of having “ballistic missiles suited to carry nuclear warheads and advanced knowledge of weaponization [acclaim: prudence].”
“The production of fissile material,” Steinitz says “is the principal stage in the process of making a nuclear weapon” and thus “acquiescing to Iranian enrichment is tantamount to legitimizing Iran's status on the nuclear threshold [attack: prudence].” The author calls “[p]roposals for the final agreement to restrict the number of centrifuges […] almost irrelevant [attack: prudence].” “If Iran were forced to reduce its number of centrifuges to only 3,000” he argues, “its stockpile of uranium enriched to 3.5 percent would allow the production of enough fissile material for a nuclear bomb within six months [acclaim: prudence].” But “if forced to start from scratch with 3,000 centrifuges Iran could still produce enough fissile material to make a nuclear weapon within one year [acclaim: prudence].” Steinitz references North Korea that became a nuclear power “after signing a similar deal in 2007 [acclaim: prudence].” “The ayatollahs’ initial objective and the reason Tehran invested around $50 billion in this project” he argues, was to become a nuclear power [acclaim: prudence]. The Ayatollahs’ regime “poses a threat to its Sunni neighbors” Steinitz says, and “calls for the annihilation of the Jewish state and sponsors terrorist groups such as Hezbollah and Islamic Jihad, all of which sparks fear in other countries [acclaim: prudence].” “Critical reaction to an international agreement” the article says, “would be not in Washington but in Cairo, Ankara and Riyadh [acclaim: prudence].” Steinitz describes Iran’s approach to negotiations as Iranian President Hassan Rouhani’s “charm offensive” which he says had a “dramatic effect in the West” but that “no one in the Middle East buys Iran's projection of pacifism [acclaim: prudence].” The article further argues that

[a]ny deal that legitimizes Iran as an unpunished, sanctions-free country on the nuclear threshold might spark a nuclear arms race in the region, as Saudi Arabia has hinted [and] some Sunni states might seek to develop the bomb in a bid to achieve parity with Iran or
to ensure their ability to join the nuclear club if Tehran does [acclaim: prudence and justice].

These scenarios, Steinitz says, “might provide Tehran the ultimate excuse to produce the bomb: to keep pace with the rivals its own actions drove to go nuclear [acclaim: prudence and justice].” Should the final compromise include de facto recognition of Iran's “right to enrich,”” he argues, “the international community would find it difficult to insist later that other problematic regimes concede that “right [acclaim: prudence and justice]."

The interim agreement, according to the article, already “linked Iran's hypothetical future enrichment to its civilian “practical needs [acclaim: prudence].”” If enrichment is allowed, Steinitz asks,

how would the United States justify its demand that, say, Egypt, Jordan or South Korea eschew uranium enrichment for peaceful civilian purposes? How would U.S. officials argue that what the deal concedes to the ayatollahs' regime, after a decade of flagrant violations of six U.N. Security Council resolutions and their commitments under the Non-Proliferation Treaty, is forbidden for more responsible countries? How could the United States cast greater legitimacy on the previously clandestine centrifuge facilities in Qom and Natanz than on those that would be aboveboard from the outset [attack: prudence and justice]?

“Rogue states” might insist on their own reactors, says the article [acclaim: prudence]. To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals to the deal as unwise (attack), knowledge (acclaim) of Iran’s abilities and motives, bad concessions (attack), understanding (acclaim) North Korea’s similarity, wisdom of fearing Iran, wisdom of understanding U.S. allies’
reactions, *wisdom* of U.S. allies’ actions, and the *wisdom* of Iranian action. In terms of *justice*, appeals (acclaims) were made to the *fairness* of U.S. allies’ actions, *fairness* of Iranian action, and the deal as *unfair* (attack). Primarily, this article acclaimed (conveyed) the information the author felt necessary to facilitate understanding of the subject. Secondarily, the article attacked the wisdom in the actions and views of deal stakeholders.

“The day after an Iran deal” (Patraeus & Serchuk, 2014), was an article in the *Washington Post* that considered potential consequences of a deal with Iran. The title is an appeal to (*acclaim*) the projected *wisdom* of a deal. Cynics “warned of the risks of a ‘bad deal,’ under which Iran's capabilities are not sufficiently rolled back [*attack: prudence*].” “[A]bsent form the debate,” the author states, is “a fuller consideration of the strategic implications a nuclear agreement could have on the U.S. position in the Middle East [*acclaim: prudence*].” To do so, it says, one must consider “the consequences of lifting the majority of sanctions on Iran - and of Iran resuming normal trade with the world's major economies [*acclaim: prudence*].” Removing sanctions would “lead to the economic empowerment of a government that is the leading state sponsor of terrorism [*attack: prudence and justice*],” the author says. In other words, it “would strengthen Tehran's ability to project malign influence in its near-abroad [*attack: prudence*].” Aside from nuclear weapons, a deal “could result in the United States and our partners in the Middle East facing a better-resourced and, in some respects, more dangerous adversary [*attack: prudence*].” However, the author says, this does not mean diplomacy with Iran should be “abandoned [*acclaim: prudence*]” because “preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons ought to be our foremost priority, and a diplomatic agreement that truly bolts the door against that danger is worth potential downsides [*acclaim: prudence*].” The “alternative,” the author argues, “military action carries its own set of costs and risks to regional stability and the global
Too often in U.S. foreign policy, we set a strategic objective and pursue it doggedly,” the author concludes, “only to be insufficiently prepared for the consequences when we achieve our goal [attack: prudence].

To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals to the wisdom (acclaim) of the deal and lack thereof (attack), bad concessions (attack) and understanding (acclaim) them, understanding deal effects, wisdom of diplomacy, deal benefits, understanding deal alternatives, and the lack of wisdom (attack) of the U.S. In terms of justice, appeals were made to the unfairness (attack) of the deal. This article primarily acclaimed the wisdom in the actions and views of deal stakeholders. Secondarily, the article acclaimed the information the author felt necessary to facilitate understanding of the subject.

A commentary in the Washington Post reflected on recommendations to “to secure Congressional support for a possible deal with Iran regarding its nuclear program”("Pre-authorizing a war with Iran," 2014). The title appeals to (attacks) the wisdom of war with Iran. The article references Eric Edelman, Dennis Ross and Ray Takeyh who had “outlined a series of steps to secure Congressional support for a possible deal with Iran regarding its nuclear program
These men “asserted that “any deal is likely to be far more credible on the Hill if the administration has a clear plan to deal with cheating” and proposed that such a plan could “include Congressional authorization for the use of force to respond to violations of the agreement [acclaim: prudence and justice].” The author concludes that the

notion of Congress pre-authorizing the use of force to respond to violations of an agreement with Iran - in effect, giving this or any future president a green light to use force against Iran would and should be met with severe skepticism by representatives intent on preserving Congressional prerogatives and not writing the White House another blank check [acclaim: prudence].

To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals to the wisdom (acclaim) in and lack of wisdom (attack) in war with Iran, and the knowledge (acclaim) of deal context. In terms of justice, appeals (acclaims) were made to the fairness in war with Iran. This article primarily acclaimed (conveyed) the information the author(s) felt necessary to facilitate understanding of the subject. Secondarily, the article acclaims the wisdom in the actions and views of deal stakeholders.

Ryan Crocker wrote an article for the Washington Post in which he discusses potential goals concerning Iran(Crocker, 2014). The use of “common cause” is an appeal to (acclaim) wisdom. Crocker references an “Arab proverb” which states that “a problem gets solved when it gets tougher [acclaim: prudence].” The author references the “advance” of the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria which he says “poses a threat to the United States [acclaim: prudence].” Crocker says that the question is “no longer whether to work together but how to do so [acclaim: prudence].” Thus, “by reaching a comprehensive nuclear agreement in talks [acclaim: prudence]” communications can be greatly improved, he says. If talks fail, then there are only
“bad options [acclaim: prudence],” Crocker says. “If the Islamic State is to be contained,” the article states, the “United States and other nations will have to reconsider past policies and manage enmities [acclaim: prudence].” The “creation of a radical Islamist Sunni state next door” to Iran would be “catastrophic” for them [attack: justice]. Crocker continues that after years of clandestinely supporting radical Sunni Islamists throughout the Middle East, the Persian Gulf monarchies face a choice between denouncing the Islamic State, which poses a significant threat to them as well, or continuing to emphasize the sectarian struggle with the Shiites [acclaim: prudence].

“The choice for Bashar Assad's government,” the author states, is “either to turn its military power against the Islamic State or to continue to kill fellow Syrians [acclaim: prudence].” The article says that “for the West to support a war against Assad as well as a war against the Islamic State makes no sense … Assad is evil, but in this case, he is certainly the lesser evil [acclaim: prudence].” As for Turkey, they “decided already to support Kurdish military action against the Islamic State, choosing to risk enabling more independence for the Kurds given that the alternative is a radical Islamist regime on its border [acclaim: prudence].” Israel, Crocker says, “must see that this violent Islamist turbulence requires it to reconsider which foreign power represents its most serious threat [acclaim: prudence].” The author concludes with a reference to another “Arab proverb,” which says that “‘at the narrow passage there is no brother or friend.’ Indeed, as we enter a new era of Middle East conflict, the path is narrow and fraught, and the United States will have to work with many strange bedfellows [acclaim: prudence].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals (acclaims) to the wisdom of Iran as an ally, understanding U.S.-Iranian relations and common threats, wisdom and benefits of a deal, understanding deal alternatives, understanding mid-east politics, and the wisdom of Turkey. In
terms of justice, appeals were made to the unfairness (attack) of ISIS. This article primarily acclaimed the wisdom in the actions and views of deal stakeholders.

“Why Iran Holds Out,” (Gerecht & Dubowitz, 2014), published in the Washington Post, discusses potential reasons why Iran negotiates the way it does. The title is an appeal to (acclaim) the temperance of Iran. The article mentions that Iran's supreme leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei accepted a deal offered by the West and says “[i]f he was simply motivated by economics, he certainly should have [acclaim: prudence].” Iran’s hard currency reserves are “low” the authors say,

Tehran has received around $4.2 billion in cash relief from unfrozen hard-currency accounts [...] Another $2.8 billion is forthcoming [...] Billions more have been gained indirectly since the United States and Europe ceased escalating sanctions; one can see the effects through the halving of Iran's inflation rate, the stabilization of its exchange rate and an increase in gross national product. If the Iranians moved toward the West, tens of billions of dollars would likely start flowing into Iranian banks [acclaim: prudence].

Concessions by Iran could “easily lead to the lifting of the embargo” says the authors [acclaim: prudence and justice]. The article says that Tehran might still have to navigate Washington's financial sanctions, an end to the embargo would probably mean that Europe would never again be a major player in sanctions - even if the mullahs were later caught cheating on a nuclear deal [acclaim: prudence].

President Hassan Rouhani was quoted expressing the need to “use Europe against the United States; it's a good bet that a primary political objective for Tehran is to shatter Western unity on the nuclear issue [acclaim: prudence].” The authors argue that the West is not really
trying arduously to deny Tehran the capacity to build nuclear weapons [...] Negotiators have recognized the regime’s “right” to uranium enrichment; they appear ready to accept several thousand operational centrifuges and Iran’s “right” to advanced centrifuge research and development at the buried-in-the-mountain Fordow site. President Obama has also accepted the idea of a “sunset clause” on any agreement (Tehran has suggested three to seven years; Washington wants more than 10), which means that eventually the regime could legally develop an industrial-size enrichment program, reducing its bomb breakout time to days and increasing the risk of uranium diversion to covert sites. The White House has also largely ignored concerns of the International Atomic Energy Agency about weaponization research, leaving those troublesome questions to separate talks between the IAEA and Tehran [acclaim: prudence and justice].

Further, the article states that the Obama administration no longer seeks to stop the development of long-range missiles, just nuclear warheads, even though warhead production is nearly impossible to detect, especially without an intrusive inspections regime. And Obama appears content to keep inspections limited to known nuclear sites; Iran won't have to agree to give IAEA inspectors unchallenged access to any suspicious location. The White House also seems to have dropped the demand that the heavy-water facility at the Arak plant be converted to a light-water reactor, which produces hard-to-extract plutonium. The emphasis at Arak is now on frequent inspections and a reduction in reactor fuel [attack: prudence and justice].

The West has offered a “very good deal” according to the article, but “Khamenei hasn't bitten” possibly because
the cleric just expects to win more concessions from a U.S. president allergic to conflict in the Middle East. Much has been made of the salutary effect of sanctions on the regime's embrace of diplomacy; too little has been made of Tehran's longtime strategy to get the West to accept its continuing nuclear progress. Diplomacy for the regime has always been a path to the bomb, and this is especially true for Rouhani, who believes he used diplomacy between 2003 and 2005 to protect his country's atomic quest from a warmongering George W. Bush. Rouhani has surely told Khamenei that the more the West extends diplomacy, the more concessions it makes and, thus, the smoother Iran's transition to a nuclear-armed state [acclaim: prudence and justice].

The article calls this “diplomatic maneuvering” wherein Khamenei thinks that “bowing to Westerners is a sin” so Rouhani “may not be able to persuade his boss to let Obama surrender with some face [acclaim: prudence].” The authors conclude by suggesting that “Khamenei regularly mocks the White House's palpable fear of conventional conflict [and the] West's track record of giving ground in talks proves in Khamenei's eyes the strategic wisdom of his nuclear aspirations [acclaim: prudence and justice].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals (acclaims) to the wisdom of Iran, the wisdom of the deal, understanding Europe’s role, understanding Iran’s motives and tactics, and the wisdom of the U.S. and lack thereof (attack). In terms of justice, appeals were made to the fairness (acclaim) of a deal and lack thereof (attack), and Iran’s rights (acclaim). In terms of temperance, appeals (acclaims) were made to the patience of Iran. This article primarily acclaimed (conveyed) the information the author felt necessary to understand the subject. Secondarily, the article acclaimed the fairness in the actions and views of deal stakeholders.
Anne Gearan examines the change of standard from not allowing Iran to enrich to allowing it in her article “Iran will not stop uranium enrichment, Hassan Rouhani says in New York,” (Gearan, 2014a). The title appeals to (acclaims) justice. The point of enrichment became a “sticking point” in negotiations over Iran’s nuclear program [acclaim: justice]. Although there was “solid popular and high-level political support in Iran for the talks after more than a decade of impasse [acclaim: fortitude],” Rouhani had “no plan […] to talk to President Obama, as he did by telephone during last year's U.N. gathering, or for the two presidents to meet [acclaim: prudence]” and insisted that Iran would “never surrender its legal right to peaceful nuclear activities […] Uranium enrichment will continue,” he is quoted saying [acclaim: justice]. To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals (acclaims) to the wisdom of Rouhani. In terms of justice, appeals (acclaims) were made to the fairness of the deal, and Iran’s rights. In terms of fortitude, appeals (acclaims) were made to hope in talks. This article primarily acclaimed the wisdom in the actions and views of deal stakeholders. Secondarily, this article acclaimed the fairness and hope in the actions and views of deal stakeholders. The article spent an equal amount of time acclaiming and attacking fairness.

A commentary written in the Washington Post posits that the negotiators representing the United States should remain firm in their demands, ("Hold the line," 2014)[acclaim: fortitude]. The article describes U.S. responses to Iranian “intransigence” as “creative but sometimes disturbing” in terms of counterproposals [attack: prudence]. Iranian Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei was quoted saying that Iran will not “dismantle any of the 19,000 centrifuges it has constructed to enrich uranium [acclaim: justice].” The United States and its allies “floated a proposal to leave the centrifuges in place but take away the plumbing that connects them [acclaim: justice],” the article says. The article says that there is “no record” of Iran having made
any additional proposals to try to bridge the gaps in negotiations. Iran “appears to be sticking to its insistence on maintaining and eventually vastly expanding its nuclear infrastructure while offering only a temporary slowdown in uranium enrichment and “increased transparency,”” the article says. In addition, Iran was “refusing to discuss its ballistic missile program and still isn't cooperating with international inspectors' probe into its past nuclear weapons design work.” The Obama administration, the authors say,

has a history of responding to Iran's stonewalling by peeling away its own demands. It gave up an attempt to impose a permanent ban on Iranian enrichment and seems to have dropped a requirement that an underground uranium enrichment plant be closed, and they are contemplating scenarios under which Iran would not have to dismantle centrifuges that would be the center of any bomb-making effort.

Secretary of State John Kerry stated that “a nuclear deal including this concession could still achieve the goal to increase the time Iran would need to produce a bomb.” But the author argues, “by leaving the nuclear infrastructure intact it would cede Iran the option of racing to build a nuclear arsenal at a time of its choosing, while removing the sanctions that are pressing the regime.” This in effect would “create a time bomb for the Middle East,” the article says. The paper’s editorial board stated that they “supported negotiations with Iran, and the interim deal struck last year, as preferable to what had previously looked like a slide toward war.” But they argue, Obama “should resist the temptation to make further concessions in order to complete a long-term deal.” The article concludes by suggesting that Iran “should be offered, at best, an extension of the existing arrangement, with the current sanctions
left in place - and threatened with tougher measures if it does not accept [acclaim: prudence and justice].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals to the lack of wisdom (attack) of the U.S., wisdom of concessions (acclaim) and lack thereof (attack), the wisdom (acclaim) in and lack of wisdom (attack) of the deal, and the wisdom (acclaim) of sanctions and standing firm. In terms of justice, appeals (acclaims) were made to Iranian rights, deal benefits, unfairness (attack) of Iran, and the fairness (acclaim) of tougher sanctions. In terms of fortitude, appeals (acclaims) were made to the power of negotiators. This article primarily acclaimed the fairness in the actions and views of deal stakeholders. It also acclaimed (conveyed) the information the author(s) felt necessary to understand the subject. Secondarily, the article attacked the wisdom in the actions and views of deal stakeholders.

Another short commentary in the Washington Post attacks the wisdom of the Iran deal, ("Iran deal is a fool's errand", 2014). The title attacks the wisdom of the deal. The author calls those that think a deal with Iran possible “delusional [attack: prudence].” He further says that the Iranians are “making fools” of the negotiators and “playing [the West] for suckers [attack: prudence].” The article says that it should be only a “matter of months” before an “underground nuclear explosion” is detected [acclaim: prudence] which will “end this negotiating charade once and for all [attack: prudence].” Iran “will become another North Korea,” the author concludes [attack: prudence]. To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals to the lack of wisdom (attack) in the deal, those pro-deal, and negotiators. This article primarily acclaimed (conveyed) information the author(s) felt necessary to understand the subject. It also attacked the wisdom in the actions and views of deal stakeholders.

Towards the end of 2014, Carol Morello wrote an article for the Washington Post in which she reports Secretary of State John Kerry’s message that an Iran deal may be
soon (Morello, 2014). The title is an appeal to \textit{(acclaim) fortitude}. Kerry gave a speech entitled “Stormy Seas: The United States and Israel in a Tumultuous Middle East” which was “preceded by a heavy dose of skepticism from Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, who spoke for 10 minutes on a video link from Jerusalem, which he called “the united capital of Israel [acclaim: prudence],”’” the article says. Netanyahu said that it was “fortunate” that the deal “was not signed that would have left Iran as a threshold nuclear power [acclaim: prudence and justice].” He also said that he approved of a “tactic urged by some members of Congress who want to add new U.S. sanctions on Iran, saying that painful economic measures would force Iran to abandon its nuclear ambitions [acclaim: prudence]” and that the world “must use the time available to increase the pressure on Iran to dismantle its nuclear capability [acclaim: prudence].” Morello says that “preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons [is the] center of President Obama’s foreign policy [acclaim: prudence]” and that the “best way to prevent Iran from having a nuclear weapon is through a verified, negotiated agreement [acclaim: prudence].” Kerry, Morello states,

spoke at the same forum last year, right after the signing of an interim agreement that allowed formal negotiations to begin [and he] seemed to relish recalling the premonitions of critics who proclaimed that Iran was bound to cheat and that the administration was jeopardizing national security [he] argued, the world is a safer place. International inspectors have daily access to Iran’s enrichment facilities. Its stockpile of highly enriched uranium has been diluted or converted. And a plutonium reactor is effectively frozen [acclaim: prudence].

Kerry is further quoted saying
I believe, President Obama believes, the administration believes that it would be the height of irresponsibility, it would be against our own interests and those of our closest partners, to walk away from a table when and if a peaceful resolution might really be within reach [attack: prudence].

“If negotiations succeed,” he concludes, “the entire world - including Israel - will be safer for it [acclaim: justice].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals (acclaims) to knowledge of Netanyahu, wisdom in and lack of wisdom (attack) in the deal, wisdom (acclaim) in sanctions, and trust in Iran, lack of wisdom (attack) in abandoning a deal. In terms of justice, appeals were made to the safety (acclaim) in and lack of safety (attack) in the deal. In terms of fortitude, appeals (acclaims) were made to hope for a deal. This article primarily acclaimed the wisdom in the actions and views of deal stakeholders. Secondarily, the article acclaimed hope in the actions and views of deal stakeholders.

Ellen Nakashima wrote an article for the Washington Post that covered the battle between lawmakers and the Obama administration over the Iran deal (Nakashima, 2015). The title appeals to (acclaims) the wisdom of the Iran deal. The article says that during the “clash” lawmakers “indicated that they would drive headlong toward tougher legislation [acclaim: prudence].” The group of lawmakers, described as “bipartisan,” believe that the measure they want to pass will “raise pressure on Iran [acclaim: prudence].” But the Obama administration “warned that new sanctions will scuttle hopes of reaching an agreement with Iran and unravel an international coalition enforcing existing sanctions [attack: prudence].” Senator Bob Corker (R-Tenn.), chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee was quoted saying that the administration should “submit any final deal to Congress for approval [acclaim: prudence].” “Other” lawmakers are described wanting “legislation that would impose a series of escalating penalties should the talks
fail [acclaim: prudence]” and still others wanted a “nonbinding resolution stating Congress's intent to impose crippling sanctions if negotiations fail [acclaim: prudence].” Both Democrats and Republicans are described as “pushing back against the administration's appeal to give diplomacy room to work [acclaim: prudence].” Sen. Robert Menendez, the ranking Democrat on the Foreign Relations Committee was quoted saying that negotiations seem to be “moving closer to their [the Iranians’] positions on all key elements [the] more I hear from the administration in its quotes, the more it sounds like talking points that come straight out of Iran [attack: prudence].” Yet, Nakashima says, the administration “insisted that further sanctions or other pressure would only risk undermining the diplomatic effort by the world powers [attack: prudence].” Deputy Secretary of State Antony J. Blinken says that the “administration believes that additional sanctions are unnecessary at this time and “risk unraveling” the current sanctions regime [attack: prudence].” He continues that Iran is “well aware that the sword of Damocles hangs over its head [and thus] needs no new sanctions [acclaim: prudence].” Israel Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu is described being “skeptical of the talks and has taken the position that any agreement should not leave Iran as a “nuclear threshold” country, one that could move to acquire nuclear weapons quickly [attack: prudence].” Robert Einhorn, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution and a former member of the U.S. team negotiating with Iran is quoted saying that the “administration will go all out to gain the necessary 34 votes to sustain a veto [acclaim: fortitude].” The “goal” according to the author is to

reach agreement on core elements [which] would include provisions to cut off Iran's pathways to obtain fissile material for a nuclear weapon; strict requirements of international access to facilities; and confidence that if Iran broke its commitments, it
would take at least one year to produce enough fissile material for a bomb [acclaim: prudence].

Iran’s economy was described as “severely hurt by financial, banking, oil and trade sanctions, whose impact was exacerbated by a steep drop in oil prices [acclaim: prudence].” David Cohen, Treasury undersecretary for terrorism and financial intelligence said that Iran is “negotiating with its back against the wall [acclaim: prudence].” Yet, Iran is described as still “‘stiff-arming’ nuclear inspectors who are seeking access to Iranian facilities [attack: justice].” Representative Corker threatened to pull the national security waivers that Congress granted the administration in sanctions legislation, which allow the president to waive sanctions if doing so is important to national security [acclaim: fortitude].

Nakashima says that the concern there is that such a move “could set a precedent for future executive branch action and undermine the executive prerogatives to conclude agreements in national security without formal Congressional approval [attack: prudence].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals (acclaims) to the knowledge Iran deal debates, wisdom in tougher sanctions and lack thereof (attack), wisdom (acclaim) of Congressional involvement, wisdom in resisting diplomacy, Obama as unwise (attack), deal benefits (acclaim), bad concessions (attack), knowledge (acclaim) of sanction results, understanding Iran’s situation, Corker’s lack of wisdom (attack). In terms of justice, appeals were made to Iranian unfairness (attack). In terms of fortitude, appeals (acclaims) were made to Obama’s power, Corker’s power. This article primarily acclaimed (conveyed) the information the author felt necessary to facilitate understanding of the subject. It also spent an equal amount of time acclaiming the wisdom in the
actions and views of deal stakeholders. Secondarily, the article attacked the wisdom in the actions and views of deal stakeholders.

David Ignatius wrote an article entitled “A solid case for an Iran deal” (Ignatius, 2015) for the Washington Post. The title appeals to (acclaims) the wisdom of an Iran deal. Ignatius begins with a quote from Prussian King Frederick the Great who “offered this rebuke to those who refused to allow any concessions: “If you try to hold everything, you hold nothing [attack: prudence].” The author says that President Obama “might make a similar retort to Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's attack on the alleged “bad deal” the United States is contemplating with Iran [acclaim: prudence].” Netanyahu, according to Ignatius, “rejects any concessions that allow Iran to enrich uranium [and] thinks the U.S. goal of a one-year “breakout” period before Iran could build a bomb isn't enough [acclaim: prudence].” Ignatius says that “several leading administration officials” responded to Netanyahu’s stance by asking what's a better practical idea for controlling Iran's nuclear program? […] They grant that their solution isn't perfect. But they argue that it's far better for Israel and the West than any other plausible scenario [and] [t]hey see in Netanyahu's maximalist goals an air of unreality - of fantasy, even [attack: prudence].

The author describes the talks over Iran’s nuclear program as “arguably the most important diplomatic negotiations of the last several decades [acclaim: prudence].” Netanyahu was planning on taking “his case against the agreement to Congress […] in an unusual speech organized by the Republican House speaker [acclaim: prudence].” Israel's Minister of Intelligence Yuval Steinitz, Ignatius says, had “made the case against the Iran agreement in an interview [attack: prudence].” “We made it clear,” Steinitz said, “we had reservations about the
goal of the negotiations [*acclaim: prudence*].” The administration’s response to nay-sayers was that the

agreement is better than any realistic alternative [we] argue it would put the Iranian program in a box, with constraints on all the pathways to making a bomb [and] would provide strict monitoring and allow intrusive inspection of Iranian facilities [*acclaim: prudence*].

Further, “[i]f Iran seeks a covert path to building a bomb, the deal [is] the best hope of detecting it [*acclaim: fortitude*].” If the talks collapsed, the author says, then the Iranians would “resume enrichment and other currently prohibited activities [*acclaim: prudence*].” The result would then be, according to the article, that the United States and Israel “would face a stark choice over whether to attack Iranian facilities - with no guarantee that such an attack would set Tehran back more than a few years [*attack: prudence*].” The monitoring and enforcing of Iran’s research limits the article calls “key bargaining issue[s] [*acclaim: prudence*].” The United States moved to accept a certain number of centrifuges while Israel insisted on zero, Ignatius says. The length of the agreement is also on the table with the West wanting a “double-digit” number [*acclaim: prudence*]. Called a “deal-breaker” by the administration, “if Iran balks at U.S. insistence that sanctions will only be removed step by step, as Iran demonstrates that it's serious about abiding by the agreement [*acclaim: prudence*].” In the view of the United States, Iran must “earn its way back to global acceptance [*acclaim: prudence*],” according to Ignatius. Ignatius concludes by suggesting that U.S. “officials” made a “compelling case that this agreement is a start toward a safer Middle East [*acclaim: fortitude*].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals to the wisdom (acclaim) in a deal and lack thereof (attack), lack of wisdom (attack) in not conceding, the wisdom (acclaim) of Obama, wisdom of Netanyahu and lack thereof (attack),
knowledge and wisdom of talks (acclaims), wisdom in Netanyahu’s speech, lack of wisdom (attack) in attacking Iran, knowledge of deal details, wisdom in sanctions, and deal benefits. In terms of fortitude, appeals (acclaims) were made to the hope in benefits and safety of a deal. This article primarily acclaimed (conveyed) the information the author felt necessary to facilitate understanding of the subject. Secondarily, the article acclaimed the wisdom in the actions and views of deal stakeholders.

An article entitled “The Third Way on Iran” ("The third way on Iran," 2015) published in the Washington Post attempts to rebut earlier articles suggesting that there were only two choices concerning Iran. The title is an appeal to (acclaim) prudence. The article argues that “support of the administration's concessions in the nuclear talks with Iran ignore[s] the most obvious practical alternative [attack: prudence].” The argument being attacked is that if the negotiations on Iran’s nuclear program fell through then the only choices would be letting Iran get a bomb or “a stark choice over whether to attack Iranian facilities [acclaim: prudence].” Rather, the author contends there is an “option that has proved effective in the past […] the imposition and enforcement of additional and stronger sanctions, such as those provided for in the Kirk-Menendez bill [acclaim: prudence].” The author notes that “sanctions previously adopted by Congress brought Iran to the negotiating table,” and that there should be “no doubt” that Iran’s “goal is to escape their bite on its economy [acclaim: prudence].” Sanctions “helped drive Libya to back off from nuclear development years ago [acclaim: prudence],” the author continues. The article concludes by arguing that “[i]gnoiring the option of squeezing the Iranian regime with tighter sanctions [is a] major flaw in the administration's argument [attack: prudence].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals to knowledge (acclaim) of deal alternatives, Obama’s lack of wisdom (attack), understanding (acclaim) Iran’s motivations and
Matea Gold wrote an article for the *Washington Post* in which she discusses 2016 GOP presidential contenders’ views on the Iran deal (Gold, 2015). The title is an *attack* on the *wisdom* of the deal. Gold says that “disgust” with the deal “dominated” a meeting of the Republican Jewish Coalition [*attack: temperance* and *prudence*]. Sen. Ted Cruz of Texas said that he “intends “to do everything humanly possible to stop a bad Iran deal [*acclaim: fortitude*].” Former Texas governor Rick Perry “warned that “tyrants don't abide by agreements [*acclaim: prudence*].”” Indiana Governor Mike Pence, “pledged that “Israel's enemies are our enemies; Israel's cause is our cause [*acclaim: fortitude*].”” Gold says that that the organization has seen a flood of new contributors in recent months as President Obama has clashed with Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu over a proposed deal to curtail Iran's nuclear program [*acclaim: prudence*].

Chairman David Flaum said that the organization is “building up [their] war chest [*acclaim: fortitude*].” Gold says that the organization “will not take sides in the GOP primary, but 2016 contenders are hoping to win the support of the wealthy individuals who make up the group's leadership [*acclaim: prudence* and *fortitude*].” Former Florida governor Jeb Bush, Wisconsin Governor Scott Walker and Senator Marco Rubio of Florida “have strong supporters on the RJC's heavyweight board, but many on the panel remain neutral, according to people familiar with the dynamics [*acclaim: fortitude* and *prudence*].” Gold says. “Many” in the group, the article says, “worry the deal will allow Iran to continue to develop its nuclear capabilities [*attack: prudence*].” Board member Ari Fleischer says “people are scared [*attack: fortitude*].” Cruz
“warned that Israel faces an existential threat from a nuclear Iran [attack: fortitude].” Perry was quoted “denounce[ing] Obama for having “delusional thinking” when it comes to his assessment of global threats adding that “he places naive trust in the ayatollah of Iran [attack: prudence].”"

To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals to lack of wisdom (attack) in the deal, understanding (acclaim) Iran’s motivations and tactics, knowledge (acclaim) of anti-deal funding, wisdom of GOP presidential contenders, wisdom of the RJC Board, and Obama’s lack of wisdom (attack). In terms of fortitude, appeals (acclaims) were made to the power of Cruz, hope in U.S.-Israeli relations, anti-deal power, hope of GOP presidential contenders, power of the RJC Board, and lack of hope (attack) in the deal. In terms of temperance, appeals were made to impatience (attack) with the deal. This article primarily acclaimed (conveyed) information that the author felt necessary to facilitate understanding of the subject. Secondarily, the article acclaimed the wisdom in the actions and views of deal stakeholders.

Paul Kane’s article in the Washington Post “House approves bill to let it review Iran deal”(Kane, 2015), addresses Congress’ interest in having some control in the Iran negotiations. The title appeals to (acclaims) the wisdom of that control. The article reports that the House of Representatives “gave overwhelming approval […] to create a Congressional review of the potential nuclear power deal with Iran, sending the bill to the White House for President Obama's signature [acclaim: prudence].” The vote was 400-25 and concluded months of tense talks between Congressional leaders and administration officials over what degree of oversight Congress would have if Obama finalizes a deal with Iranian leaders to ensure their nuclear program won't shift into military use [acclaim: prudence], Kane says.
Obama, the article says, “agreed to the slightly modified version drafted by Sen. Bob Corker (R-Tenn.), chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, after three months of negotiations led a large number of Democrats to support the plan [acclaim: prudence].” Kane says that “Republicans and Democrats in both the House and the Senate sent a strong message that the American people - through their elected representatives - must have a voice on any final nuclear deal with Iran [acclaim: prudence].” The bill, according to the article, “grants Congress 30 days to review the nuclear deal [acclaim: prudence].” The president would be able to “waive sanctions against Tehran that were imposed by the executive branch but must leave in place sanctions that Congress previously drafted [acclaim: prudence].” “If the House and the Senate disapprove of the Iran deal, including overcoming a possible presidential veto, then Obama must leave in place those Congressionally mandated sanctions [acclaim: prudence],” the article says. “Any other outcome [acclaim: prudence]” gives Obama a free hand. Nineteen Republicans voted against the bill because their leadership forbade amendments and put it on a fast-track, according to Kane. Six Democrats who want Obama unhindered also opposed the bill. Washington Representative Adam Smith, the ranking Democrat on the House Armed Services Committee said that the bill “will give Congress the opportunity to review and play an active role in evaluating any agreement with Iran [acclaim: prudence and justice].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals (acclams) to the wisdom of Congressional involvement and details thereof, deal benefits, Corker’s wisdom, and the knowledge of Obama’s abilities. In terms of justice, appeals (acclams) were made to the fairness of Congressional involvement. This article primarily acclaimed the wisdom in the actions and views of deal stakeholders. It also acclaimed (conveyed) the information the author felt necessary to facilitate understanding of the subject.
An article in the *Washington Post* reported that some world leaders no longer respected U.S. leadership in the middle-east after the deal ("Bahrain's rulers now flout the U.S. openly," 2015). The title is an *acclaim* of the *wisdom* of seeing U.S. leadership in this way. The article contends that “[g]overnments across the Middle East perceive that President Obama has subordinated much of U.S. policy in the region to the goal of completing a nuclear bargain with Iran [*acclaim: prudence*].” “Policies that might disturb Tehran,” the author says, “have been put on hold [*acclaim: prudence*].” However, “traditional U.S. allies that are skeptical of the deal have been promised stepped-up U.S. military assistance [*acclaim: fortitude*],” the article says. Bahrain is noted as “particular[ly] cynical [*acclaim: prudence*].” The ruling al-Khalifa family, the article says, “appears to have concluded that it can afford to flout the Obama administration openly [*acclaim: prudence*].” The family “expelled the visiting State Department assistant secretary for human rights after he met with opposition members [*acclaim: justice*].” King Hamad bin Isa al-Khalifa was said to have attended a horse show in England rather than the summit Mr. Obama held to sell the Iran deal to Persian Gulf leaders [while] still counting on a handsome payoff: U.S. tolerance for the imprisonment of the country's foremost opposition leader, and more military aid to boot [*acclaim: justice*].

“In its zeal to complete the Iran deal, the administration seems to be setting aside the president's [previous] *wisdom* [*attack: prudence*].” To summarize: in terms of *prudence*, this article made appeals (acclaims) to the *knowledge* of foreign views of the U.S., *knowledge* of Obama’s motivations and tactics, and Obama’s lack of *wisdom* (attack). In terms of *justice*, appeals (acclaims) were made to Bahrain’s *fairness*, and the *fairness* of the treatment of Bahrain. In terms of *fortitude*, appeals (acclaims) were made to U.S. ally *safety*. This article primarily
acclaimed the information that the author felt necessary to facilitate understanding. Secondarily, the article attacked the fairness in the actions and views of deal stakeholders.

Karen Tumulty’s article “Clinton making a sales pitch for the agreement” (Tumulty & Kane, 2015) showcases Hilary Clinton’s efforts to support the Iran deal. The title acclaims the wisdom of the deal. Clinton’s support for the deal, Tumulty says, stands in contrast to all the GOP presidential candidates for the 2016 presidential election [acclaim: fortitude]. The article argues that this scenario “offers further evidence that foreign policy could loom as a crucial issue in the election [acclaim: prudence].” “Clinton’s endorsement underscores the degree to which her political fortunes have been joined with Obama's legacy [acclaim: prudence],” Tumulty says. The author calls Clinton’s endorsement “ironic” considering “how the two tangled over Iran during the 2008 race for the Democratic nomination, with Clinton dismissing Obama's talk of overtures to Iran as “irresponsible and, frankly, naïve [attack: prudence].”” According to the article, Clinton even takes “credit […] for “having been part of building the coalition that brought us to the point of this agreement [acclaim: prudence].”” The article quotes Clinton saying that the key questions now are the degree to which the agreed-upon terms are enforced and whether Iran continues its “bad behavior” in other areas, including sponsoring terrorism, undermining other governments in the Middle East, human rights violations and threatening Israel [acclaim: prudence].

Whereas the Republican candidates “offered near-apocalyptic assessments of the agreement [attack: prudence],” Tumulty says. Senator Ted Cruz (R-Tex.) is quoted calling the deal a “fundamental betrayal of the security of the United States and of our closest allies [attack: justice].” Senator Lindsey O. Graham (R-S.C.) “told MSNBC that it ensures “that the Arabs will
go nuclear” and is “a death-over-time sentence to Israel if they don't push back.” Former Florida governor Jeb Bush is quoted saying that the deal “paves Iran's path to a bomb.” Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Bob Corker (Tenn.), however, said “I want to read the agreement in detail and fully understand it but I begin from a place of deep skepticism that the deal actually meets the goal of preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon.” Tumulty says that “reservations” were “not confined to Republicans.” Senator Robert Menendez (D-N.J.), a Democrat on the Foreign Relations Committee expressed concern that “the deal ultimately legitimizes Iran as a threshold-nuclear state [and] the red lines we drew have turned into green lights [and] that Iran will be required only to limit rather than eliminate its nuclear program.” “If Clinton were elected,” the article continues, “she would have to implement the deal, which is one reason her assessment carries such weight with her fellow Democrats.” Representative Steve Israel (D-N.Y.) says that he “remains skeptical” of the Iran deal.” Tumulty also quotes “polls” which show that majorities or pluralities of Americans support the broad outlines of a deal with Iran that would lift economic sanctions in exchange for restrictions on or inspections of its nuclear program [but they] also indicate that most do not trust Iran to abide by the terms of an agreement.

Duke University professor Peter D. Feaver is quoted positing that “as debate over the deal goes forward, the political advantage is likely to rest on whichever side frames the choice,” [and] Obama “will prevail if Americans consider the Iran deal an alternative to further military conflict in the region.” Feaver went on to say that Republicans “could win the argument if they are convinced that tougher negotiations could have
produced a better deal [acclaim: prudence].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals (acclaims) to the knowledge of who’s pro-deal, understanding foreign policy’s election influence, understanding Clinton and Obama’s connection, Obama’s lack of wisdom (attack), Clinton’s wisdom (acclaim), deal benefits, the deal as wise and unwise (attack), knowledge (acclaim) of deal opposition, bad concessions (attack), and the knowledge (acclaim) of the U.S. politics surrounding a deal. In terms of justice, appeals were made to the deal as unsafe (attack), and distrust (attack) of Iran. In terms of fortitude, appeals were made to Clinton’s power (acclaim), and the lack of hope (attack) in the deal. This article primarily acclaimed (conveyed) the information the author felt necessary to facilitate understanding of the subject. Secondarily, the article acclaimed the wisdom in the actions and views of deal stakeholders.

Karoun Demirjian wrote an article which focused on a top Democrat’s opposition to the Iran deal (Demirjian, 2015a). The title appeals to (acclaims) the wisdom of Schumer’s decision. Senator Charles E. Schumer's announcement that he would oppose the Iran deal, the author says, brings up the question as to whether or not it will “hurt President Obama or Schumer more, the former in his quest to sell the deal and the latter in his bid to become the highest-ranking Senate Democrat [acclaim: prudence].” Representative Eliot Engel, D-N.Y. also opposed the deal, the author says. These oppositions “could spell trouble for a deal that is already challenging to sell to a skeptical Congress, even among members of Obama's own party [attack: fortitude],” says the author.

If the Iran deal falls apart,” the author says it “would spark a period of uncertainty, as the world observes how an Iran freed of international sanctions but unfettered by the confines of a broken nuclear deal behaves on the world stage [attack: fortitude].
In addition, “how, in such circumstances, the United States might respond to perceptions that Iran is nearing nuclear weapons’ readiness [acclaim: prudence]” the article questions. The “trend in the Senate” according to the author, “has been Democrats declaring their support for the deal [acclaim: fortitude].” Senators have been

shuttled through a series of high-level briefings, both in public and behind closed doors, to examine the deal, from security concerns to inspections regimes, and collect information on everything from the nuclear fuel cycle to the negotiating process [acclaim: prudence].

The article says that Senator Ben Cardin, D-Md

could arguably sway an even greater flock than Schumer once he makes a decision.

[He’s] not said when he will declare himself. But he has been pushing for the administration to provide the text of side agreements between the International Atomic Energy Agency and Iran to Congress. But those agreements do not appear to be in the offing [attack: fortitude and prudence].

White House “allies” are said to have “pounced on Schumer immediately, questioning his fitness for leading the Democrats if he was so willing to blatantly cross Obama on a topic of such import [attack: prudence].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals to the wisdom (acclaim) of Schumer and lack thereof (attack), knowledge (acclaim) of the politics surrounding the deal, knowledge of U.S. action sans a deal, and the lack of knowledge (attack) in “side” deals. In terms of fortitude, appeals were made to the lack of hope (attack) and the hope (acclaim) in passing a deal, the lack of hope (attack) in an unchecked Iran’s behavior, and the lack of hope (attack) in more information on “side” deals. This article primarily acclaimed
(conveyed) the information the author felt necessary to facilitate understanding of the subject. Secondarily, the article acclaimed the wisdom in the actions and views of deal stakeholders.

The last article from the *Washington Post* covers Obama’s apparent victory in getting the Iran deal through Congress (Demirjian, 2015b). The title is an appeal to *(acclaims)* the strength *(fortitude)* of the Obama administration. The article begins by explaining that Senate Democrats “blocked a Republican effort to scuttle the Iran nuclear deal, delivering the Obama administration a long-awaited, major foreign policy victory *(acclaim: fortitude)*.” “Republicans in both chambers,” the author says are, “dead set on taking further shots to eviscerate the agreement, and potentially even drag it to court to block its implementation *(acclaim: prudence)*.” The vote by the senate “virtually assures that the deal will be implemented, at least in the short term *(acclaim: fortitude)*,” according to the article. The author calls a “successful filibuster of the resolution of disapproval” the reason why “Obama won't have to rely on his veto pen to preserve a major piece of his foreign policy agenda *(acclaim: fortitude)*.” Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) said

[i]f we want to do anything further about this Iranian regime bring me a bill with enough co-sponsors to override a presidential veto … Otherwise, the American people will give us their judgment about the appropriateness of this measure a year from November *(acclaim: prudence)*.

Speaker John A. Boehner (R-Ohio) said Republicans “will “use every tool at our disposal to stop, slow and delay this agreement from being fully implemented,” including suing Obama to keep him from carrying out the deal *(acclaim: fortitude)*.” Republicans and some Democrats were “asking to see two confidential side agreements, struck between Iran and the International Atomic Energy Agency *(acclaim: justice)*,” says the article. But the administration “argues it
can't produce them because it has never had the confidential documents [acclaim: prudence].” Representative Raúl R. Labrador (R-Idaho) was quoted saying that he would “like to see the Senate actually go nuclear on this [acclaim: prudence].” Senator Ted Cruz (R-Tex.) “sent House Republican leaders a letter making the same argument as House conservatives about Congress not having to abide by the deal because of lawmakers not being privy to side agreements [acclaim: fortitude],” the article says. But Senator Bob Corker (R-Tenn.) stated that “there isn't much interest among Senate Republicans in taking steps to formally assert that Obama is in violation of his obligations under the law [attack: prudence].” Senate Minority Leader Harry M. Reid (D-Nev.) argued that it was “time we move on to something else [the] matter is over [acclaim: prudence].” To summarize: in terms of prudence, this article made appeals to the lack of wisdom (attack) and the wisdom (acclaim) of those anti-deal and their tactics, wisdom of Obama, and the wisdom of those pro-deal and their tactics. In terms of justice, appeals (acclams) were made to the fairness in full-disclosure of deal information. In terms of fortitude, appeals (acclams) were made to the power of Obama, hope in deal implementation, and the power of those anti-deal. This article primarily acclaimed the wisdom and power in the actions and views of deal stakeholders.

Conclusion

To understand the first part of the research question “what kind of values can be determined from the function of rhetoric,” this chapter presented the results of an analysis of rhetoric from five sources about the Iran nuclear deal: Al Jazeera, British Broadcasting Corporation, USA Today, New York Times, and Washington Post. It began with an explanation of the limitations of the data collected due to search constraints as determined and applied which were explained in the methods section. Then voice was explained due to its effect on functional
theory and value determination. The note on voice will resurface in the next chapter which will explain its role in using functional theory and values together. The general quantitative outcomes were also explained in terms of the relationship between functional theory and values. The themes derived from analysis were explained. Lastly, some of the findings from each source were given in chronological order including quantitative relationships between functional theory and values as well as theme associations.

As was shown, prudence, justice, fortitude, and temperance were appealed to directly in some instances. It was also shown that these virtues were referenced via thematic language. In reference to our subject, the Iran Deal, the most referenced virtue, whether it be an acclaim or an attack, was prudence. Within the virtue of prudence, the most referenced theme was understanding (factual knowledge plus some interpretation) followed closely by wisdom (factual knowledge, interpretation, and advocacy). The next most referenced virtue was justice. Within justice the most referenced theme was fairness (reciprocity, equality) which was followed by trust (particularly as couched in justice). Although the references were nominal relatively speaking compared to prudence and justice, fortitude was the next most referenced virtue particularly in terms of power (courage, strength) but also in terms of hope (wishing) and faith (evidence for things yet to be seen). Lastly, there were some references to temperance in terms of patience, whether it be directed at a process, an outcome, an individual, or a group. More of these kinds of analyses should be done by multiple researchers to determine if such findings are unique.

This chapter presents the results of an analysis that answers the first part of the research question, namely “what kind of values can be determined from the function of rhetoric?” The next chapter will answer the second part of the research question: “how does determining value
extend the power of functional theory?" It will begin with explaining how value determination extends functional theory and then move to describe the complexity added by value claims. The chapter concludes with a presentation of other pertinent findings and suggestions for future research.
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CHAPTER V. CONCLUSION

Introduction

This overall study began its first chapter by explaining the “deal” between the governments of the United States and Iran, along with a very brief history of the relationship between these two parties to provide a context for the “deal.” Then, the work of various scholars was introduced in order to help establish the necessary link between rhetoric and value-claims. Functional theory was explained as the lens by which the rhetorical-value claims pertaining to the “deal” would be analyzed.

Chapter two began with an explanation of functional theory and its six axioms of classification which describe contextual concerns when analyzing political speech and dialogue. Although these axioms were not entirely abandoned, challengers of functional theory have suggested that additions to it are necessary to compensate for essential cultural characteristics that they claim the theory cannot capture. But cultures vary, so, a foray into the nature of rhetorical claims and their relationship with values was considered. Next, a contemporary political object, the nuclear Deal between Iran and the United States as negotiated by the Obama administration, was chosen to investigate for its expressions of value. The chapter then delves into the contextual history surrounding the Deal. The chapter ends with examples of other investigations into the language of the Deal and introduces the research question for the overall study.

Chapter three discussed the method of qualitative content analysis as it has been used in many other scholarly pursuits of knowledge across fields where quantitative methods were deemed to be insufficient. These fields include both the humanities and the sciences. A short history of the development of qualitative content analysis as a tool for capturing what quantitative methods were missing was also covered. Then an explanation of how qualitative
content analysis would be used followed by objects of investigation upon which it would be used was presented.

Chapter four, to answer the first part of the research question: “what kind of values can be determined from the function of rhetoric,” presented the results of an analysis of rhetoric from five sources about the Iran nuclear deal: Al Jazeera, British Broadcasting Corporation, USA Today, New York Times, and Washington Post. It began with an explanation of the limitations of the data collected due to search constraints as determined and applied which were explained in the methods chapter. Then voice was explained due to its effect on functional theory and value determination. The general quantitative outcomes were also explained in terms of the relationship between functional theory and values. The themes derived from analysis were then explained. The chapter ends by providing some of the findings from each source which were given in chronological order including quantitative relationships between functional theory and values as well as theme associations.

This chapter of this overall study will answer the second part of the research question: “how does determining value build on functional theory?” First, an explanation of how determining value as warrant for functional theory categories increases the depth of the analysis by increasing the richness of questions asked about a text. This includes uncovering the value-hierarchy to which texts appeal and determining the voice-perspective to help expose which value takes contextual primacy where multiple values may be present. Secondly, a description of how the inclusion of value claims along with functional theory provides for an expansion of analysis by increasing the amount of text that can be included in the investigation. This includes a concretizing of the meaning(s) of phronesis (prudence) which has tended to elude solid definition. In turn, this allows for the inclusion of all utterances in a text which serves to allow
for a more complete contextual purview, a ‘contextual semiomosaic,’ so to speak. Since all utterances can now be analyzed, the functional theory categories acclaim, attack, and defense can be expanded freeing them from only being used on campaign messages. Next, the combination of voice-perspective, value-hierarchy, and category expansion is explained in terms of potential miscommunication. Thirdly, the six axioms will be revisited to reveal what remained unchanged and what was modified in this overall study and its implications for future research. This will include the predictive capability that was attributed to functional theory by Benoit. Lastly, a description of the term ‘contextual semiomosaic’ and its application in qualitative contextual analysis will conclude this chapter.

**Value Determination**

Benoit and other scholars who have used functional theory do not attempt to examine every characteristic of verbal rhetoric but rather only those characteristics which most likely seem to fit within their predetermined categories. Until now, no research has been done on the function of value statements or how the categories devised by scholars who use functional theory might be more fundamentally represented by value categories. This study posited that such research may help to transcend political boundaries by reorienting political rhetoric to statements about values which may be easier with which to identify since the cardinal value categories are arguably human universals. Even where there is sufficient doubt about which values to use for analysis, other values could potentially be used in place of prudence, justice, fortitude, and temperance given adequate warrant.

---

5 This term will be explained later in the chapter.
Including value determination as part of functional theory analysis deepens the analysis in several ways. Whereas functional theory axioms stop at acclaim, attack, or defense, which include the ‘who’ (whose voice is represented in the statement), ‘what’ (what is the direct subject), and ‘to whom’ (to whom is the message directed); the addition of value to the analysis forces one to ask ‘why?’ For example, if using functional theory, one determines a statement to be an attack and then asks ‘why?’ one can determine from the context the motivating value behind the functional theory category. Arguably, functional theory analysis already contains a latent determination of value as part of its process. Thus, value analysis added to functional theory analysis merely makes manifest what has already taken place in the latter. The idea of latent values existing in argumentation was addressed previously by Chaim Perelman and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca wherein they stated that “[v]alues enter into every argument,” (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1969). These scholars also differentiate between values which exist as “unique entities” and those which “transcend particular circumstances.” Further analyses of combining functional theory and values are needed in order to delve into this differentiation. However, since the source of these values, namely, human beings and their motivation (needs, wants, desires), tend to stay consistent one could arguably assume that the cardinal virtues (prudence, justice, fortitude, temperance) would remain fixed as categories whereas the themes derived from them might shift in focus from context to context.

It was also noted that Malcolm Sillars and Patricia Ganer argued that values are not merely to be reduced to a type of claim (such as acclaim, attack, defense) but that values are “strategically significant” in argumentation (Sillars & Ganer, 1982). Therefore, any effort to understand communication should involve discernment of values in use. Further, to the idea that the cardinal virtues might remain as fixed categories, Edward Inch and Barbara Warnick were
quoted saying, this is because argumentation “reveals certain standard or stock issues” (Inch & Warnick, 1998). As stated previously, rhetorical argument always involves values that are standard or part of a hierarchical relationship. Hence, arguments reference and make appeals to a norm. Building upon Stephen Toulmin, arguments need to be defined according to their “argument field” which helps to establish the “perspective hierarchy.” In other words, value determination helps to define the argument field and thus the perspective hierarchy inasmuch as human beings are the object of values. The “perspective hierarchy” may in and of itself be the point of contention for the argument. In other words, in terms of values, the predominant question might be ‘what should be the norm in this case?’ As analysis has shown, the functional theory categories of acclaims, attacks, and defenses are merely the results of assuming a norm and acclaiming it, attacking its absence, or defending its presence. However, as the context or field changes so might the focus, hence, field-dependent criteria or value determination is needed in order to facilitate evaluation. Toulmin also notes that application of policies resulting from the establishment of value hierarchies can also be a source of contention. Even in such a case a value is being “normalized” so to speak. The abstract concept of ‘prudence’ for example, might be the goal for the objects involved namely, human beings, but just how to apply or achieve ‘prudence’ is where the contention lay. This is where acclaims, attacks, and defenses concerning values come into play as analysis shows.

Value determination also forces a more contextual consideration in terms of voice and underlying message. Thus, the overall narrative becomes more important in terms of analysis when considering values.
Value Claims

As mentioned in the last chapter, voice can either be the author themselves or the voice of the person being quoted. Even in situations where the text in question is mainly quoted material, the predominant voice could be that of the author depending upon contextual considerations. Particularly where there are potentially multiple values underlying the statement(s) in question, the predominant voice may focus on all or any number of the underlying values. For example, if one determines using functional theory, that a statement is an attack which includes a direct or indirect implication of lying, the underlying values may include a primary attack on justice (lying is not fair), a secondary attack on prudence (lying is not wise), and a tertiary attack on temperance (the lying may be due to impatience). The predominant voice may choose to focus contextually on any one of these underlying values to support the overall message that they want to convey. In some instances, the author and the person being quoted may be focusing on the same values in their acclaim, attack, or defense. In other instances, they may not. In some instances, the author may choose to share a quote from someone who is clearly attacking someone else, for example, but contextually speaking, the quote is being included in the piece merely as a conveyance of knowledge about what the person being quoted thinks or to show that they made that particular statement. This is a situation where the predominant voice is the author’s and the underlying value to which the voice appeals is prudence, wherein the author feels/thinks it best (prudent) that their reader(s) have the knowledge that the person being quoted made the statement and/or thinks that way. In other words, even though the person being quoted is making an attack, the attack is not the focus in the overall piece in which it is quoted. Rather, the author(s) of the overall piece are recategorizing the quote to fit the narrative which they are espousing. In other situations, statements that were not previously categorizable by functional
theory, such as factual statements by the author, or factual quotes can now be included when considering value.

Functional theory with the addition of values in analysis is broadened and expanded in several ways. Statements previously unable to be categorized by functional theory axioms can now be included in the overall analysis which enables a more complete picture of the voice/message of the piece. Factual statements made by the author or quoted by the author were not originally included as acclaims, attacks, or defenses but may have been more for the purpose of definitions upon which functional theory axioms depended for acclaim, attacks, and defenses. With the addition of values in analysis one can now at the very least categorize factual statements as acclaims to prudence wherein the predominant voice feels/thinks it best (prudent) for their reader/listener to have the knowledge/understanding contained in the factual statement in order to better understand the message being conveyed.

Functional theory does not examine every line or utterance but rather only those that fit the category of acclaim, attack or defense as determined by the prime voice. Allowing for a shift in voice from those quoted to author allows inclusion of statements that would normally not be included for analysis in functional theory alone. The contention of this study is that all claims have value content. Therefore, every line or utterance is value-laden. For example, prudence or ‘phronesis’ as a value category has a complex meaning which is still debated. It is considered the ‘mother of all virtues’ by many scholars. Its relative lack of specific definition can make it more difficult to use from situation to situation, including contextual analysis. This study

---

6 For an interpretation of Aristotle’s treatment of prudence in Nicomachean Ethics, see: Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologiae II-II, 47, 2.
included the phronetic levels (or themes of prudence) knowledge, understanding, and wisdom. Statements containing what might be construed as only factual information would not be included in functional theory analysis. However, shifting the prime voice to the author of the piece (where necessary) one can determine that the author thought it wise (or prudent) to include that information in order to facilitate meaning or provide context to the reader or listener. In order to make ‘prudence’ more applicable and definable, this study calls such communication knowledge and includes it as part of value analysis. Although these designations are highly dependent on context, an example of a knowledge statement would be “[e]nriched uranium is used to make nuclear weapons.” This example contains factual information but seems to lack context by itself. Within a larger piece these types of statements appear to have no other function contextually speaking other than to provide potential knowledge in order to understand the larger message in the piece and make a wise choice concerning it. One might imagine the author thinking “my readers should know these facts.” Dependent upon knowledge, statements dubbed understanding by this study contain some factual information plus some interpretive or contextual content such as might be found in a paraphrased quote. An example of a statement of understanding might be “Iranians have been enriching uranium, which has drawn international attention.” This example contains both factual information plus some contextual information. One might imagine the author thinking “my readers should understand this connection or concept.” Lastly, wisdom statements are dependent on both knowledge (facts) and understanding (context) but also include advocacy (or opposition) by the prime voice. An example of a wisdom statement might be “the rest of the world should be concerned about Iranian uranium enrichment.” This example clearly contains advocacy by the author who is recommending a course of action or thought. One might imagine the author thinking “my readers should think/act
this way.” Depending upon the prime voice, statements which at first glance appear to be advocating some thought or action may actually not be functioning that way in the context of the piece. Rather, the author may include a quotation from someone wherein the person making the statement is advocating for something but the author couches the quote in language conveying that they (the author) are either neutral on the subject or hold a contrary opinion but the author thinks it prudent that their readers understand that the quote represents what that particular person or group thinks. An example might be “Netanyahu argues that ‘the Iranians can’t be trusted.’ Yet the IAEA inspectors have found no evidence of cheating.” This example contains factual information, context, and advocacy (or rather ‘opposition’ in this case). When analyzing a statement(s) like this, at first glance one might categorize it as an attack on prudence or justice. But considering the overall message of the piece, one might classify both these statements under an acclaim to ‘prudence’ wherein the author is attempting to convey the information to promote understanding of the situation. One might think that perhaps this is an example of a defense. But closer inspection shows that these statements are not pitted one against the other but rather they are juxtaposed to show potentially contrary information. Thus, they function as an acclaim to understanding.

Further, Benoit originally defined an ‘acclaim’ in functional theory as “self-praise” or praise of a candidate or their views or policies. This overall study has expanded ‘acclaims’ to include any positive aspects of any choice including the choice to convey information which may seem to serve no other function or be trivial in nature or the choice to be silent (the concept of silence as a rhetorical choice was not covered in this study but deserves mention here). Similarly, ‘attacks’ as defined by Benoit in functional theory, tend to be constrained to candidates or their views or policies. But this overall study expands ‘attacks’ to include negative aspects of any
choice. Lastly, ‘defenses’ as defined by Benoit are responses to ‘attacks’ and meant to refute some purported deficiency in a candidate or their policies in an attempt to reduce the potential costs of an attack. However, ‘defenses’ as used in this study can be applied as a category to anything that is being defended from an attack on its virtue characteristics. A defense is really just a special type of acclamation wherein the defender is merely acclaiming a value which was under attack. A defense is merely an acclamation that occurs in time after an attack.

With all of these categories, recognizing an appeal as being multi-level can help better understand potential miscommunication involving functional theory categories. An general acclaim could be made about the prudent aspect of something, for example, a policy is wise because of the benefits it will bear; whereas another person might attack the same policy but concerning an aspect of justice about it, for example, the policy is unfair to another particular group; and lastly, another person could defend the policy but in reference to fortitude, for example, one might argue that others should have faith in the policy because of those who are proposing it. The latter, of course, is not a true defense in the sense that a true defense would attempt to refute the original attack. So, in that sense it is a faux-defense but rhetorically speaking, looking like a defense might be as important as actually being a defense. The point is, determining values to which an acclaim, attack, or defense appeal can help uncover these ambiguities and bring clarity to communication in this regard. The analysis in this overall study does this.

Benoit argued that ‘acclaims,’ ‘attacks,’ and ‘defenses’ function “as an informal variant of cost-benefit analysis: acclaims increase benefits, attacks increase an opponent’s costs, and defenses reduce a candidate’s alleged costs,” (Benoit & Henson, 2009). With the addition of the determination of value to these functions one can determine what ‘benefit’ is being acclaimed,
what ‘cost’ an attack might have, and what ‘costs’ are being reduced but all in terms of values. Benoit mentions that its not necessary to think that people are weighing these things mathematically in their heads. But rather, as was stated earlier, what is important is to realize the persuasive power of the rhetoric involved. If a reader/listener identifies with an acclaim then the perceived value involved will increase the potential for it to be a motivating factor. Similarly, if a reader/listener identifies with a value being attacked, that too might become a motivating factor regarding the choice to be made. If a reader/listener perceives a defense to be effective then the apparent value-cost is reduced. Further studies that could include polling data or surveys to determine value standards before and after reading or listening to a speech that purports to address those values, would help to measure this claim.

Benoit also differentiated between policy and character in his work and included further subdivisions of these concepts. This differentiation was preserved in this overall study in terms of the objects of the values in question, but it was not emphasized in any way to make any additional points. Further analyses in other subjects and fields could be done to determine if any new characteristics might evolve from such considerations, particularly in regards to the balancing, maintenance, or reaching of a value-standard.

In terms of functional theory’s application across media types and cultures, the addition of values in analysis maintains and enhances this characteristic. If indeed values are human universals then they can be used for analysis across cultures. In this study, Aristotle’s cardinal virtues were used: prudence, justice, fortitude, temperance. There is evidence to suggest that these are the fundamental universal values from which all other values originate. However, this is not to say that this approach requires the use of these values in order to be successful. Functional theory with value analysis could focus on sub-values or other values deemed more
fitting. Benoit also argued that functional theory with its six axioms, allowed a researcher to make predictions about use of campaign rhetoric. Adding values to the axioms of functional theory analysis can positively impact future research.

Other Findings and Future Research

Previously in this study, the six axioms of functional theory were listed and explained. It was also described as to how they might be modified, if necessary, to account for values in analysis. At this point these axioms will be revisited to retrospectively audit their application in this study and for future research.

Building upon Benoit’s first axiom that “voting is a comparative act,” this idea was expanded to ‘argumentation is a comparative act which is value laden.’ It was found that the comparison that is made in each statement is the arguer’s perception of reality as compared to a value-standard. If the arguer’s perception of reality matched that of the value-standard then it was acclaimed. If the arguer’s perception of reality did not match that of the value-standard then it was attacked. If an arguer attacked a person or concept and that attack was perceived as unwarranted (or unwanted) then a defense was made as an attempt to correct reality perception. The result is an uncovering of an appeal to a value or values in each line or utterance as designated by the examples in the analysis section of this overall study.

The second axiom in functional theory posits that candidates must differentiate themselves one from another. Building upon this axiom in terms of values, one could say that arguers must differentiate themselves one from another. During the course of a discussion or argument, discussants go through a process of clarifying and differentiating their positions both to themselves and one another. It was found that this held true with proponents and opponents of
the Iran deal as well. Those who were for the deal and those against made their reasons known via the press and thus tried to differentiate themselves from each other. However, using values along with functional theory categories in analysis revealed that stakeholders in the Iran deal were all referencing a value-standard in their arguments. In some cases, their arguments focused on different levels of meaning on the same subject. For example, a proponent might acclaim that the deal provides ‘benefit-X’ and is therefore a wise choice but an opponent might attack the deal as unfair in ‘sense-Y.’ Further, an opponent might attack the deal because it seems to violate ‘right-X’ while a proponent acclaims the deal because it supports ‘right-Y.’ While these are certainly expressions of differentiation they also suggest a certain amount of miscommunication. This scenario becomes even more clouded when a third voice, the journalist, gets involved and perhaps introduces and third level of meaning (‘sense-Z’ or ‘right-Z,’ for example) and uses that to further acclaim, attack, or defend. More research is needed to explore such differentiations in regards to value-standard focus and the miscommunication involved in order to suggest possible remedies if they can be had.

Along those lines, Benoit differentiates between Democrats and Republicans in his research as those are the predominant parties vying with one another for power. He argues that Republicans and Democrats tend to advocate in certain, predictable ways. More investigation is needed to determine if this holds true when values are considered as well. The Iran deal ended up passing along party lines but it certainly started out as very much a mixed bag in terms of party opposition. More research is needed to add to the body of knowledge about which values are important to whom and in what ways before such predictions can be made with any confidence.

Further, the work of functional theorists has included differentiation between candidates and journalists and found that the latter tend to be more negative than the former. Although this
study included pieces penned by politicians and other actors involved in the Deal, there was no attempt to distinguish the messages of journalists with that of politicians or journalists with other actors involved with the Iran deal. Rather, each piece was treated as an integrated whole with potentially more than one voice. However, the author arguably remains the gatekeeper of the overall message and therefore the overall predominant voice.

Benoit’s third axiom, that “political campaign messages are important vehicles for distinguishing between candidates,” retains its essential meaning in terms of distinguishing between proponents and opponents of non-political issues. Building upon the third axiom, it can be restated, “value-laden arguments are important vehicles for distinguishing between value-hierarchies and their adherents.” For the purposes of this overall study, axiom three was refocused to include the language of news media personalities and editorialists. As stated previously, news organizations enact a *gate-keeping* function in terms of deciding what information and when to pass that information along to stakeholders in an attempt to shape opinion and thus policy about the Deal. News media personalities and editorialists also have the opportunity to comment and evaluate any messages or messengers of the Deal to which they have access. Also, news media personalities can shape the information that is disseminated merely by the questions that they ask and the way that they ask them. Thus, they can decide what information is circulated by choosing the framework of issues that they will allow to be discussed for the public to see. Therefore, it was decided that journalists’ language is pertinent.

---

As specified before, language of authors as well as other voices in a piece were analyzed individually but considered in total as far as appeals to values were concerned. Discussion on the previous axiom included the idea of treatment of journalists’ messages in contrast with those of stakeholders as something needed in future research.

Also, as demonstrated in this study, functional theory need not be applied only in the realm of political campaigns and political communication. Functional theory can be applied in any communicative situation. This is especially possible with the addition of knowledge, understanding, and wisdom to the levels of phronesis (prudence). With these levels of meaning one can analyze communication that may be considered more factually based (perhaps lacking in emotive language or what might be considered traditional rhetorical content) to see if there are underlying values. Still, this kind of analysis would seem to require language other than numeric communication. It would seem that if one were looking at a data sheet which contained only numeric information that one would need to seek out supplemental language to facilitate any kind of attempt at analysis. But perhaps such an endeavor belongs to the realm of visual rhetoric insofar as to how the author might choose to present such information. Other studies could investigate the possibility that value analysis could be applied in such instances. Traditional visual rhetoric gleaned from pictures may be more informative in that regard.

The fourth axiom in functional theory involves establishing preferability among choices through acclaiming oneself, attacking the other choices, and defending against attacks from those who disagree with one’s choice. This has cross-subject operability and the inclusion of values with functional theory categories merely refocuses the object of choice to the values themselves rather than just the immediate subject of the discussion. However, as discussed before, focusing on different levels of meaning, consciously or not, can affect perception of acclaims, attacks, and
defenses. One need only to emphasize acclamations (presence of a virtue) to the exclusion of attacks (lack of a virtue). In other words, deception by omission can be employed. In example, an opponent can emphasize the unfairness of ‘X’ (attack) but the proponent emphasizes the benefits of ‘X’ (acclaim) and another proponent defends against the unfairness of ‘X’ by evidencing the benefits of ‘X.’ This is arguably the subtest of argument misrepresentation otherwise known as a ‘strawman’ fallacy. As part of that type of emphasis and omission, defense can include a downplaying of potential issues or faults that might be attached to the person, policy, or concept by defending on a different level of meaning. To truly defend against an attack ‘X’ one must show ‘not-X’ (the fairness of ‘X’) not just ‘non-X’ (the benefits of ‘X’) unless one can show how the acclaim involved in ‘non-X’ (benefits) outweighs the attack on ‘X’ (unfairness). Thus, if these rhetorical moves are being made consciously, a value standard is being referenced and not only a value standard but a hierarchy of values. Included in this axiom, Benoit cites his own research that suggests that stakeholders prefer attacks on policy rather than attacks on character. There were some specific references in the data in this overall study that suggested that stakeholders preferred that representatives address policy over character but more research is needed, perhaps in terms of polling and/or survey data from readers and listeners to determine which values are most important to them in regards to the Iran Deal or any other concept under scrutiny. Such data could then be compared and contrasted with functional theory and value analysis on the arguments being made on both sides.

---

8 See: Israeli Press, “Israel's Hebrew press focuses on Obama defence of Iran nuclear deal,” BBC, 2015
Concerning preferability among choices, Benoit posited that functional theory allowed a researcher to make certain predictions concerning acclaims, attacks, and defenses. According to functional theory, acclaims have no drawbacks, attacks potentially have one, and defenses have potentially three. Thus, he claims, that candidates will use acclaims more frequently than attacks and attacks more frequently than defenses. Although Benoit’s work focused on political campaigns and rhetoric this study showed that these predictions hold true for non-political communication as well. More studies are needed using the combination of functional theory and values to test this. However, for the most part this prediction holds true for this overall study as well. All of the news sources studied, except for Al Jazeera, contained more acclaims than attacks and more attacks than defenses. Al Jazeera contained more attacks than acclaims and more acclaims than defenses. This phenomenon needs more investigation in an attempt to determine its causes and characteristics.

The fifth axiom of functional theory states that messages of significance for stakeholders in terms of how comparative judgment is made are those whose subjects are about policy and character. This axiom does not need modification to work with values as a lens. Character, as it pertains to credibility, includes experience and reliability as well as compassion. Policy for Benoit’s purposes pertains to past accomplishments, education, jobs, national defense, and crime. For the purposes of this overall study, ‘policy’ simply refers to the Iran Deal or those things which can be linked to the Deal in a substantial or meaningful way. But ‘policy’ can refer to almost any subject, political or not. Further, as indicated previously, Benoit mentions research that shows that candidates who were most likely to win were those who spoke mostly of issues rather than character. Further research needs to be done in this area to determine if this prediction holds true for the Iran Deal or any other issue. The difference, of course, would be a refocus on
acclaims, attacks, and defenses of values as they apply to policy or character. With regard to policy, functional theory further subdivides it into past deeds, future plans, and general goals. This holds for any policy, political or not. In this overall study, these sub-divisions were not referenced directly but they were useful in terms of contextual considerations about the relationship between the different sides of the issue. Further investigations might uncover value differences as regards past deeds, future plans, and general goals. Character or credibility considerations in terms of advocates, Benoit divides into personal qualities, leadership qualities, and ideals. This overall study examined news articles over a large time-frame and thus examined a larger narrative. But a more focused, in-depth study using functional theory categories and values could also use Benoit’s character sub-divisions to uncover any appeals to values referenced in news articles or other media.

Benoit says that voters prefer campaign messages about policy rather than those about character. Thus, his second prediction is that candidates will discuss policy more than character. No differentiation was discussed in this overall study in terms of policy and character but this could be done in future studies. More studies are needed to make that determination in terms of functional analysis with values. Benoit further states that his research has shown that candidates who are ahead in polls tend to receive more attacks than opponents do. More investigation is needed to determine if political or non-political concepts, like the Iran deal, rather than solely political candidates meet this measurement as well but in terms of values.

Considering evidence used on policy and character, Henson and Benoit (Henson & Benoit, 2010) found that while most of the appeals made in campaigns were acclaims, the bulk of any citations to support a claim were used to support attacks. In their study, attackers tended to use newspaper reports followed by governmental studies, and statements from opponents and
their voting records. These types of attacks were used against policies as well as character in Henson and Benoit’s findings. The use of citations was found to “increase the credibility” of the speaker and thus the persuasiveness of the message. Henson and Benoit cite research that shows that there is a debate concerning just what constitutes “evidence” in this regard and note that “significant” differences are demonstrated depending upon which definition is used. In some cases, news portrayals of the Deal included personal testimony from private individuals\(^9\) and from public figures who were deeply involved with the contextual considerations involving the Deal. They included lawmakers who were directly involved with policy formation and its language as well as those who were on location, so to speak, and dealt with the parties involved or those involved in terms of the negotiating process. As noted earlier, Henson and Benoit concluded that testimonial evidence can have a “significant” effect on public attitude. The scope of this overall study did not allow for an in-depth treatment of all of the evidence or what should constitute ‘evidence’ that may be in play with the news portrayals of the Deal, but the type of evidence used and why it was used was considered as part of contextual analysis.\(^10\)

The sixth and last functional theory axiom points to the idea that advocates need to win over a majority of stakeholders in order to see their candidate or policy move forward. This was certainly the case with the Iran Deal both internationally in terms of getting other countries to


sign off on the deal and in terms of getting the majority of the United States Congress to advocate it. In any discussion on any topic the goal is similar. But a ‘majority’ means that not every stakeholder needs to be persuaded. Thus, as stated earlier, not all stakeholders who are affected by policies are significant but only those who actually have power in terms of ratifying a decision. For Benoit, such advocates would be voters directly but in the case of the Deal they would be lawmakers, international leaders, and indirectly, voters (those who can put them in office or remove them). This was evident in the data analyzed, particularly in coverage of speeches made to groups who were argued to have influence over lawmakers.11

Both the increased depth and the expansion which ‘value’ adds to functional theory analysis allows the researcher to construct a better representation of meaning in terms of context. Context is present in each line or utterance of a speech act such as an article in a periodical or a public speech, where each line or utterance represents a piece of the overall picture and the absence of any piece results in an incomplete picture or absence of meaning. Similarly, where an overall narrative may involve multiple stories or articles, each article makes up a piece in the larger narrative and the absence of any of those articles or stories results in an incomplete picture or absence of meaning. Thus, each letter which makes up each word in each line or utterance is a

11 See: Frantzman, Seth J. “A dangerous deal for the region.” Al Jazeera 2 April 2015 for reference to such a speech made to Congress; David, Jackson. “Obama Vows to Stand by Gulf Allies Vs. Iran.” USA Today, 2015 for reference to such a speech made to the GCC; Jackson, D., & Firozi, P. (2015, Sep 10). “Iran nuke deal now a campaign hot button.” USA Today for such a speech made to Republican donors; and Korte, G. (2015, Sep 04). “U.S. credibility at stake in Iran deal, Biden says.” USA Today for reference to such a speech made to a Jewish group.
sign pointing to meaning. In other words, the significance of each line or utterance in terms of values and functional theory is the attempt to normalize an assumed standard, whether the author is cognizant of the standard or not. This translates to the entire piece itself as well as all such pieces that might make up an epic narrative. This could be characterized as a ‘contextual semiomosaic,’ where the latter term is a combination of ‘semiotic’ and ‘mosaic.’ ‘Semiotics’ is the study of signs and symbols and their use and interpretation. ‘Mosaic,’ or more specifically, ‘photomosaic,’ is an art form wherein a larger picture is made from smaller pictures. Thus, the combination of ‘semiotics’ and ‘photomosaic’ suggests signs and symbols combined in such a way to create another (larger in time and space) level of meaning, all of which can be interpreted contextually. The ‘levels’ in this regard appear to have no discernable end. There are ontological and epistemological dimensions to this as well but they are beyond the scope of this particular study.

Conclusion

This overall study examined the connection between language and ethics by considering the axioms of functional theory and particularly acclaims, attacks, and defenses often used in campaign rhetoric, as indicators of appeals to a value-hierarchy. The functional theory axioms were deepened by increasing the richness of questions asked about a text during analysis. Evidence was shown that suggests that behind every utterance is an appeal to a value-hierarchy. The acclaims, attacks, and defenses as used in functional theory are appeals to that value-hierarchy. To test the idea that values can be derived from a functional theory analysis with the addition of the consideration of a value-hierarchy, the Aristotelian cardinal values of prudence, justice, fortitude, and temperance were used as a filter. Because a hierarchy by definition has
various levels to which one can appeal, the concept of voice-perspective was used to distinguish from appeals in a text from the journalist and the person(s) being quoted.

These moves allowed for an expansion of functional theory wherein all of the utterances in a text can be analyzed, providing for an expanded contextual investigation. ‘Prudence’ whose definition has remained somewhat all-inclusive up to this point, was further defined to allow for a better thematic categorization of the newly added utterances.

Since the type of analysis being done in this overall study is popularly termed ‘qualitative content analysis,’ a presentation of what constitutes such an endeavor including its history and wide-spread application in both the humanities and sciences was discussed. After a foray into the history of the situation and a presentation of current qualitative analysis on the issue, the debate about the Deal between the rest of the world and Iran about the latter’s nuclear program was used as the subject of analysis to further test the ethico-lingual connection between values and language. It was decided to use news articles from September of 2013 through September 2015 from Al Jazeera, the British Broadcast Corporation, USA Today, the New York Times, and the Washington Post. After delimiting the amount of data to analyze via search parameters and random selection, articles from each source were analyzed as just described. Findings were organized and presented to show the value-hierarchies involved as well as the themes derived from the texts.

Aside from what has already been mentioned, further research could include other subjects and perhaps attempting to use other values as filters. The scope of data could also be adjusted to varying degrees to compare the results gotten from smaller samples of a larger narrative.
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APPENDIX A. ANALYSIS TEMPLATES

Article: Iran: Bell, John. The deal that cuts both ways. Al Jazeera, 21 Aug 2015


I. Decontextualization: Title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “deal”
   iii. To whom: readers of Al Jazeera and internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. acclaim
      1. quotes: “cuts both ways”

   c. values
      i. justice
      1. rationale: both sides give [fairness]

1. decontextualization: sentence one
   i. who: author
   ii. what: “deal”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “may cause problems”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: deal unwise in concessions

2. Decontextualization: sentence two
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “debate”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “debate … vibrant … will continue”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: good debate [wise]

3. Decontextualization: sentence three
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “progressives”
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same  

b. FTC  
i. Acclaim  
   1. Quotes: “have lined up … as has most of the world.”  

c. Values  
i. Prudence  
   1. Rationale: appeals to authority in numbers  

4. Decontextualization: sentence four  
i. Who: “many voices”  
ii. What: deal  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: same  

b. FTC  
i. Attack  
   1. Quotes: “many voices in the US, Israel, and the region lined up against it.”  

c. Values  
i. Prudence  
   1. Rationale: appeal to authorities  

5. Decontextualization: sentence five  
i. Who: same  
ii. What: “objections”  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: same  

b. FTC  
i. Attack  
   1. Quotes: “Iran will be free to build a bomb after 15 years, or that the agreement empowers a rising Iran against some Sunni Arab states and Israel.”  

c. Values  
i. Justice  
   1. Rationale: goals of deal not met [fairness]  

6. Decontextualization: sentence six  
i. Who: same  
ii. What: “Obama”  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: same  

b. FTC  
i. Acclaim  
   1. Quotes: “promised to stand by US allies, and he has pointed out that moderate forces may now have a better chance to change the nature of the Islamic Republic.”  

c. Values
i. fortitude
   1. Rationale: promise of support, change in Iran [faith]

7. D: sentence seven
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “case”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “no real alternative today to this deal but conflict.”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: avoidance of conflict [wisdom]

8. D: sentence eight
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “reality … both sides”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “both sides of this debate may be right.”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D: sentence nine
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “This is a good deal…”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: “it does contain Iran,” [fairness]
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: “there is no current alternative;”

10. D: sentence ten
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “distrust and hostility”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
1. Quotes: “but in the long term, continued distrust and hostility in the region may prove the naysayers correct, if not for the reasons they now cite.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: long term wisdom

11. D: sentence eleven
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “difficult to accept … necessary now … problematic in the future.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom even though problems in future

12. D: sentence twelve
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “We”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “We tend to think …”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to lack of wisdom

13. D: sentence thirteen
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “diplomacy”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Either … or …” rather than both

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to lack of wisdom

14. D: sentence fourteen
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “allegiance”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “… may not match Middle Eastern realities.”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to lack of wisdom

15. D: sentence fifteen
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Something more basic …”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “… need for the deal, and its potential unravelling.”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D: sentence sixteen
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “disregard for rules”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “The disregard for any rules or limits to the game of geopolitics defines the Middle East.”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Lack of fairness

17. D: sentence seventeen
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “interests”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “One's interests, however they're perceived, are a permanent green light for violence, subterfuge, or the use of proxies.”
c. Values
   i. Justice
1. Rationale: lack of justice

18. D: sentence eighteen
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “This” [one’s interests]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “This applies to Israel, the Arab states, as well as Iran before and after the nuclear.”
   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Lack of justice

19. D: sentence nineteen
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “distrust of Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “It is distrust of Iran as a nuclear power that propelled the need for a deal, and it is distrust of Iran as a regional power that may now propel others on dangerous paths.”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: wise to distrust, need to establish trust

20. D: sentence twenty
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “regional perception”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “The regional perception of Iran is that it is as a hegemonic power that has to be checked.”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: caution [wisdom] about Iran

21. D: sentence twenty-one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Few”
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Few believe it will ever become Denmark, or like China…”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: foresight on Iran

22. D: sentence twenty-two
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “This” [viewpoint]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “This may be pessimistic and a misperception, but those in conflict with Iran will not change their minds easily about its nature and motivations - unless Iran goes out of its way to make them do so.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: Caution about Iran

23. D: sentence twenty-three
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “By empowering one side, some fear that the deal will only heighten the ardent geopolitical competition in the region.”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: Cautious foresight on Iran

24. D: sentence twenty-four
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “temptation for other states”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “… the temptation for other states to match Iran's nuclear capacities will not go away.”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: Fairness in strength

25. D: sentence twenty-five
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “The deal may diminish the likelihood of an immediate arms race, but the possibility looms large in the longer term.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: Cautious foresight on Iran

26. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “region”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “A region bred on the logic of distrust is bound to confront the danger of WMD proliferation again and again.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: cautious foresight on region

27. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “past”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “If you can get away with it’ In the past, Iraq used chemical weapons against Iran, and someone in Syria used them against civilians.”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: Being unfair if one can escape consequences

28. D
   i. Who: author
ii. What: “cases”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “In both cases, the assumption was "if you can get away with it, do it".”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: unfairness, lack of oversight

29. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “regional rules”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Unless regional rules are developed, agreed to or imposed, the region risks a continued escalation.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: regional rules wise

30. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “answer”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “An obvious answer is one that Iran itself has put forward even recently: a Middle East free of WMD.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: wise solution

31. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “This” [no WMD’s]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “This is the ideal.”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: wisest goal

32. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “possibility”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “… the possibility of Israel giving up its weapons without concomitant political developments is zero.”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: option possibilities

33. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Peace”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Peace between Israel and the whole region is a long way away.”
   c. Values
      i. Temperance
         1. Rationale: appeal patience

34. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “that” [peace]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “… that would require Iran to move politically as far as Israel would have to move in terms of its WMD arsenal.”
   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: what would be fair

35. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Others”
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same  
b. FTC  
i. Acclaim  
   1. Quotes: “Others recommend the development of an OSCE like structure in the Middle East, building confidence slowly.”  
c. Values  
i. Prudence  
   1. Rationale: wise path

36. D  
i. Who: author  
ii. What: “OSCE”  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: same  
b. FTC  
i. Attack  
   1. Quotes: “However, the OSCE developed within a Cold War context of relative equilibrium.”  
c. Values  
i. Prudence  
   1. Lack of wisdom

37. D  
i. Who: author  
ii. What: “middle east”  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: same  
b. FTC  
i. Attack  
   1. Quotes: “The Middle East does not enjoy this today;”  
c. Values  
i. Prudence  
   1. Rationale: lack of wisdom

38. D  
i. Who: author  
ii. What: “battle”  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: same  
b. FTC  
i. Attack  
   1. Quotes: “… the battle is still on for territory, power, and control.”  
c. Values  
i. prudence  
   1. Rationale: lack of wisdom as per context
39. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “stable ground”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “If such stable ground is found in the future, such discussions can proceed realistically and fruitfully.”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: wise path

40. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “The nuclear deal is really about Iran and the West and does not begin to address fundamental regional tensions.”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: lack of proper content in deal

41. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “This” [lack of proper content in deal]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “This suggests that another approach is needed today.”
         2. “another” suggest alternative to deal
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: lack of wisdom

42. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “it” [idea]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “Although it may seem counterintuitive after a deal with Iran, what might help is to empower the troubled Arabs.”
2. “may” seem

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: Wise path

43. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Arab confidence”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “A renewed sense of Arab confidence can help change their lens of perception of the Iranian threat, and makes the desired equilibrium state more likely.”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: Wise path

44. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “EU”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “The EU may have an important role on this file.”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: Wise path

45. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “US”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “The US is already involved with all in a confused and contorted process …”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: lack of wisdom
d. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “… and Russia seems to have already begun its own rebalancing by courting the Arabs.”

e. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Wise path

46. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “it” [situation]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “… the rulers of Jordan, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Morocco and Egypt are expected to visit Moscow.”

c. Values
   i. prudence
      1. rationale: wise path

47. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “EU”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “The EU remains the power with the interest and the weight to engage further and more ardently with key states in the Arab world - and the power to make a difference.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: Wise path

48. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Rushing”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Rushing to do business with Iran - or worse: to look to it as primary in managing a chaotic region – may make sense after a successful deal, but it does not attend to the deeper ailments of the region.”

c. Values
i. Temperance
   1. Rationale: lack of patience

49. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Arabs”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “… may prove to be more stabilizing.”
      2. [support of previous idea]

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: wise path
Article: Culhane, Patty. The reality of the Iran deal: Congress can't 'kill' it. *Al Jazeera*, 13 July 2015

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “reality”
   iii. To whom: readers of *Al Jazeera*, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “The reality of the Iran deal: Congress can't 'kill' it”
      2. Unable to “kill”
   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: ‘killing’ suggest ending the life of something prematurely here
      ii. Courage
         1. Rationale: no need to fear

II. D: highlight
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “… Obama does not need congressional approval to sign an Iran deal or go to the UN to lift sanctions.”
   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: Fairness, appeal to power

1. D: first sentence
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Washington, DC”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Washington, DC is a confusing place.”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: Lack of wisdom

2. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “I”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “… new law on Iran sanctions will give Congress the ability to "kill" any potential agreement.”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: Appeal to power, lack of justice

3. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “I”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “I don't think that is right, but I've been doubting myself because so many people are saying it. I've gone back three times and read the bill.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: lack of accuracy [wisdom]

4. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Here” [statement]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Here is what the law actually does.”
      2. Contradicts other reports

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: Accuracy [wisdom]

5. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “It” [the law]
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “It gives Congress the power to stop the US president from lifting US sanctions on Iran.”
      2. Bad thing but …
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: Appeal to power, lack of justice

6. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “you” [reader]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “… it’s pretty certain that they will only be able to stop him for a short time.”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to powerlessness, fairness

7. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “It” [law]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “It doesn't stop President Barack Obama from making the agreement or going to the UN and lifting international sanctions.”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: fairness, lack of power

8. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “I’ve” [author]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
1. Quotes: “So I've been trying to figure out how that could "kill" any potential agreement.”
2. Lack of accuracy
c. Values
   i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: lack of accuracy [wisdom]

9. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “thing” [idea]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “… the mentality that the US is the centre of the world is behind the assumption.”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
   1. Lack of accuracy [wisdom]

10. D
    i. Who: author
    ii. What: “Let’s” [readers]
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “… Congress will override a presidential veto and forbid him from waiving most US sanctions on Iran.”
   2. Bad path
c. Values
   i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: Bad path [lack of wisdom]

11. D
    i. Who: author
    ii. What: “I”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “… these people are assuming that without US sanctions relief Iran would walk away from their side of the bargain.”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: lack of accuracy [wisdom]

12. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “they” [Iran]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Why would they do that?”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: lack of wisdom

13. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “They” [Iran]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “They would basically be saying "I can now do business with the entire globe except America, but that is just not good enough."”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: Lack of accuracy [wisdom]

14. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “White House”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “The White House doesn't believe Congress can now say yes or no to a deal.”
c. Justice
   i. Rationale: lack of power

15. D
395

i. Who: “White House Press Secretary Josh Earnest”
ii. To whom: public
iii. How: public statement

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “‘The bill that has passed by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee with bipartisan support essentially is a vote to vote later on congressional sanctions and not the decision about whether or not to enter into the agreement, that would certainly resolve some of the concerns we've expressed about the authority that is exercised by the president of the United States to conduct foreign policy.’”
   2. “passed” Appeals to authority: Senate Foreign Relations Committee “bipartisan support” “resolve … concerns”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to authorities, fairness

16. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “president”
iii. To whom: readers
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “The president would never give up his right to act as the sole ‘decider’ on foreign policy.”
   2. Attacks other views, “decider” shot at Bush

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: Appeal to power, fairness

17. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “He” [Obama]
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “He doesn't need congressional approval to do whatever he feels like at the UN.”
   2. Attacks other views

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to power

18. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “He” [Obama]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “He was smart enough to not frame this as an official treaty.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to intelligence [wisdom]

19. D
   i. Who: “Senate”
   ii. To whom: same
   iii. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “The Senate would have had to weigh in on that and with the lobbying that is taking place, it never would have passed.”
      2. Attacks previous sentence’s suggested view

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: lack of resolution, fairness
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: would have been unwise

20. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “I”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “I have to think the reason behind this mischaracterisation is coming from some members of Congress.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: lack of accuracy [wisdom]
21. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “They” [members of congress]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “They can tell their constituents that they are "being tough".”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: Lack of accuracy
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: Lack of honesty

22. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “They” [members of Congress]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “They can vote their disapproval knowing, in the end, it won't change a thing.”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: lack of honesty

23. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “I” “negotiators”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “I don't know if the negotiators will actually get a deal, but I'm certain about this Congress can't kill it if they do.”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: lack of power

24. D
25. **D**

   i. Who: author
   
   ii. What: “They” [congress]
   
   iii. To whom: same
   
   iv. How: same

   b. FTC

      i. Attack

         1. Quotes: “They can try to force Iran to walk away.”

   c. Values

      i. Justice

         1. Rationale: Lack of fairness

26. **D**

   i. Who: author

   ii. What: “They” [congress]

   iii. To whom: same

   iv. How: same

   b. FTC

      i. Attack

         1. Quotes: “They can embarrass their president on the world stage.”

   c. Values

      i. Prudence

         1. Rationale: unwise path

27. **D**

   i. Who: author

   ii. What: same

   iii. To whom: same

   iv. How: same

   b. FTC

      i. Attack
1. Quotes: “They can complain and they will.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: lack of wisdom

28. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “If they get a deal we will see a mad dash by members of Congress to the closest camera.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: lack of wisdom

29. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “what Congress can do”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “There will be outrage, and name calling, but in the end that will likely be the extent of what Congress can do - because no matter what the politicians say, they really have little power to stop it.”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: lack of power
Article: Frantzman, Seth J. “A dangerous deal for the region.” *Al Jazeera* 2 April 2015

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “deal”
   iii. To whom: readers of *Al Jazeera*, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “dangerous deal”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Lack of fairness

II. D: highlight
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran” “region”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Iran gets nuclear energy, the region gets Iranian military adventures, incitement, and militias.”

c. Values
   i. prudence
      1. rationale: unwise deal

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “background”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “the whole of the Middle East is on fire due to Iranian meddling” “negotiations have been taking place on another planet.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: unwise negotiations

2. D
   i. Who: Obama
   ii. What: “people, in both our countries and beyond,”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “oppose a diplomatic resolution.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: Appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “we” [Iran and Obama]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “we have to speak up for the future we seek”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: “speak up” fairness
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: “future we seek” wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “one” [people in general]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “any criticism of it is viewed as placing an obstacle in their path.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: unwise

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “that” [see previous sentence]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
1. Quotes: “US administration's wrath at Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's speech”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: unwise

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Netanyahu”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “said what many in the region were thinking,”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: wisdom

d. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Iran's ambitions go beyond just a nuclear agreement, Iran will be emboldened by the agreement and seek greater control” “deal risked a regional arms race.”

e. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: unfair
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: “arms race” unwise

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “details”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “The most symbolic details underpin how this deal came about.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who: same
ii. What: “Iranian Foreign Minister Mohammad Javad Zarif”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “Why is Iranian Foreign Minister Mohammad Javad Zarif always smiling so broadly in pictures of his "negotiations" … “

c. Values
i. justice
   1. rationale: unfair

9. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “these” [negotiations]
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “Who seriously believes these were "tough" negotiations for Iran?”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: unfair

10. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Iran”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “received everything it wanted;”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: unfair

11. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Iran”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
1. Quotes: “shopped around a story”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: Lack of truth

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “This” [Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “This is the same Supreme Leader who was reported to be suffering from a terminal illness and has been in critical condition.”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: lack of truth

13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “John Kerry”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “made clear the degree to which this has become a cornerstone of US Policy”

c. Values
   i. prudence
      1. rationale: unwise

14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “details”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “details behind what those interests were are fuzzy.”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: lack of truth/clarity
15. D
i. Who: John Kerry
ii. What: “We” [US]
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: public statement
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “We will defend our interests, maintain urgency and uphold principles.”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: Appeal to fairness

16. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “Israel”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “played the role of a canary in the goldmine on this issue, constantly warning against an Iranian deal”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: fairness

17. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “This” [previous sentence], “Iran”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “This is unsurprising as Iran has been involved in funding and arming Hezbollah in Lebanon with which Israel has fought wars and whose arsenal threatens Israel.”

c. Values
   i. Wisdom
      1. Rationale: “unsurprising” appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: “funding and arming” “threatens”
18. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Arab regimes and Lebanese”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “’the resistance’”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: lack of truth

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “resistance”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “Then Hezbollah's "resistance" poured over into Syria to prop up Bashar al-Assad's crackdown on those opposing his rule.”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to truth

20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “brutality”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “The brutality with which Assad and Hezbollah suppressed the Sunni fighters in Syria precipitated the rise of more extreme elements such as ISIL.”
   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: unfairness

21. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “it” [situation]
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “For Hezbollah it became a self-fulfilling prophecy, once ISIL appeared then Hezbollah claimed it was "protecting" Lebanon from extremists.”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. rationale: appeal to truth, wisdom

22. D
i. Who: Hezbollah's leader Hassan Nasrallah
ii. What: “We” [Hezbollah]
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “"We have fought a great victory so that the region will not fall into the hands of extremists,"”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

23. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “It” [situation]
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “It is the opposite, Hezbollah invaded Syria, it has created tension in Lebanon and blocked the new appointment of a president…”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: unfairness

24. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Saudi Arabia and 10 other nations, including the Gulf Cooperation Council and Egypt”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “…one of the first condemnations came from Nasrallah in Lebanon.”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: fairness

25. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “resistance”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Why was the "resistance" inserting itself in the Yemenite crises?”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: unwise

26. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Nasrallah and his supporters”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Because Nasrallah and his supporters in Tehran are guided by the same force.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: lack of wisdom

27. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “reports”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
1. Quotes: “Reports that the Iranian General Qassem Soleimani who was leading Iraq's Shia militias in their assault on Tikrit, might be heading for Iran, were not an aberration.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

28. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “arms”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Iranian arms were reportedly being unloaded in Yemen through last week and planes were landing in Sanaa.”

c. Values
   i. prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

29. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “negotiators”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Iran's negotiators in the Iranian deal and its senior diplomats are highly skilled and mostly western educated.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

30. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Ali Akbar Salehi, Iran's deputy chief negotiator,”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Ali Akbar Salehi, Iran's deputy chief negotiator, was educated at MIT and has a collegial rapport with the Americans.”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

31. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “He and the other Iranians understand the Obama administrations desire for "peace" and the American proclivity for "getting to yes".”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: wisdom

32. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: Same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “So they warn that absence of a deal can mean war.”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: wisdom

33. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “war”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “But war is exactly what Iran has launched on the entire Middle East…”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: unwise

34. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “invasion”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “…Iran has grown in power in leaps, while Arab countries have been thrust into chaos.”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: fairness

35. D
   i. Who: same
      ii. What: “militias”
      iii. To whom: same
      iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “…don't build up economies or endow universities, they only undermine the sovereignty of their respective countries.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: wisdom

36. D
   i. Who: same
      ii. What: “Kerry”
      iii. To whom: same
      iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “When Kerry speaks about a "good deal" it is a good deal for Iran and a bad deal for the region.”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: unjust

37. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran” “region”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Iran gets nuclear energy, the region gets an Iranian octopus of military adventures, incitement, and militias slowly gobbling up the region and turning it into a wasteland.”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: unfair

38. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “They” [dealakers]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “They can quote Persian poetry all they want, but the real poets they should be looking to are those of the Sasanian Empire.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

39. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “poets”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “After all, the poets praised Persian greatness, and Iran is trying to resurrect that greatness.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

40. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “region”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
1. Quotes: “The region has been handed to them on a silver platter in these negotiations.”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: unfair
Article: Heydarian, Richard J. “Iran nuclear deal is a triumph of diplomacy.” *Al Jazeera*. 8 August 2015

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “deal”
   iii. To whom: readers of *Al Jazeera*, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “triumph of diplomacy”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: wisdom

II. D: highlight
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “… Iran deal has triggered a seismic shift in the global geopolitical landscape.”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: “shift” of power

1. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “… the historic nuclear deal between the Islamic Republic of Iran and the world powers is primarily a non-proliferation agreement.”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: “historic” appeal to wise deal itself

2. D
   i. Who: same
ii. What: “Obama administration and its European partners”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “… aimed at keeping Tehran's nuclear programme within strictly civilian parameters.”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: fairness

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Democrats in the US Congress as well as Gulf Arab countries, particularly Qatar”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Thanks to the proactive diplomatic efforts of Tehran and Washington, a growing number of high-profile Democrats in the US Congress as well as Gulf Arab countries, particularly Qatar, have openly expressed their support for the nuclear deal.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: wise choice

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama administration”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “It well looks like the Obama administration has enough legislative support to overcome Republican and Israeli opposition.”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: Appeal to power

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “deal”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “From the Western perspective, the nuclear deal represents the most important security agreement since the signing of the Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (INF) Treaty between Washington and Moscow during the twilight years of the Cold War.”

c. Values
i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Iran”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “… successfully managed to legitimise its nuclear enrichment programme, protect its rights as a member of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and ostensibly end its pariah status in favour of greater integration and interaction with the international community.”

c. Values
i. Prudence
1. Rationale: “legitimize” “end its pariah status” “greater integration and interaction with the international community” [wisdom]
ii. Justice
1. Rationale: “protect its rights” [fairness]

7. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “negotiations”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “… two years of non-stop negotiations - anchored by patient and determined diplomatic manoeuvres of both Tehran and Washington - has triggered a seismic shift in the global geopolitical landscape.”
c. Values
   i. Temperance
      1. Rationale: “two years of non-stop negotiations” “patient and determined diplomatic manoeuvres” [appeal to patience and determination]

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Vienna”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “… Vienna served as a crucial venue for the establishment of a new order in Europe, ending years of devastating wars during the Napoleonic age in favour of a carefully constructed balance of power system.”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: “balance of power” [fairness]

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “European capital”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Once again, the beautiful European capital has facilitated the carving out of a new international order.”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: “new international order” [fairness from last sentence]

10. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “implications”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same
b. FTC
    i. Acclaim
       1. Quotes: “… renewed faith in the power of diplomacy.”

c. Values
11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “prospect of a devastating confrontation”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack [previous situation]
         1. Quotes: “For more than a decade, the prospect of a devastating confrontation between the US and Iran extended a dark shadow across an already unstable region.”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: unstable therefore unwise situation

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “several American administrations … Israel”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack [diplomacy vs. action]
         1. Quotes: “… Insisting on keeping "all options on the table", "repeatedly vowed to preserve its rights to defend its interests - have threatened military intervention.”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Unwise military path

13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama administration”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack [previous situation]
         1. Quotes: “… after years of acrimonious statements and fruitless negotiation,”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: Unwise talk
ii. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “... finally able to find a reliable counterpart in Iran.”

d. Values
   i. Temperance
      1. Rationale: “finally” [appeal to patient diplomacy]

14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “President Hassan Rouhani”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “pulled off a landslide victory” “promising not only to end the debilitating sanctions against Iran, which is crucial to ending the country's economic conundrum, but also a new chapter in Iran's relations with the Western world.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: wise goals

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Javad Zarif … foreign minister, Rouhani”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “… able to garner support from the Iranian establishment in favour of opening up new communication channels with the West.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to ability

16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “agreement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack [agreement less than ideal]
1. Quotes: “… falls short of fulfilling all the major demands of both sides.”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

17. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “red lines” “hardliners”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack [see previous sentence]
      1. Quotes: “may have been stealthily crossed,” “expressed their discontent.”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

18. D
   i. Who: “Robert Jervis, a leading political scientist,"
   ii. What: “two sides preferences”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “… extremely rare for one side, let alone both, to get everything that it could. In almost all cases, the two sides' preferences do not meet at a single point, but instead have some overlap...”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to precedent

19. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: ““extraordinary intelligence and luck””
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “… they were able "to squeeze out the last drop" of concessions”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: Appeal to intelligence

20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iranian streets” [Iranian public]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “brighter future,” “exploded into celebrations”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

21. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “some … President Barack Obama,”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “overoptimistic”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: Appeal to ideal wants
d. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “after a month America will reopen its embassy and the
good man, President Barack Obama, will visit Iran.”
e. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: “good man” [wisdom]

22. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama administration”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
1. Quotes: “… isn't counting on any major reconfiguration in bilateral relations with Iran anytime soon.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to caution [wisdom]

23. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “deal … Nixon-Mao rapprochement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “… paved the way for not only a new relationship among two powerful nations, but also transformed the domestic politics of a long-isolated revolutionary state.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: wise path

24. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “deal” “pragmatist-reformist factions in Iran,”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “significantly strengthened … expected to enhance their influence …”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: wise decision/path

25. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “This” [deal] “US-China rapprochement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “strengthened … discarded ideological rigidity in favour of pragmatism and reform at home.”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wise path

26. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran-West rapprochement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “… holds the promise of unlocking one of the world's most promising markets, with broad implications for the global economy.”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: wise decision

27. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “… Blessed … Iran is expected to benefit from huge investments in its oil and gas industry, which will have a significant impact on the global energy markets.”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: wise path

28. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran's robust manufacturing sector, deep human capital, and booming science and technology sector”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “… represent the ingredients of the world's next major emerging market.”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
1. Rationale: wise choice

29. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “rapprochement between Beijing and Washington” “deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “… may have opened up much-needed space for strategic cooperation between the West and one of the Middle East's most powerful and enduring nations.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: wise choice

30. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “geopolitical dividends, … willingness to cooperate with Washington on a whole range of issues of common concern,”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: wise path

31. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “stakes”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “… successful implementation couldn't be any higher.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: Wise choice
**Article:** STAFF. “Kerry defends Iran nuclear deal in Senate testimony.” *Al Jazeera*. 23 July 2015

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Kerry”
   iii. To whom: readers of *Al Jazeera*, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “Kerry defends Iran nuclear deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: deal wise

II. D: highlight
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Agreement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Agreement has "closed off all paths to a bomb" through peaceful means,…”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: justice served
   ii. Prudence
      1. Appeal to wisdom via “peaceful means”

1. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “John Kerry”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “…mounted a defence of the Iran nuclear deal, telling members of Congress that

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: deal wise
d. FC
   i. Attack
1. quotes: “rejection of the accord would give Iran "a great big green light" to swiftly accelerate its atomic programme.”

e. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: deal just

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “the US secretary of state strongly defended the Vienna agreement, saying that with the Iran deal, the US and other world powers have "closed-off all paths to a bomb".”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “He dismissed the argument that the US could get a better deal with Iran as "a fantasy, plain and simple".

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: lack of wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “they tried to convince senators to support the deal, amid intense opposition”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: "prevents Iran from getting a nuclear weapon" appeal to fairness

5. D
   i. Who: Kerry
      ii. What: "technical underpinnings"
      iii. To whom: same
      iv. How: public statement
   b. FTC
      i. Defense
         1. Quotes: "I am confident that the technical underpinnings of this deal are solid."
   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

6. D
   i. Who: author
      ii. What: “Kerry”
      iii. To whom: same
      iv. How: author language
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “…Kerry faces the challenge of answering questions from "quite sceptical" senators, adding that "there are going to be some tough questions."
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: same
      ii. What: “hearing”
      iii. To whom: same
      iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “bruising struggle”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “…unless Congress blocks it, and Republicans in control of the House and Senate have made clear they intend to try to do so”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “the three US officials”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “have "enormous credibility"”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “it” [political move]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “risky move” “ceding the political argument to the opponents of the deal.”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: unwise move

11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “US negotiators”
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “‘fleeced’ by the Iranians.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: lack of wisdom

12. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Kerry and the other cabinet officials”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “…classified briefing to legislators, away from the media and the public.”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: lack of transparency

13. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Kerry”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Defense
   1. Quotes: “reassure Gulf Arab officials meeting in Qatar that the US will work with them to "push back" against Iranian influence in the region.”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: fairness

14. D
i. Who: Kerry
ii. What: “I will be travelling to Doha”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
i. Defense
   1. Quotes: “…meet with the whole [Gulf Cooperation Council],”"
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

15. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: [Kerry]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Part of previous defense
      1. Quotes: “He was referring to the group comprising Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman and Qatar.”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: see previous

16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “US allies”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “publicly welcomed a deal between world powers”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to authority
d. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “accuse the country of interfering in Arab conflicts and pushing hard for heightened regional influence.”
e. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: unfairness

17. D
   i. Who: Kerry
   ii. What: [negotiators]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “we can persuade them” “they will be significantly Strengthened”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to authority, fairness

18. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, Iran's supreme leader,”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “US policies in the region were "180 degrees" opposed to Iran's”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: lack of fairness
d. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “his country would continue to back its allies in Arab states.”
e. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: wisdom

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Kerry”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “he found those comments disturbing and troubling.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: unwise comments

20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “America's friends in the region”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Few of America's friends in the region back the deal.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to authority, unfairness
Article: Staff. “Kerry holds talks on Iran deal with top Gulf leaders.” Al Jazeera 3 August 2015

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Kerry”
   iii. To whom: readers of Al Jazeera, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “talks” “top” Gulf leaders”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to diplomacy, authority

II. D: highlight
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “US secretary of state's Doha visit”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “seeks to address security concerns”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust, diplomacy

1. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “John Kerry”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “meeting senior officials of Arab Gulf states to *reassure* them”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust, diplomacy

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Kerry”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “met the Emir of Qatar on Monday morning ahead of a separate Meeting”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: Appeal to authority, wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “He” [Kerry]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “expected to hold a news conference later in the day with Qatar's foreign minister,”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom, authority

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: Qatar's foreign minister, Khalid bin Mohammad Al Attiyah
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Al Attiyah enumerated a number of other issues including the ongoing conflict in Yemen and the pursuit for an independent Palestinian state.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to authority, wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “foreign ministers of the GCC”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “held a preparatory meeting”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom, importance

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Gulf Arab states”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “publicly welcomed the deal”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to authority
d. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “many have expressed private reservations.”
e. Values
   i. Wisdom
      1. Rationale: “many” “private reservations” = down-players

7. D
   i. Who: Al Jazeera's Hashem Ahelbarra
   ii. What: “GCC officials”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “*voice* their concerns with the Iran deal”.
   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: fairness

8. D
   i. Who: Same
   ii. What: “This” [moment]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “quite a delicate moment for the Gulf countries,”
c. Values
   i. Justice
1. Rationale: appeal to justice, knowledge

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “They” [Gulf countries]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “They are worried…”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: fairness

10. D
    i. Who: author
    ii. What: “Our correspondent”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “there are concerns”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Fairness

11. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “Kerry”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “… expected to discuss the fight against the Islamic State
         of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) group in Syria and Iraq.”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: fairness

12. D
    i. Who: same
ii. What: “Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “plans to hold a three-way meeting”


c. Values
i. Prudence
1. Rationale: Appeal to wisdom, authority

13. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Russian foreign ministry”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “visiting Qatar to discuss peace moves” “international consolidation against ISIL” “bilateral relations between Russia and Qatar.”


c. Values
i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
ii. Justice
1. Rationale: vs. ISIL

14. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Kerry”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “stopped in Cairo for meetings” “US-Egyptian relations were returning to a "stronger base" in bilateral ties despite tensions and human rights concerns.”


c. Values
i. Prudence
1. Rationale: wisdom

15. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “development”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “development” “US delivered … military support package”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: Appeal to wisdom

16. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “Kerry”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “raised the issue of human rights and pressed Egypt on the arrests of dissidents and journalists and mass trials.”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: fairness
Article: *Al Jazeera* staff/editorial board. “Netanyahu lobbies US Jews to act against Iran deal.” 5 August 2015

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Netanyahu”
   iii. To whom: readers of *Al Jazeera*, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “act against”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: deal unwise

II. D: highlight
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Israeli PM”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “deal "will bring war"
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: unwise path

I. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “... launched a campaign to mobilise Jewish Americans against the nuclear Deal”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: “launched” [war language] unwise deal
d. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “... between Iran and world powers championed by President Barack Obama,”
e. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: “championed”, appeals to power

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Netanyahu”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “… deal was not enough to curb Iranian nuclear projects with bomb-making potential.”
   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: deal not fair, goal not reached

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “He” [Netanyahu]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “… a windfall in sanctions relief could help Tehran finance destabilising regional conflicts.”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: unwise path

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “surveys” “Netanyahu”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “American Jewish opinion mixed” “dispute that has strained the US-Israeli alliance,” “cast his opposition to the Iran deal”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: “strained” “cast” appeal to wisdom
5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “He” [Netanyahu]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “… pushed back against the Obama administration's counter-argument that the deal was the only way to avoid eventual war with Iran.”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: unwise path

6. D
   i. Who: Netanyahu
   ii. What: “deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. Public statement
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “I don't oppose this deal because I want war. I oppose this deal because I want to prevent war. And this deal will bring war,””
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: war/deal unwise

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “This” [time]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “”This is a time to stand up and be counted.””
c. Values
   i. justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to power
d. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “”Oppose this dangerous deal.””
e. Values
   i. Prudence
1. Rationale: unwise deal

8. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “10,000 people”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “Organisers said 10,000 people - not taking into account expected group audiences - had signed up to view the webcast.”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to interest, wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “That” [10,000 people]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “grassroots pressure”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to numbers, wisdom

10. D
    i. Who: Al Jazeera's Kristen Saloomey
    ii. What: “opponents”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: public statement
    b. FTC
       i. Attack
          1. Quotes: “… opponents of the deal have been much more vocal and active in expressing their case. Thousands attended a very organised Jewish rally against the deal …”
    c. Values
       i. Prudence
          1. Rationale: “much more vocal and active” appeal to numbers

11. D
    i. Who: same
ii. What: “Citizens for a Nuclear-Free Iran”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “… organisation that has been recently born. It is spending some $1.7m to lobby against the deal. They are trying to get people to call their congressmen and congresswomen to push them to express their concerns,”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: “recently been born” “$1.7m to lobby” “push,” appeal to numbers, pressure, and $, fairness

12. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “Netanyahu”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “infuriated the Obama administration” “invitation of the Democratic president's Republican rivals,” “Netanyahu cast himself as the emissary of an Israeli public that, polls show, mostly shares his misgivings about the deal with Iran.”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: deal unwise, appeal to numbers

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Republican hopefuls”
   iii. To whom: readers of *Al Jazeera*, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “… blast Obama Iran policy.”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: deal unwise

II. D: highlight
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “US presidential candidates”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “…use GOP leadership summit to position themselves on Iran and Israel.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom, authority

1. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Texas Senator Ted Cruz”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “sounded the alarm against a recent deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: deal unwise

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Tehran is "the single greatest threat" to security”
         “Iranians still celebrate a "Death to America" day.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety

3. D
   i. Who: Ted Cruz
   ii. What: “somebody” [Iran]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “If somebody tells you they want to kill you, believe
         them,””

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Cruz”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Cruz was in New Hampshire this past weekend to
         participate in the "First in the nation" Republican leadership
         summit.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to authority, leadership

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “anyone running for president in 2016”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “chance … to make an early pitch to GOP voters for support.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “US President Barack Obama's Middle East policy”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “no shortage of criticism,”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: deal unwise

7. D
   i. Who: Florida Senator Marco Rubio
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Iran is the premier sponsor of terrorism on the planet,”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “They” [Iran]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “They use terrorism the way normal nations use diplomacy.”
   c. Values
      i. Justice
      1. Rationale: Iran unjust
9. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: [Marco Rubio]
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language
b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “… signed a letter threatening to block the Iran nuclear deal, he not only opposes it, he argued, "our president should have never entered into these negotiations".”
c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: deal, negotiations unwise

10. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: [deal]
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “popular theme at the two-day summit” [see previous]
c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: deal unwise

11. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Iran bashing”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “Expect plenty more Iran-bashing as the campaign heats up.”
c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom, expectation

12. D
i. Who: Kyle Kondik, a political analyst from the University of Virginia
ii. What: “Obama”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “…Obama does not fully grasp the dangers posed by many of the actors in the region,”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: Obama unwise

13. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: same
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “he wants the Iran deal primarily as a way of retroactively 'earning' his Nobel Peace Prize.'”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: lack of wisdom

14. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “Rich Galen, longtime Republican strategist,”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “shows their lack of confidence in the deal”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: lack of confidence, wisdom in deal

15. D
i. Who: Rich Galen
ii. What: “candidates”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “’If they [candidates] thought there was a chance of success," he argued, "they would hedge their bets,”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

d. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “they believe that the 'deal' will be nothing more than words and it will go down as a failed negotiation.”

e. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to power, wisdom

16. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Iran, however, was not the only target.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom about situation

17. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama’s approach”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Obama's approach to all sorts of conflicts in the Middle East - from Libya to Syria to Yemen - has failed, most potential nominees argued.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: Obama unwise

18. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “theme”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “a theme Americans will hear over and over again” [see previous]

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom, preparedness

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Republican hopefuls”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “hammered Obama over his perceived lack of leadership and believe the US should do more.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom, leadership

20. D
   i. Who: Wisconsin Governor Scott Walker
   ii. What: “issue”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “threat from what he calls "radical Islamic terrorism".”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom about situation

21. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “fight”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “bring the fight to them”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
22. D
   i. Who: Kentucky Senator Rand Paul
   ii. What: “military action”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “I support military action against ISIS,”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

23. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: [Rand Paul]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “he criticised hawkish members”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

24. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “love for Israel”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Expect plenty of love for Israel,”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: “love” sarcastic, unfair

25. D
   i. Who: Jeb Bush
   ii. What: “alliances”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “We need to re-nourish the alliances that have kept us safe,”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

26. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “We” [constituents]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “We need a president that does not disrespect our friends like Israel.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: Obama unwise

27. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Bush” “disagreements”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Attack [see previous]
      1. Quotes: “referring to the disagreements between the Obama administration and Israel,”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom about situation

28. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Carly Fiorina”
   iii. To whom: sam3
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “bragged to summit-goers”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
1. Rationale: “bragged” = unwise

29. D
   i. Who: Carly Fiorina
      ii. What: “negotiations”
      iii. To whom: same
      iv. How: public statement
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “If it were me, I would stop talking immediately,”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

30. D
   i. Who: same
      ii. What: “sanctions”
      iii. To whom: same
      iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “I would put all the sanctions on that we could unilaterally.”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: wise path

31. D
   i. Who: same
      ii. What: [negotiations] “inspections”
      iii. To whom: same
      iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “I would not talk to them again until they had agreed to full, unfettered inspections of every single nuclear facility they have.”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: wise action

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Thousands”
   iii. To whom: readers of *Al Jazeera*, internet searchers
   iv. Author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “… against Iran deal.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: deal unwise

II. D: highlight
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Protesters”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Protesters converge…” [unity in protest]

c. Values
   i. Courage
      1. Rationale: appeal to unity/strength in face of government power

1. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “… to denounce the Iran nuclear deal as a threat to Israel and global security, demanding that the US Congress reject the pact.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: deal unwise

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Speakers”
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “… called on the US Congress to throw the deal out,”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: deal unwise

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “protest”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “The protest came as US secretary of state and other senior officials briefed members of Congress about the deal behind closed doors.”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: public protest during secret meeting

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “members of Congress”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “… still very sceptical about the deal.”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: deal questionable

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Jeffrey Wiesenfeld, co-organiser of the Stop Iran Rally,”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “… 10,000 people in the crowd.”
c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to numbers, wisdom

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Protesters”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “placards denouncing the deal.”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: deal unwise

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Al Jazeera”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “could not confirm the number of people in attendance.”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: numbers questionable

8. D
   i. Who: George Pataki, the former three-term Republican governor of New York
   ii. What: “We” [protestors]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “here as Americans to speak with one voice”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to numbers, unity, wisdom
   d. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “to say stop Iran now, reject this deal,”
   e. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: deal unwise

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “This” [deal]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “God-awful deal, this must be rejected.”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: deal unwise

10. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Congress”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “Congress must do its job and stand up for the American people, stand up for our safety and say no to this Iranian deal,”
   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to authority, duty

11. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “rally” “Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “The rally expressed support…”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: Netanyahu wise, good leader; criticism wise

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “polls”
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “48 percent disapprove.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to numbers, wisdom

13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Organizers”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “played a montage of news reports about bombings around the world carried out by armed groups linked to Iran.”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: Iran unjust

14. D
   i. Who: Jesse, an attendee at the rally
   ii. What: “it” [reason to be against deal]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “"very, very obvious why anyone would be against the deal".”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: deal unwise

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Iran has been our enemy for 36 years.”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: Iran untrustworthy

16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “reason”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “no sensible reason why anyone would believe that Iran should be trusted with weapons”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to reason, trust
ARTICLE: Gulf News website, Dubai (BBC). “US senator says any permanent Iran deal requires GCC "involvement."” 10 December 2013

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “US Senator”
   iii. To whom: readers of new from Gulf News (BBC), internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “any permanent Iran deal requires GCC "involvement"”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Any permanent agreement with Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “needs GCC involvement, a ranking US senator told Gulf News, although he disagreed with a senior Saudi non-government official on the mechanics of achieving such a role”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “GCC officials”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “made clear their concerns that the nuclear issue is not the only problem with Iran, and if Iran is to be welcomed back to the regional community it needs to stop trying to destabilise its neighbours”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

3. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Senator Tim Kaine, Chairman of the sub-committee on Near Eastern, South and Central Asian Affairs of the US Senate Committee of Foreign Relations, and Prince Turki Al Faisal, Head of King Faisal Centre of Research and former head of Saudi Intelligence”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “were talking at the Manama Dialogue on regional security”

4. D
   i. Who: “Senator Tim Kaine, Chairman of the sub-committee on Near Eastern, South and Central Asian Affairs of the US Senate Committee of Foreign Relations”
   ii. What: “The next phase of talks with Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “should include others such as the GCC, which should play a significant part ... the talks with Iran moved to the wider topics that are necessary for a complete and permanent solution, "countries from the region and Iran's neighbours must be involved”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [committee members]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “We need to develop a way that the GCC and others can be part of this process”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

6. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: [Kaine]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “suggested some kind of formal network under which the GCC and others could be part of a consultative process”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Kaine”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “refused to say to Gulf News that the current talks could be widened to include all aspects of Iran's foreign policy … attempted to allay GCC fears that any deal with Iran cannot just cover the nuclear issue”
   ii. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Iranian nuclear programme is not the only source of tension, and we need to deal with Iran's adventurism and its efforts to destabilise governments both near and far”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Kaine”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “commenting on a blunt attack on the talks from Prince Turki, who said that he was suspicious of the methods of negotiations in the P5+1 process which had excluded the GCC”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust, fairness

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “The current interim agreement with Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “arrived at after secret talks between the US and Iran, followed by the more formal P5+1 process, and it deliberately focuses on allaying international fears”

   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

10. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “Prince Turki”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “softened his position slightly by acknowledging that the current deal is progress … reiterated the well defined Saudi position that any full agreement with Iran has to also include a wider clarity banning weapons of mass destruction from the entire region, in a clear reference to Israel's nuclear weapons”

   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

11. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: same
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “clear that any permanent settlement cannot just be based on the specific of controlling Iran's nuclear programme, and would Iran to stop its support for sectarian groups all over the region.”

   c. Values
      i. Justice
1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “active backer of Hezbollah in Lebanon, of several groups in Iraq, and has been sending its own troops and Hezbollah units to fight for the regime in Syria”

   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Prince Turki”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “gave two other examples of Iranian efforts to destabilise the region”

   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [Prince Turki]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “Iran encouraged its client Hezbollah to blame Saudi Arabia of being behind the recent bombing in Beirut”

   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust
ARTICLE: Xinhua news agency (BBC), Beijing. “Iran nuclear deal to have positive impacts on Syrian crisis - China commentary.” 26 November 2013

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iran deal”
   iii. To whom: readers of news supplied by Xinhua news agency and the BBC, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “positive impacts”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “may have positive impacts on the efforts to secure an agreement on a political solution to the Syrian crisis”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “date for the long-awaited conference”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “aims to bring the Syrian government and the opposition to the negotiation table”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
   ii. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “may contribute to a possible international consensus on how to resolve the Syrian Crisis”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
      ii. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “has had a positive impact on the situation here as it marks a success of political negotiations in solving tough regional issues”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
      ii. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran agreement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “may be useful for preparing the Geneva II Conference”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
   i. Who: “Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov”
   ii. What: “multiple positive aspects of this agreement”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “I hope it will have a useful impact on the currently underway efforts to solve the Syrian problem”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
ii. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

7. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “Geneva II conference”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “will begin without preconditions, adding that he will ask the Syrian government and the opposition to name their delegations to the conference as soon as possible”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
ii. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
i. Who: “Maher Murher, head of the Youth Party”
ii. What: “news”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “Iran's deal with the Western powers, I knew that placing a date for the Geneva II conference would be next”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “Setting a date for the conference”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “wasn't surprising, which followed the dismantling of Syria's chemical weapons and then the clinching of the Iran nuclear deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

10. D
   i. Who: “Maher Murher, head of the Youth Party”
   ii. What: “international consensus”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “has been reached and now the focus would be on the details among Syrians”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “agreement on the Syrian crisis”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will put an end to the flow of terrorists, weapons and money into Syria”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Syrian crisis”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “has never been a domestic issue, but an international one widely linked to other regional issues”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “Iran deal”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “sceptical that the Iran deal would have positive effects on the Syrian crisis, attributing his pessimism to the non-stop support for the rebels and al-Qaida-linked groups from regional players”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

14. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “Iran deal”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “conducive to opening up discussions, dialogues and communication between all external Parties”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

**ARTICLE**: Turkish newspaper Today's Zaman website (*BBC*). “Commentary views possible impact on Turkey of nuclear deal in Geneva.” 27 November 2013

I. Decontextualization: title
i. Who: author
ii. What: “impact on Turkey”
iii. To whom: readers of news supplied by Today’s Zaman (BBC), internet searchers
iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “possible impact” [see following]
   
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [impact on Turkey as a result of the nuclear deal]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: [see following]
   
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “major seismic shift in the region that rearranges the entire chess board”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “as claimed by respected analyst Vali R. Nasr”
   
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “first economic signs”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “positive: Turkish stocks and the lira went up after the good news”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Turkey”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “supposed to profit from a drop in oil prices”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, beneficence

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “trend”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “could lead to a substantial decrease in the big current account deficit”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “new possibilities for trade with Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “trying to make up for the $6 billion lost in the first nine months of this year due to the trade embargoes on Iran that are now being relaxed, albeit only partially, as part of the nuclear deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: same
ii. What: “the short run”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Turkey will benefit economically from a deal that has, in the short run, diminished tensions in the region and will help to re-establish some pre-existing trade patterns while also holding out the promise of a future boom in Turkish-Iranian economic relations”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “jury”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “still out, however, on the consequences for Turkish foreign policy”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Optimists”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “the confidence-building deal on Iran's nuclear programme fits in perfectly with the more pragmatic modus operandi recently adopted by Turkey”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
    i. Who: “Istanbul-based Centre for Economic and Foreign Policy Studies (EDAM) Chairman Sinan Ulgen”
    ii. What: “Iran deal”
    iii. To whom: same
iv. How: public statement
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will facilitate Turkey's new approach and allow Turkey to overcome the criticism that its foreign policy has been too sectarian”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

11. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Foreign Minister Ahmet Davutoglu”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “already did some fence-mending in Baghdad earlier this month and will visit Tehran this week”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “trips”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “meant to show that Turkey is moving away from ideology-based diplomacy to a strategy centred on improving conditions for Turkish businesses and securing access to oil and gas for its economy”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “One of the challenges in making that shift a success”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “trying to convince Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan that he should change his rhetoric”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Justice and Development Party (AKP) leader”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “apparently finds it hard to abstain from harsh condemnations of governments he disapproves of”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “result of his ongoing bashing of the new Egyptian regime”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Cairo downgraded relations and expelled the Turkish ambassador, creating a crisis that seems will be hard to overcome in the immediate future”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “new outreach to Iraq and Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “new outreach to Iraq and Iran is, of course, important, but the real test for Turkish foreign policy will be how it copes with the effects of the Iran deal on the situation in Syria”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Some observers”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “quite optimistic and expect that further American-Iranian rapprochement will make reaching a deal on a cease-fire and, ultimately, a political solution in Syria easier because of Iran's enormous leverage with Syrian President Bashar al-Assad”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Others”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “are more pessimistic”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Brookings Doha Centre Research Director Shadi Hamid”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “does not expect Iran to distance itself from Assad as long as there is no final nuclear deal”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “US”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “not going to put serious pressure on Tehran to do so”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

21. D
   i. Who: “Brookings Doha Centre Research Director Shadi Hamid”
   ii. What: [Iran distancing itself from Syrian President Bashar al-Assad]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “isn't the American focus now and anything that could potentially complicate the coming negotiations is likely to be put to the side. Assad was already given a free hand with the US-Russia chemical weapons deal in September. He had to become a partner, rather than an enemy, even if that meant looking the other way as the rebels struggled to respond to Assad's military offensives."

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

22. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “guess”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Davutoglu and Erdogan would agree with Hamid's analysis”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

23. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “upper hand”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
1. Quotes: “adjusting Turkey's policy to that extremely unwelcome prospect”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

24. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Turkey”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “bitter loss or will it refuse to accept the American-Iranian (and Russian) script and continue to try and remove Assad from power”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
ARTICLE: Hurriyet website, Istanbul (BBC). “Commentary hails Iran deal, rues Turkey’s absence from process.” 6 April 2015

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Commentary”
   iii. To whom: readers of Hurriyet website (BBC), internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “hails Iran deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

d. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “rues Turkey’s absence”

e. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Well done! … something to celebrate, since I have always been for diplomatic solutions”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [author]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “fan of Iran as a beautiful country and great culture”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: same
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “I want to hope that it will help restore peace in the Region”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “the most realistic and rational thing to do”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “risked my image of being considered a "sober" observer of politics by saying the best solution was to politically engage with Iran”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [deal]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
1. Quotes: “could be conceived as a pure fantasy, but fortunately, my friend agreed with me”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [author]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “dared to write about my "fantastic" views”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “my argument”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Western politics, which have been shaped by hostility to Iran since the Islamic Revolution, had done nothing but increase turmoil and suffering in the Middle East”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “idea of the spring”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “failed shortly afterwards as the region turned more unstable than ever”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
    i. Who: same
ii. What: "idea of "moderate Islamic forces,"
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “countries, failed on two Fronts”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “sliding towards another authoritarian regime, the Syrian opposition surrendered to violent radicalism and Libya lost all stability and order”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Tunisia”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “Ennahda had to step down to prevent political and social tension”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Sunni politics in Iraq”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “enforced the rise of radical groups”

c. Values
Prudence

1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D

i. Who: same
ii. What: “Turkey”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC

i. Attack

1. Quotes: “lost its moderating role and engaged in sectarian politics in Syria”

c. Values

i. Prudence

1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D

i. Who: same
ii. What: “Iran”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC

i. Acclaim

1. Quotes: “turned out to be a more sensible Interlocutor”

c. Values

i. Prudence

1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D

i. Who: same
ii. What: “best solution”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC

i. Acclaim

1. Quotes: “return to diplomacy in the Middle East, and talking to Iran is an inevitable step to achieve a diplomatic solution”

c. Values

i. Prudence

1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. D

i. Who: same
ii. What: “Turkey”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “I wish Turkey could have been a part”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “current government”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “put in real effort to mediate between Iran and the West and should be given credit for its previous political line”

c. Values
   i. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patient work
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “recent deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would best work for it” [Turkey]

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would help overcome the difficulties that Turkey has had”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

21. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Turkey”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “isolating itself from the Western alliance while also its relations with Iran are also deteriorating”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

22. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “inevitable outcome”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “Turkey's (perceived) indulgence of sectarian politics”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

23. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [Turkey’s absence]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “another missed opportunity for Turkey, but also there may be more negative impacts from recent developments”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

24. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “domestic politics”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “politics, the most risky thing is the rising hostility towards the perceived rise of Shi'i power in the region and the
concomitant tendency to accuse Alevis for all manner of things in Turkey”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

25. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “killing of a public prosecutor”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “week, by two members of an illegal and dubious leftist organization, has been linked to Alevis by pro-government journalists and supporters”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

26. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “the event”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “seen as part of "a dirty game of playing with Shi’is and Alevis in the region”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

27. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “current government”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “can realize the risk, as it needs to call its supporters to be sensible - otherwise Turkey will fall into the trap of sectarianism in domestic policy”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
ARTICLE: Israeli Press (BBC). “Israel's Hebrew press focuses on Obama defence of Iran nuclear deal.” 6 August 2015

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Israel's Hebrew press”
   iii. To whom: readers of Israeli press, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “focuses on Obama defence of Iran nuclear deal”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “US President Barack Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “defended the Iran nuclear deal now before Congress, accusing its opponents of "selling a fantasy"”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “agreement with Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “brought about an open rift between the Oval Office and the Prime Minister's Office in Jerusalem”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “respect”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “has vanished and what is left is suspect him squared”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “directed at Netanyahu several sharp arrows … defined
         those who proposed a better agreement as 'sellers of fantasy' and
         then marked the detractors of the agreement as 'ignorant or they do
         not speak the truth’”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Harsh words” [Obama]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “but not accidentally”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “wagon of the Agreement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “has set off”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Such moments”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “could turn a prime minister into a leader”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [Prime Minister]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “does not have to bless [the agreement], but do what his predecessors did”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “when there were disagreements with the White House”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “the personal channel with the president was kept”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [situation]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “fundamental Israeli interest”
c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “president”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “chose to appropriate for himself the legacy of the charismatic and loved John Kennedy and spoke to the nation and its legislators from the same podium on which President Kennedy stood on 10 June 1963 when he delivered his unforgettable ‘peace speech’”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, peace

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “analogy he created with his statements”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “sounded hollow”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “audience”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “audience got a familiar melody intended to ridicule his political opponents and at the same time scare the American public by drawing apocalyptic scenarios about what is expected as a result of Congress thwarting the presidential veto”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fear, fairness

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama the politician”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “called on the American people to apply pressure on its representatives in Congress to support the agreement”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety, trust

1. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Netanyahu's battle against the nuclear agreement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “has pushed Obama into a situation in which he must distinguish between the security interests of the United States and those of Israel, and clarify that they are not necessarily the same”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: [Obama]
   ii. What: “abrogation of my constitutional duty”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “to act against my best judgment simply because it causes temporary friction with a dear friend and ally … passed a clear message: Netanyahu crossed red lines in his battle against the Iran deal, when he grossly intervened in domestic American politics and tried to present himself as someone who knows America's interests better than the president of the United States”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “wild applause from the audience following that Sentence”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “small example of the serious problem Israel finds itself in”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “President Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “has taken to attacking its opponents in personal ways”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to ad hominem

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [Obama]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “accused critics of his deal of being the same republican war mongers who drove us into the ground war against Iraq and has warned that they would offer 'overheated' and often dishonest arguments”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, ad hominem, trust

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [Obama]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “complained about the influence of lobbyists and money on the process of deciding this important issue”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
      ii. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “These types of ad hominem arguments”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “becoming less and less convincing as more democratic members of Congress, more liberal supporters of the president, more nuclear experts and more foreign policy gurus are expressing deep concern, and sometimes strong opposition to the deal that is currently before Congress”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “President”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “would be well advised to stop attacking his critics and to start answering their hard questions with specific and credible answers”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
ii. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

1. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Military Intelligence Research Department and the Mossad”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “provided senior decision makers with assessment based on analysing the agreement between the five powers plus the EU and Iran, according to which what we have here is a reasonable, even good agreement which includes the means that will deny Iran nuclear weapons in the coming decade”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
      ii. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Quarrel and strife”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “will not assist in filling Israel weapons' stores”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “prime minister”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “had not chosen to enter discreet discourse opposite the US administration on the required package of compensation and assistance to secure Israel's security”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
ii. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to safety

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “hinted to this in his speech”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Wars in the Middle East”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “are everything, but an expected scenario”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Netanyahu”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “should show restraint”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
      ii. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

1. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “speech to the nation”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “an expression of the pressure in which President Obama is in”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “In the eyes of many”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “many, there are sellers only for the agreement he reached”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “United States”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “understand that the deal with Iran is diplomatic deception … those who signed it did not read it and are not familiar with many documents that are supposed to constitute means of supervising and implementing it”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “When US Jews act out of concern for Israel”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “they do not put their loyalty to the test”
c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

ii. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iranian nuke”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “no doubt that this is also the American interest”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
      ii. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to safety

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [situation]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “it is possible to change the grave reality which the agreement puts before the world”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
      ii. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to safety
ARTICLE: Jerusalem Post (BBC). “Former Israeli spy chief raps Netanyahu handling of Iran deal.” 7 September 2015

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Former Israeli spy chief”
   iii. To whom: readers of BBC, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “raps Netanyahu handling of Iran deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Former Mossad chief Meir Dagan”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “criticized the Israeli government's handling of the Iranian nuclear threat … Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu was only serving to alienate the Jewish State from the United States and its president, Barack Obama”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: “Dagan”
   ii. What: [situation]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “strategic decision by Israel to adopt a policy against the United States”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “problem”
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “is Iran, not President Obama”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “conflict”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “reaching to places that I think are against the interest of Israel and against the interests of the United States”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Dagan”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “frequent critic of Netanyahu and has publicly voiced disagreement with his approach to the Iranian nuclear threat”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
   i. Who: [Dagan]
   ii. What: [opinion]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “I'm not representing the state of Israel and I'm not sharing the point of view of my prime minister, to be honest. It's not a secret”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “long approach against the United States”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “it's time to end”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Dagan”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “harshly criticized Netanyahu's speech to US Congress”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “seen watching the speech while using harsh, blunt language to describe some of the claims made by the prime minister”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “When Netanyahu said that Iran could sprint to a nuclear device in less than a year”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “Dagan said that the assessment was "bullshit."”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
   i. Who: [Dagan]
   ii. What: [situation]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “"It will take more time than that”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “former Mossad chief”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “ridiculed Netanyahu's assertion that Iran posed a threat to the United States”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
   i. Who: “Dagan”
   ii. What: “Iranian missiles”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. quotes: “will never be able to hit the United States”

c. values
   i. prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom
ARTICLE: Israeli press (BBC). “Israel's Hebrew press discusses fears of Iranian-Russian "coalition."” 31 August 2015

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Israel's Hebrew press”
   iii. To whom: readers of Israeli press (BBC), internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “discusses fears of Iranian-Russian "coalition."”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “US President Barack Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “called for a more civil debate over the Iran nuclear deal … shares their concerns about Iran's threats to Israel but that ensuring a nuclear-free Iran was the most important objective”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust, safety
2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “passionately defended the Iran nuclear arms deal”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “undoubtedly qualified to argue that the Iran deal enhances US security, how can he say the same about Israel's security when its elected leaders and a strong consensus on both the Right and the Left see things very differently”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “tone of debate between Israel and the USA, between American Jews and between Democrats and Republicans surrounding the Iran deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “has turned too vitriolic”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [Israeli press]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “We join Obama's call for more civility”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “US and Israeli policy concerning Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “US and Israeli policy concerning Iran will realign 'pretty quick’”

c. Values
7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “after the Iran deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “There is life”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
**ARTICLE:** *The Moscow Times*, Moscow (BBC). “Russian pundit says no S-300 deal with Iran deal on the horizon.” 20 April 2015

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Russian pundit”
   iii. To whom: readers of the *Moscow Times* (BBC), internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “no S-300 deal with Iran deal on the horizon”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Observers”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “interpreted President Vladimir Putin's recent decision to lift the ban on shipping Russia's S-300 air defence systems to Iran as a sign that the Kremlin intends to immediately deliver those weapons”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [observers]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “they forget that delivery is anything but certain”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “fact”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “no such decision has been made, and in all likelihood, will never be made”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “contract signed in 2007”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “cannot simply be reactivated”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “weapons systems that Russia built to fulfil the 2007 contract”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “no longer physically exist”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “permissible storage period”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “expired long ago, and keeping them in usable condition would have required a major investment that neither the manufacturer nor the Russian government was willing to pay”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “raised the question of what to do with the weapons”

Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “Russian armed forces could not use them”

Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Same
   ii. What: “Russia”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “decided to dismantle the weapons intended for Iran and use them for parts”

Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “legal status of the transaction”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “has also changed”

Values
i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “demanding not only delivery of the weapons – for which it had already made partial payment - but also that Moscow pay a penalty of 4bn dollars for breach of contract”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “the two sides”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “will have to draft a new contract, while at the same time searching for a resolution to Iran's demands that Russian pay a hefty penalty”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “some reports”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “no longer in production”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Moscow”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “will offer Tehran either the S-300VM Antey system or the newer S-400”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “backlog of several years on foreign and domestic orders”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “unlikely that the weapon will appear in Iran anytime soon”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: [Russian weapons in Iran]
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “not the main concern”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “problem”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “Moscow cannot be certain Iran even wants to purchase Russian air defence systems, or any Russian weapons for that matter”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
18. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Russia”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “twice unilaterally terminated military and technical cooperation with Iran”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “decision to back out of the deal in 1996”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “stemmed from the country's extremely weak political and economic condition at the time”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “the anti-Iran demarche in 2009”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “far more opportunistic and cynical”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

21. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Moscow”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
1. Quotes: “buckled under the usual pressure from the United States and Israel, but also naively fell into a trap set by Saudi Arabia”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

22. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Riyadh”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “promised to purchase 10bn dollars in Russian weapons if Moscow would use its vote on the UN Security Council to support sanctions”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

23. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Saudi Arabia”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “retracting its promise to buy hundreds of Russian tanks and helicopters in a pointedly humiliating manner”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

24. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “every reason not to trust the Kremlin, and not to make the same mistake a third time”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

25. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “alternatives to Russian weapons”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “have appeared on the market in recent years”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

26. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Iran”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “developing its own defence industry as well”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

27. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “result”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Defense
   1. Quotes: “if Russia has not already lost the Iranian market, it hardly enjoys a privileged position there”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

28. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “the project for Moscow to supply Iran with air defence systems”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Defense
   1. Quotes: “will be a difficult and problematic process that will require years to bring to fruition”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
ARTICLE: Palestinian press (BBC). “Israel's Hebrew press ponders Russia's role in Syria, support for Iran deal.” 8 September 2015

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Israel's Hebrew press”
   iii. To whom: readers of Israeli press, readers of Palestinian press, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “ponders Russia's role in Syria, support for Iran deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Israelis”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “naturally worried about the future”
   ii. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “reasons for hope as well…”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Sunni Arab states led by Saudi Arabia”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “likely to turn even more to Israel for an alliance against Shi'i Iran … growing chance that a pro-Israel Republican could win the 2016 presidential election and undo much of the Iran deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
1. Rationale: appeal to safety

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Israel”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “by far the strongest power in the Middle East … strong
         First World economy … strong, if often frenzied, democratic
         regime and accompanying legitimacy”
   ii. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Third World Iran's economy, as a petro state, is at a
         pitiful … Iran is highly corrupt and its elections pseudo-democratic
         at best”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [situation]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “much about which to be concerned - and even more that
         gives hope to Israel in the years to come”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Turkish press”
   iii. To whom: readers of the Turkish press (BBC), internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “discusses Iran nuclear deal, coalition talks.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “great benefits for Turkey”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “economic relations between the two countries”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “rescued from the limitations caused by the sanctions against Iran”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “country that benefits most from that will be Turkey”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “material and non-material burden caused by the Syrian refugees”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “reaching unbearable levels”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “possibility of a political solution in Syria”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “might give Ankara the opportunity to return to the foreign policy conducted before 2011 and summarized by the motto ‘zero problems with neighbours’”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Turkey”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “not managed to escape the accusations that it helps ISIS, the anti-ISIS international front has become much stronger after the deal achieved with Iran”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “this case”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “unnecessary to ask the permanent members of the Security Council who they will trust most on fighting against ISIS - Iran or Turkey”

  c. Values
     i. Prudence
        1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Turkey's policy that foresees the toppling of Asad through military means”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “has been totally Undermined”

  c. Values
     i. Prudence
        1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “increased the probability of finding a diplomatic and political solution for the Syria crisis”

  c. Values
     i. Prudence
        1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “isolation into which Turkey has fallen”
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “will be much more visible than before”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “has allowed Iran to legitimize its armament of the region with weapons other than nuclear ones”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “uranium enrichment activities that are not banned but limited”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “From now on, anyone can set up a nuclear centrifuge, enrich uranium and have nuclear arms technology”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “hope that the world”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “will not one day name this deal among the reasons for the start of a nuclear war”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
1. D  
   i. Who: same  
   ii. What: “strengthening of the Iranian economy”  
   iii. To whom: same  
   iv. How: same  

b. FTC  
   i. Acclaim  
      1. Quotes: “will increase the trade volume with Turkey”  

c. Values  
   i. Prudence  
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom  

2. D  
   i. Who: same  
   ii. What: “Iran”  
   iii. To whom: same  
   iv. How: same  

b. FTC  
   i. Attack  
      1. Quotes: “arena, might nullify Turkey's policies in these regions, whose goals are not properly thought out”  

c. Values  
   i. Prudence  
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom  

3. D  
   i. Who: same  
   ii. What: “a new game”  
   iii. To whom: same  
   iv. How: same  

b. FTC  
   i. Acclaim  
      1. Quotes: “roles will be re-assigned”  

c. Values  
   i. Prudence  
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom  

4. D  
   i. Who: same  
   ii. What: “Turkey”  
   iii. To whom: same  
   iv. How: same  

b. FTC  
   i. Acclaim  
      1. Quotes: “must be ready for these”  

c. Values
5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “foreign policy era based on ideological and personal preferences/desires”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “is coming to an end”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “AKP-HDP [pro-Kurdish leftist alliance] talks”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “not focused on coalition at all”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “[Kurdish] solution process”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “was discussed”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [talks]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “attempts to melt the ice between the parties”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “known”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “President [Recep Tayyip Erdogan] does not view positively the AKP making a coalition with the CHP [Republican People's Party];” “opposed to it”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “if politics cannot solve [the coalition crisis]”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “then the nation will solve it [through an early election] '... He wants them to go to the nation”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “result that came out of yesterday's AKP-HDP meeting”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “not surprising”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “HDP”
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “wants the AKP and the CHP to make a coalition and itself to be the chief who evaluates the record of this Government … calculating about the votes that it can receive from the CHP base at the next election [after the CHP is weakened by its time in government].”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
      1. D
         i. Who: same
         ii. What: “first round of talks”
         iii. To whom: same
         iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “has ended”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
      1. D
         i. Who: same
         ii. What: “prime minister”
         iii. To whom: same
         iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “wants to form a coalition”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
      1. D
         i. Who: same
         iii. To whom: same
         iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “wants to be in the coalition”
   c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “MHP [Nationalist Movement Party] and the HDP”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “offers an AKP-CHP coalition”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “if you ask whether I am hopeful for an AKP-CHP coalition”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “I am not.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “The pointer”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “seems to be closer to an early election and a caretaker government formed by the AK Party”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Turkish Islamic daily”
   iii. To whom: readers of Zaman website (BBC), internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “praises US president’s handling”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Winston Churchill”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “once famously said, "To jaw-jaw is always better than to war-war."

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Barack Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “made clear that he would challenge the traditional norms of American foreign policy”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Hillary Clinton”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “trying hard to prove how tough she would be with the enemies of the United States”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

d. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Obama made clear he would be willing to talk to them”

e. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “on the top of his list”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “already voted against the war in Iraq”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [Obama]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “knew the risks and costs of wars”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “his opponents” [Obama]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “accused him of being a naive pacifist, he cleverly argued that the Iraq war, which Clinton had voted for and supported, helped Iran to establish political supremacy over Baghdad”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “War”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “always produced unintended consequences”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “such a position”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “very risky and bold one”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “deal”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “finally done”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “delivered on his promise”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patient hard work

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama's determination to prioritize nuclear non-proliferation over America's involvement in other Middle Eastern conflicts”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “main reason why this deal became possible”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “talks with Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “trumped the civil war in Syria.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
   i. Who: same
ii. What: “Obama”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “rightly believed that any direct military involvement to
topple the Assad regime would have jeopardized nuclear talks.”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “answer”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “should be clearer now”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Obama's Iran-first strategy”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “paid off”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Iran deal”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “will be heavily scrutinized by sceptics”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
18. D
   i. Who: same  
   ii. What: “makes sense”  
   iii. To whom: same  
   iv. How: same  

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim  
      1. Quotes: “to reserve judgment and see how the administration explains the clauses of the agreement”

c. Values
   i. Prudence  
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
   i. Who: same  
   ii. What: “number of observations”  
   iii. To whom: same  
   iv. How: same  

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim  
      1. Quotes: “possible now”

c. Values
   i. Prudence  
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

20. D
   i. Who: same  
   ii. What: “outcome”  
   iii. To whom: same  
   iv. How: same  

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim  
      1. Quotes: “appears largely consistent with the framework agreement announced on April 2”

c. Values
   i. Prudence  
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

21. D
   i. Who: same  
   ii. What: “most important achievements of the framework”  
   iii. To whom: same  
   iv. How: same  

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim  
      1. Quotes: “remain intact”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

22. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “agreement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “most likely be remembered as the most important foreign policy achievement of the Obama presidency”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

23. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Historians”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “a different, more hawkish, American administration could have intervened in Syria and prioritized bringing peace and quiet to this country rather than engaging in nuclear diplomacy in Iran.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

24. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “unknown”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “whether an intervention in Syria and nuclear talks with Iran could have happened simultaneously”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
25. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Ankara”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would have preferred such a strategy”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

26. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Arab Gulf States and particularly Saudi Arabia and Qatar”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “preferred a stronger American military involvement in Syria”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

27. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “proved to be very cautious and did not want to take such risks”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

28. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [Obama]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “believed America's direct military involvement against Damascus would have jeopardized nuclear talks with Iran”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

29. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “took serious risks with both Saudi Arabia and Israel by pursuing talks with Iran”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

30. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “White House”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “did not lose its strategic patience and managed to continue the nuclear talks with Iran despite serious interventions from Israel to the American domestic political process”

c. Values
   i. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patient hard work, resisting negative pressures
I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “bad deal”
   iii. To whom: readers of USA Today, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “bad deal will bring war”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “talks to rein in Iran's nuclear program”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Israel prevailed upon negotiators to harden the deal to avert war.”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
2. D
   i. Who: Same
   ii. What: “Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “convince the Kremlin that any deal should force Iran to abide by U.N. Security Council demands it end its enrichment of uranium”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Netanyahu”
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “maintaining economic sanctions imposed on Iran to force it to open up its nuclear program to inspections and to stop ongoing construction”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
4. D
   i. Who: [Netanyahu]
   ii. What: “if they refuse”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “increase sanctions”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “options”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “not a bad deal or war … There is a third option: Keep the pressure up; in fact, increase the pressure”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
6. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “stakes”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “are high”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “a nuclear Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “threat to its existence and it will launch a military strike if necessary to stop it”
   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “has held firm, insisting its program is peaceful and that it has the right to pursue it”
   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “will calm the Middle East and improve the odds of a better future deal”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “President Obama”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same
    b. FTC
       i. Attack
1. Quotes: “asked U.S. senators to hold off on their intention to propose tougher sanctions”

c. Values
   i. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patience

11. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “U.S.”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “proposing to ease sanctions without getting proper assurances that Iran will end its nuclear program”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “sanctions amendments”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will not be any sanctions amendments added before Thanksgiving but that legislators from both parties want to propose them, anyway”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “deal”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “is defective”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
ii. What: “United States”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “cannot allow Iran to continue to advance toward a nuclear weapons capability while at the same time providing relief from the sanctions pressure we worked so hard to build”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “Iran”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “already has five bombs' worth of lower enriched uranium and could convert it in a matter of weeks to weapons-grade uranium”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “bad deal”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “that lets Iran off the hook will lead to the military option that the world is trying to avoid”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. D
i. Who: “Kerry”
ii. What: “judgment”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
i. Defense
   1. Quotes: “Nothing that we are doing here, in my judgment, will put
      Israel at any additional risk … In fact, let me make this clear: We
      believe it reduces risk”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

18. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “United States”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
   
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “negotiating with France, England, Germany, China and
         Russia over Iran’s nuclear program”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “details of the deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Netanyahu has suggested that Kerry is prepared to accept
         a deal that allows Iran to keep intact its machinery and facilities for
         making nuclear weapon fuel.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “deal”
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “first step" in broader negotiations to curtail Iran's nuclear program

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

21. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Israel"
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “not the only party urging caution"

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

22. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “France"
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “scuttled the negotiations early this month when it said they were headed toward a deal that would not guarantee the safety of the region”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety, fairness
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

23. D
   i. Who: Same
   ii. What: “[French] government”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “will maintain sanctions and pressure against Iran until he is certain that it has renounced a suspected nuclear weapons program”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

24. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “sanctions”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “should not be removed in return for half-measures by Iran”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

25. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “resolution”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will introduce a resolution in the Senate that defines what Iran must do first”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

26. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “any interim deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
1. Quotes: “a mistake, a terrible mistake, a historic error”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

27. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “What Israel wants from Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Suspension of uranium enrichment. Halt production and installation of additional centrifuges. Transfer uranium enriched to 20% or higher to another country. Halt construction of plutonium reactors in Arak, Iran.”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iran deal”
   iii. To whom: readers of USA Today, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “leaves Arab fears intact”
   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety
      ii. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “will alter the Middle East dramatically”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: “Abdullah al-Askar, chairman of Saudi Arabia's appointed Shoura Council”
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “will give up something to get something else from the big powers in terms of regional politics -- and I'm worrying about giving Iran more space or a freer hand in the region”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
ii. What: “government of Iran”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “has an ugly agenda in the region, and in this regard no one in the region will sleep and assume things are going smoothly”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
4. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Western governments and the allies of Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “praised the deal as walking the world back from a possible military confrontation”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Arab countries whose rulers belong to the Sunni Muslim sect”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “There was silence”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patience
6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “blunt on his opinion”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: “Netanyahu”
   ii. What: “What was reached in Geneva”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “not a historic agreement, it is a historic mistake”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

8. D
   i. Who: “President Obama”
   ii. What: “United States”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement
b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “will remain firm in our commitment to Israel, which has
good reason to be skeptical about Iran's intentions”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to courage

9. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “differences over the two sides' understanding of the deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Less than a day after the deal was made”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “Iran President Hassan Rouhani”
    iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “crowed Sunday that the deal recognizes Tehran's "right" to enrich uranium”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Secretary of State John Kerry”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “said it does not”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Members of Congress”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “pushing to strengthen economic sanction against Iran over its program -- said they would hold off”
c. Values
   i. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patience
13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Critics”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “deal does not freeze or force a rollback of Iran's production of nuclear fuel, as several United Nations Security Council resolutions have demanded”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “can continue to enrich uranium”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Secretary of State John Kerry”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

   b. FTC
      i. Defense
         1. Quotes: “this is the first stage … will also be even more consequential”

   c. Values
      i. Temperance
         1. Rationale: appeal to patience
      ii. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “agreed to put a cap on its nuclear program and give international inspectors greater access”

   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

17. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: same  

b. FTC  
i. Acclaim  
   1. Quotes: “agreed to stop producing medium-enriched uranium”  

c. Values  
i. Justice  
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness  

18. D  
i. Who: same  
ii. What: “the West”  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: same  

b. FTC  
i. Acclaim  
   1. Quotes: “agreed to provide Iran about $7 billion in relief on sanctions”  

c. Values  
i. Justice  
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety, trust  

19. D  
i. Who: same  
ii. What: “Other Middle East analysts”  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: same  

b. FTC  
i. Attack  
   1. Quotes: “concern across the Middle East that the most worrying result is that it looks as if the United States is retreating from its traditional role as the guarantor of security in the region.”  

c. Values  
i. Prudence  
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom  

20. D  
i. Who: same  
ii. What: [other middle east analysts]  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: same  

b. FTC  
i. Attack  
   1. Quotes: “leaving Iran a threshold nuclear nation that can race across the weapons line in a matter of weeks or months means
Israel and the Sunni nations must look more to each other to defend against Iran”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

21. D
   i. Who: “Michael Doran, who served as a Middle East adviser to President George W. Bush”
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “announced that the United States cannot be relied upon to stand up to Iran … Israel and our Arab allies will be forced to live by their wits”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust, safety

22. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Countries across the Middle East”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “now more likely to invest in nuclear programs of their own, form new alliances and reorient their policies to accommodate Iranian rather than American interests”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

23. D
   i. Who: “Nadim Shehadeh of the Royal Institute of International Affairs”
   ii. What: “Iran's bottom line”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Attack
1. Quotes: “will it will trade its nuclear capability with the recognition of its hegemony over the region … Saudi-Iranian tensions and (tensions in) the broader Gulf region increase”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

24. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Saudis”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “most alarmed by the potential U.S.-Iran detente and the rise of an unrestrained Iran”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

25. D
   i. Who: [Nadim Shehadeh of the Royal Institute of International Affairs]
   ii. What: “Further Saudi-Iranian antagonism”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “will lead to major sectarian escalation with incalculable price for the region”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety

26. D
   i. Who: “Prof. Avraham Diskin, a political scientist at Hebrew University in Jerusalem”
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “not a threat only to Israel; it is a threat to the whole world and especially to the Middle East”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety

27. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Shiite country and very much interested in dominating the area while most of the region is dominated by Sunni regimes that are relatively open to the West … although not progressive toward human rights”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

28. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “These regimes”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “feel threatened and, like Israel, have a very strong interest in blocking Iran's potential nuclear military capabilities”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

29. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iran's Arab neighbors in the Gulf and Egypt”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Attack
1. Quotes: “may not sit and wait” to see if Iran abides by the agreement

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

30. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Jordan, Israel and the Sunni monarchies in the Persian Gulf”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “see the deal as the world letting Iran continue its nuclear work while pursuing its ambition of becoming the region's dominant power”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

31. D
   i. Who: “Danielle Pletka, a Middle East analyst at the American Enterprise Institute”
   ii. What: “The Saudis, Kuwaitis, emiratis, Jordanians”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “looking at the United States, which has been their security umbrella, and they have a dawning understanding like the Israelis that America no longer has their back”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety, trust

32. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Saudis”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will seek nuclear capability for themselves, and "it's not ridiculous to assume" there may be a domino effect across the region of countries seeking nuclear weapons … that applies for Turkey as well”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “U.S. and Iran”
   iii. To whom: readers of USA Today, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “back at the nuke negotiating table in Geneva”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patience

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “U.S. and Iranian negotiators”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “sought to break a logjam over Iran's disputed nuclear program”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patience

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Deputy Secretary of State William Burns, top U.S. Iran negotiator Wendy Sherman and members of the White House national security staff”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Participating in the five-hour meeting”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
ii. Temperance
   1. Rationale: appeal to patience

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “talks”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “to continue all day”

c. Values
   i. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patience

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “latest round of meetings”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “comes after last month's sessions ended with negotiators far apart on the key issue of the eventual size of Iran's uranium enrichment program”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “All sides”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “scheduled to meet again in a week in Vienna, with hope of meeting a July 20 deadline for a comprehensive agreement”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “plans to build facilities for 100,000 centrifuges to produce it themselves”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

7. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: same
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “its nuclear program is for power generation, research and medical purposes”
ii. Attack
   1. Quotes: “a claim doubted by the West”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

8. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “U.S. negotiators”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “pushing for as few as 4,000 Iranian centrifuges because the machines can also be used to produce fuel for weapons”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
ii. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “the makeup of the U.S. negotiating team and Iran's official attitude about the talks”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “show both sides are serious about reaching a deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “In Israel, the country's chief military intelligence analyst”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “a deal is looking more likely”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
   ii. What: “Iran and the world powers”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “moving toward the signing, sometime during the year, of a permanent nuclear deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom


I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “deal”
   iii. To whom: readers of USA Today, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “may allow nuclear program”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “emerging deal with Iran over its nuclear program”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “unlikely to satisfy lawmakers who seek to end Iran's ability to develop a nuclear weapon”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “U.S. diplomats”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “met Wednesday in Vienna with representatives of Iran and other world powers to write the text of a deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama administration”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “may allow an Iranian nuclear program that retains the capability to produce a weapon.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: “Mark Dubowitz of the Foundation for Defense of Democracies”
   ii. What: “Iranians”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will have some kind of (uranium) enrichment capacity”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. d
   i. who: author
   ii. what: “any deal”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would increase inspections and monitoring, along with the number of inspectors in Iran and the number of places they can go”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

6. D
   i. Who: [Jofi Joseph, former director for non-proliferation in Obama's National Security Council]
   ii. What: [deal items]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would significantly reduce the chance of Iran acquiring a nuclear weapon”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

7. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “backs several terrorist organizations in the Middle East”
   ii. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “the world's fourth-largest oil reserves and second-largest natural gas reserves”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran's leaders”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “say its nuclear program is for power generation”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “increasing Iran's "breakout period" -- the time it would take to produce enough nuclear fuel for one bomb -- from two months to six to 12 months”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would be a significant accomplishment”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
    i. Who: “John Kerry”
    ii. What: “what we’d settle for”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: interview
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “not saying”
c. values
   i. prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. d
    i. who: author
    ii. what: “a six-to-12-month window”
iii. to whom: same
iv. how: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would give the United States more time to discover any
duplicit, and mobilize to stop it if Iran cheated on a deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “whether such an agreement would satisfy Israel or U.S. senators,
both Republicans and Democrats”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “signed onto a bill that would increase sanctions on Iran
unless it agrees to much greater limitations”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: "Iran nuke talks"
   iii. To whom: readers of USA Today, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “teeter”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iranian and U.S. negotiators”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “meet today for a new round of talks over a nuclear program that Iranian leaders are vowing to keep despite a threat from the U.S. Senate of harsh sanctions should the talks fail”

  c. Values
     i. Fortitude
        1. Rationale: appeal to courage

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama administration”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “said the negotiations in Vienna will lead to a pact that would curtail Iran's ability to convert nuclear fuel to atomic weapons fuel”

  c. Values
     i. Prudence
        1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
     ii. Justice
        1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
3.  D
   i.  Who: same
   ii. What: “Israel”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv.  How: same

b.  FTC
   i.  Acclaim
       1. Quotes: “threatened to attack Iran's nuclear facilities if negotiations do not prevent Iran from being able to build a bomb”

c.  Values
   i.  Justice
       1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

4.  D
   i.  Who: same
   ii.  What: “Britain, France, Russia, China and Germany”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv.  How: same

b.  FTC
   i.  Acclaim
       1. Quotes: “also participating in the talks”

c.  Values
   i.  Prudence
       1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5.  D
   i.  Who: same
   ii.  What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv.  How: same

b.  FTC
   i.  Acclaim
       1. Quotes: “agreed to limit some of its technology in an initial agreement in November, it has since said it will not roll back centrifuges that can enrich uranium into bomb material, nor will it abandon a plutonium plant project in Arak or open up for full inspection a secret plant in Fordow”

c.  Values
   i.  Justice
       1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

6.  D
   i.  Who: same
   ii.  What: “hard stands”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv.  How: same
b. FTC  
i. Acclaim  
1. Quotes: “come as a majority in the U.S. Senate is unified behind a bill that would impose harsh sanctions on Iran if it fails to curtail its program”

c. Values  
i. Justice  
1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

7.  
D  
i. Who: “Sen. Mark Kirk, R-Ill”  
ii. What: “Iran's supreme leader be able to wake up one day, kick out inspectors and race to the bomb”  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: public statement

b. FTC  
i. Acclaim  
1. Quotes: “No' should be the only acceptable answer”

c. Values  
i. Justice  
1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

8.  
D  
i. Who: author  
ii. What: “any pact”  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: author language

b. FTC  
i. Acclaim  
1. Quotes: “must have a clear goal of ending the nuclear program that is in violation of United Nations resolutions calling for Iran to suspend all nuclear enrichment”

c. Values  
i. Justice  
1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

9.  
D  
i. Who: same  
ii. What: “President Obama”  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: same

b. FTC  
i. Acclaim  
1. Quotes: “trying to prevent the bill from coming to a vote,”

ii. Attack
1. Quotes: “saying it would anger the Iranians into walking away from negotiations”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “U.S.”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “must pursue negotiations to determine how much Iran is willing to concede with its nuclear program”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
    i. Who: [Jofi Joseph, former director for non-proliferation for the White House National Security Council]
    ii. What: [negotiators]
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “do not know today where Iran's ultimate bottom lines rest”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
    i. Who: author
    ii. What: “if Iran's nuclear program is for peaceful purposes as it claims”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “then it "does not need" a fortified underground enrichment facility”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. **D**
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “testimony”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. **FTC**
   i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “worthless”

c. **Values**
   i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. **D**
   i. Who: “Iran's chief negotiator, Mohammad Javad Zarif”
   ii. What: “Iran's nuclear technology”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. **FTC**
   i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “non-negotiable and comments about Iran's nuclear facilities are worthless”

c. **Values**
   i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
   ii. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Nuclear talks”
   iii. To whom: readers of *USA Today*, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “spotlight Iran’s enmity with west”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “nation's authoritarian regime”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “must decide if it wants to remain in conflict or engage with the West”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “10 years of international negotiations with Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “reaching "the hours of truth."”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: “German Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier”
   ii. What: “if Iran is really ready to renounce every research development it's working on in the direction of getting a nuclear weapon”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “remains a question … the only criterion”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety

4. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Negotiators”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “remain deadlocked on the size of Iran's program for producing fuel that can be used in reactors or bombs, and on when to lift sanctions”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: “President Obama”
   ii. What: “goal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “to shut off a whole bunch of different avenues whereby Iran might get a nuclear weapon, and at the same time make sure that the structure of sanctions are rolled back, step for step, as Iran is doing what it's supposed to do”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

6. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iran's nuclear weapons program”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “view as a guarantee against external and internal threats”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety

7. D
   i. Who: “Reuel Marc Gerecht, a former CIA operative who's now an Iran analyst at the Foundation for Defense of Democracies in Washington”
   ii. What: “U.S.”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “asking those three men to forsake their most valued child … If they were to agree to confess to past nuclear weapons research, provide access to scientists, (and) turn over all the paperwork, that would certainly suggest Khamenei has given up on his former identity”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who: “David Albright, a former U.N. weapons inspector who now heads the Institute for Science and International Security”
   ii. What: “Iranians”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “have to choose between isolation and engagement”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “extending Iran talks”
   iii. To whom: readers of USA Today, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “has benefits and risks”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “A second extension of talks to curb Iran's nuclear program”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “shows that Iran and world powers remain far apart on the key issues, yet both sides benefit from letting the negotiations continue”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iranians”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will gain an additional $700 million a month in released frozen assets as the talks continue”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “delay”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “gives Iran hope of further weakening sanctions that have punished its economy”

c. Values
i. Fortitude
   1. Rationale: appeal to hope

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran's economy”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “German exports to Iran increased in 2014 … modest recovery, and the nation is working on large trade deals with Russia and China”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “West”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “gains from a continuation of the talks because it is hoping Iran will eventually agree to nuclear curbs and cooperate in the U.S.-led war against Islamic State militants in Iraq and Syria”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Both sides”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “run risks from letting negotiations drag on”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “might not get a deal that will lift the onerous sanctions”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “West”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “risks allowing Iran to stall for time as it secretly grows a nuclear weapons program”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “If Iran were to join the nuclear weapons club”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “it could face military action from the United States or Israel”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “two sides”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “agreed to try to reach a final accord in seven months”

   c. Values
      i. Temperance
         1. Rationale: appeal to patience

11. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “talks”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “have already been extended once”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “Sanctions”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “imposed to force Iran to stop producing nuclear fuel that can power reactors or weapons, and to answer questions about suspected weapons development”

   ii. Defense
      1. Quotes: “Iran denies it is doing”

   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety
      ii. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “World powers”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “have been deadlocked with Iran on the size of Iran's program for producing nuclear fuel, and the timeline for removing sanctions”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Also at issue”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “whether Iran will fully explain its past nuclear activities as demanded by the United Nations Security Council”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “continuing talks”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “averts a stark choice for President Obama, who has pledged to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D
   i. Who: “Reuel Marc Gerecht, an Iran analyst at the Foundation for Defense of Democracies”
   ii. What: “choice”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “between surrender (to Iran) and military action”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
17. d
   i. who: author
   ii. what: “others”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: author language
b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “choice is not that stark”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. D
   ii. What: “either side”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “escalation (of tensions) as in their interest”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “U.S. Congress”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “likely to follow through on those threats when Republicans take control of the Senate”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “such a move”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
1. Quotes: “would shatter global unity on sanctions and cause the talks to collapse”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

21. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “prefers to extend the talks rather than accept a bad deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to justice
   iii. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patience

22. D
   i. Who: [Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu]
   ii. What: “The right deal that is needed”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “is to dismantle Iran's capacity to make atomic bombs and only then dismantle the sanctions … Since that's not in the offing, this result is better, a lot better”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: readers of the USA Today, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “firm as Iran nuke deadline set”
   c. Values
      i. Fortitude
         1. Rationale: Appeal to strength
      ii. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “President Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “clock starts ticking Jan. 20 on a six-month nuclear deal with Iran, calling it the best bet to deny Tehran the means to make nuclear weapons”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety
2. D
   i. who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “vowed to veto any congressional legislation that slaps new sanctions on Iran”
   ii. Attack
1. Quotes: “saying it would damage prospects for a long-term nuclear agreement”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Appeal to strength
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   iii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

3. D
   i. Who: “Obama”
   ii. What: “give[ing] diplomacy a chance to succeed”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “no illusions about how hard it will be to achieve this objective, but for the sake of our national security and the peace and security of the world, now is the time”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to stamina
   iii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety

4. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would restrict its uranium enrichment program in exchange for the loosening of economic sanctions that are crippling the Iranian economy”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “credited the sanctions with forcing Iran's leaders to the negotiating table”
c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
ii. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

6. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “the United States and its global partners”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “will negotiate the details of a long-term agreement to restrict Iran's nuclear program”
c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. rationale: appeal to wisdom
ii. justice
   1. rationale: appeal to fairness

7. d
i. who: same
ii. what: “Obama”
iii. to whom: same
iv. how: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “vowed to prevent Iran from securing the means to make nuclear weapons”
c. Values
i. Fortitude
   1. Rationale: appeal to strength
ii. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to safety

8. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Some congressional lawmakers”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “skeptical”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “proposed a new package of sanctions that have strong bipartisan support, despite opposition from Obama and his aides”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

10. D
    i. Who: “Obama”
    ii. What: “Imposing additional sanctions now”
    iii. To whom: Same
    iv. How: public statement
b. FTC
    i. Attack
       1. Quotes: “will only risk derailing our efforts to resolve this issue peacefully”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
    i. Who: author
    ii. What: “If Iran fails to live up to its commitments”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “new sanctions can be imposed and the suspended ones can be re-applied”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

12. D
   i. Who: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “fears the Obama administration's policies will lead to either a nuclear-armed Iran, or a pre-emptive military strike on Iran by Israel”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
   i. Who: “Sen. Mark Kirk, R-Ill.”
   ii. What: “administration”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “will give the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism billions of dollars while allowing the mullahs to keep their illicit nuclear infrastructure in place”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “new Iran sanctions bill”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “plan now has 59 of 100 senators as co-sponsors”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “noted that the temporary deal includes "new and more frequent inspections," to make sure Iran follows through on its pledges”

c. Values
   i. fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “easing sanctions”
   iii. To whom: readers of USA Today, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “a mistake”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “President Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “easing sanctions and delaying further sanctions in his six-month agreement with Iran over nuclear inspections is a deal with the devil”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “Iran”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “has a long history of misusing diplomacy to buy time to further its devious activities in gaining more power in the region”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran's nuclear development”
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: same

b. FTC  
i. Acclaim  
   1. Quotes: “much more dangerous than its previous assaults on Israel, and its advancement of power in Iraq, Syria and other Mideast nations”

c. Values  
i. Prudence  
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D  
i. Who: same  
ii. What: “a nuclear armed Iran”  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: same

b. FTC  
i. Acclaim  
   1. Quotes: “would work toward the annihilation of Israel”

c. Values  
i. Prudence  
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D  
i. Who: same  
ii. What: “Easing sanctions on Iran and threatening to veto increased sanctions on Iran by Congress”  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: same

b. FTC  
i. Attack  
   1. Quotes: “naïve”

c. Values  
i. Prudence  
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D  
i. Who: same  
ii. What: “Iran's false promise”  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: same

b. FTC  
i. Acclaim  
   1. Quotes: “will result in Iran developing a nuclear weapon”

c. Values  
i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Israel”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “knows it and will not allow Iran to do it”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “will accomplish will be an attack on Iran by Israel, the proliferation of war in the region, and increased national and global security threats.”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety
Decontextualization: title
1. Who: author
2. What: “choice”
3. To whom: readers of USA Today, internet searchers
4. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   1. Acclaim
      1. quotes: “continue Iran talks”
   c. values
      1. prudence
         1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

d: sentence one
1. who: same
2. what: “all parties”
3. to whom: same
4. how: same
b. FTC
   1. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “agreed to a four-month extension”
   c. Values
      1. prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
      2. Temperance
         1. Rationale: appeal to patience

2. D
1. Who: same
2. What: “game of delay”
3. To whom: same
4. How: same
b. FTC
   1. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “until Iran's leaders have what they want”
   c. Values
      1. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
1. Who: same
2. What: “Any agreement in which Iran abandons nuclear weapons”
3. To whom: same
4. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “would be an astounding achievement”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “agreement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “There will be no”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Negotiating”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “the one good thing we do in foreign policy”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “This kind of negotiation”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “has the potential to prevent a future nuclear war”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Sanctions”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “very rarely, if ever, work … waste of time”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Negotiating”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “has a chance of working if both sides take it seriously”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Sanctions”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “a step in the process of convincing people of our seriousness”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: same
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Maybe they won't work, but we need to try”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: [negotiators]
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “failed to meet the deadline … just keep extending it because there is nothing else we can do”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: [alternatives]
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “Maybe a harshly worded letter and give them the old "stink eye"”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “These countries”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “known for years that we have no teeth”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Negotiating with Iran to stop development of its nuclear program”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “exercise in futility”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will continue to pursue nuclear weapons until stopped by complete sanctions and military action if necessary”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “President Obama's drive to have a nuclear weapons-free world”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “is delusional”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “Agreeing to reduce our nuclear weapons”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. quotes: “deadly mistake”
c. Values
   i. prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: [Obama]
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “wants to reduce them further”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [USA]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “must retain the deterrent with overwhelming nuclear strength”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength

20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “America”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “much more vulnerable, and the world is less safe”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to faith, safety

21. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “secretary of State and the White House”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “being played for the fools they are”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

22. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “refusing to deal with problems”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Like the debt ceiling, what possible consequences”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

23. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [USA]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “keep your friends close, and your enemies closer”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

24. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [USA]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Are they serious? We have been delaying deadlines on this for years”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

25. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “taking a North Korean approach of delay”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

26. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Three strikes”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “and you are out would work”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

27. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Holding out a carrot to Iran by pushing back the deadline without imposing stronger sanctions”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “encourages it to develop nuclear weapons”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

28. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Pushing back the deadline”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “dangerous children who own dangerous toys … mistake”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “progress in Iran talks”
   iii. To whom: readers of USA Today, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “makes extension worthwhile”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “negotiations to end a uniquely menacing threat”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “have percolated quietly, making progress that just a few months ago seemed far beyond reach”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “those talks”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will continue”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope
   ii. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patience

3. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “all parties”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “agreed to an extension”

c. Values
i. Fortitude
   1. Rationale: appeal to hope

4. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Iran”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “will continue to allow intrusive inspections and receive
   minor relief from economic sanctions that are crippling the Iranian economy”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

5. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “extension”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “was expected”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “muted reaction of skeptics”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “telling”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “alarmist predictions that easing sanctions would be disastrous … dire warnings that Iran would cheat while negotiations continued”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “proved false”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “is complying”
   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “gone further, agreeing to alter the design of a key plutonium reactor and proposing to convert much of its bomb-grade uranium to a less dangerous form”
   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

10. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “None of this”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “an agreement will be reached”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “technical obstacles to a credible agreement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “daunting”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Hard-liners in Iran, Israel and the U.S. Congress”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “appear intent on scuttling any deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Members of Congress from both parties”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “have gone as far to say they will vote to tighten sanctions -- not loosen them -- unless Iran also gives up its missile program and abandons terrorism, neither of which is even a subject of the current negotiations”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

14. d
i. who: same
iii. to whom: same
iv. how: same
b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “criticized the extension of the talks”
ii. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “called for ratcheting up the economic pressure on Iran”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “moving ahead with new sanctions at this delicate point in the negotiations”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. defense
      1. Quotes: “would undoubtedly derail them”
c. Values
   i. prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “President Hassan Rouhani”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “faces powerful domestic opponents bent on holy war with the United States”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
17. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran's supreme leader”
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. attack
   1. quotes: “sent conflicting signals, first forsaking nuclear weapons, then last week saying Iran must retain a robust enrichment capability, ostensibly for energy generation.”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Any agreement in which Iran abandons nuclear weapons”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “would be an astounding achievement, one that could lead to a reassessment of the caustic United States-Iran relationship”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [agreement]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “would avoid a nearly certain nuclear arms race in the Middle East, not to mention an equally likely U.S. war with Iran prompted by an attack on Iran's nuclear facilities”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety

20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Success … rewards”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “remains against the odds … exceptionally high”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patience

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Netanyahu”
   iii. To whom: readers of USA Today, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “remains alone”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. what: “Israelis
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “interrupted their frenetic preparations for today's Purim holiday to watch Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's impassioned address to the U.S. Congress explaining the dangers of a nuclear deal with Iran”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope, strength
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “many”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “saw his speech Tuesday more as an attempt to woo Israeli voters in the elections March 17 than to persuade American lawmakers to oppose an agreement President Obama is negotiating with Iran”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust
ii. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: “Isaac Herzog, head of the Zionist Union Party and Netanyahu's main rival in the elections”
   ii. What: “that Netanyahu knows how to give a speech”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “no doubt”
   ii. Attack
      1. Quotes: “his speech will not stop the Iran deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “painful truth”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Netanyahu remains alone. And the negotiations with Iran will continue without any Israeli involvement”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

5. D
   i. Who: “Reuven Hazan, a political scientist at Hebrew University”
   ii. What: “speech”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “predominantly inspired by domestic political concerns and not necessarily Israel's security. It could have been delivered three weeks ago or two weeks from now”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust

6. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Netanyahu's speech”
iii. To whom; same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “broadcast on two TVs. The reaction varied widely among
      the diners”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Avi Marciano”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “warned that Israel "will pay the price" for Netanyahu's
      refusal to cancel the trip after Obama objected to it so close to the
      elections … Sometimes you have the right message, but if you
      deliver it the wrong way, it can come back to haunt you”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

8. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Ronit Vazana”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. quotes: “filled with pride" when U.S. lawmakers gave Netanyahu
      several standing ovations. "If our leaders don't protect us, who
      will?" she asked. "If something isn't done now, Iran will have
      nuclear weapons in a year or two”

c. values
i. fortitude
   1. rationale: appeal to hope
ii. prudence
   1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. d
i. who: same
ii. what: “Eric Gurevitz”
iii. to whom: same
iv. how: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “Netanyahu "was looking out for his own political interests," but he was pleased the prime minister went. "Any deal that doesn't take away Iran's nuclear weapons potential isn't good enough for us and shouldn't be good enough for the rest of the world”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Yoel Guzansky, an expert on Iran's nuclear program at the Institute for National Security Studies in Tel Aviv”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. attack
         1. Quotes: “what worries Israelis most is that Iran won't abide by any deal”
   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: readers of USA Today, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Vows to Stand by Gulf Allies Vs. Iran”

   c. Values
      i. Fortitude
         1. Rationale: appeal to faith

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “proposed nuclear deal with *Iran*”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “includes stringent inspections to make sure the Iranians do not pursue nuclear weapons in secret”

   c. Values
      i. Fortitude
         1. Rationale: appeal to faith

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “pledged to work with them to resist *Iran*'s "destabilization activities" throughout the region, nuclear deal or not”

   c. Values
      i. Fortitude
         1. Rationale: appeal to faith

3. D
   i. Who: “Obama”
   ii. What: “United States”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. quotes: “will **stand** by our (Arab) partners against external attacks”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. rationale: appeal to faith

4. d
   i. who: author
   ii. what: “topic of **Iran**”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “dominated **Obama**’s talks with the **Gulf** Cooperation Council”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “**Obama**”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “told his Arab partners that there would not be a reduction in sanctions until the Iranians prove they will comply with the agreement … pledged to work with other countries to resist Iranian aggression, but said he would also welcome a reformed **Iran** into the community of nations … reaffirmed the U.S.’ "iron-clad" commitment to the security of its **Gulf allies**, and will increase its defense assistance with more joint military exercises and stepped-up training … will also streamline the delivery of weapons systems, including missile defense technology, **Obama** said … called for new governments in Syria and Libya, pledged to help maintain the ceasefire in Yemen, and beat back violent extremism throughout the region … said the group agreed to hold a similar meeting next year”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to faith
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “**Iran**”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “still poses a threat to the region”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
ARTICLE: Dorell, O. (2015, Apr 01). Iran deal can't ensure 'no cheating'. USA Today Retrieved from https://search.proquest.com/docview/1668019111?accountid=26417

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iran deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “can't ensure 'no cheating’”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “deal under discussion”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “lacks guarantees that Iran won't secretly try to develop nuclear weapons … conclusion of supporters and opponents of a deal, based on Iran's refusal to give inspectors unfettered access to every suspected nuclear site … argument made by critics, such as Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, who says Iran can't be trusted to pursue only a peaceful program”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope/faith

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Supporters of an agreement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “acknowledge that tough monitoring requirements may prove less than airtight to prevent cheating, but they say a deal is better than no inspections.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: “Robert Einhorn, a former State Department adviser for non-proliferation and arms control in the Obama administration”
ii. What: “No verification system”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: interview

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “s going to give you 100% confidence there is no cheating”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “Iran”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. attack
   1. Quotes: “refused to discuss past weapons work, leaving the world in the dark about where it may have conducted secret research and whether it has hidden processing equipment or nuclear fuel”

c. Values
i. fortitude
   1. Rationale: appeal to hope/faith

5. D
i. Who: “Olli Heinonen, former deputy director of the United Nations nuclear watchdog, the International Atomic Energy Agency”
ii. What: “What Iran needs to do at this point”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: interview

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “come forward with a comprehensive statement about its past program”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
ii. Justice
   1. Rationale; appeal to trust

6. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “negotiations”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “could continue beyond Tuesday's deadline if "talks continue to be productive.”

   c. Values
      i. Fortitude
         1. Rationale: appeal to hope

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “United States, Britain, France, Russia, China and Germany”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “seek a completed deal by June 30”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “wants sanctions that have crippled its economy lifted”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale; appeal to fairness

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “world powers”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “want limits that would ensure Iran's nuclear program is solely for peaceful purposes, as it claims”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust, safety

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Dissident group”
   iii. To whom: readers of USA Today, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “group alleges secret nuke site in Iran”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “An Iranian dissident group”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “accused Tehran on Tuesday of hiding a secret nuclear facility even as U.S. negotiators signaled they’re ready to make a concession to reach a deal with Iran on its disputed nuclear program”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “National Council of Resistance of Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “showed satellite imagery and photographs of what it said was a secret facility buried several stories under a military base on the outskirts of Tehran”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “facility”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “protected by vault-like doors and anti-radiation shielding, is used for research and development, and advanced machinery produces enriched uranium”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “secrecy of the program and its underground location”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “signs that its purpose is "for a nuclear weapons project”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Soona Samsami”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “called on the United States to demand that Iran provide the United Nations nuclear watchdog agency immediate access to the site”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
   i. Who: “Soona Samsami”
   ii. What: “If the USA is serious about preventing the Iranian regime from getting nuclear weapons”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “must make continuing talks dependent on letting the IAEA (International Atomic Energy Agency) to immediately visit this site”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
ii. Justice
   1. rationale: appeal to safety

7. d
   i. who; author
   ii. what: “NCRI's allegations”
   iii. to whom; same
   iv. how: author language
b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “could not be confirmed, and U.S. officials did not respond to requests for comment”
c. Values
   i. prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “United States and other Western nations”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “cited evidence that Iran has harbored a secret weapons program”
   ii. defense
      1. Quotes: “but Iran denies it”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety, trust

9. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “new allegations”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “come a day after U.S. negotiators meeting with their Iranian counterparts in Geneva said they had discussed a major U.S. concession”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
    i. Who; same
    ii. What: “United States”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “indicated that Iran should be barred from increasing nuclear fuel production for 15 years or more”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Secretary of State John Kerry said the U.S. goal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “limit production for a "two-digit" number of years”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “insisted that any steps it takes must be matched by significant and rapid relief from stringent economic sanctions imposed by the West”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Requires Proof for Iran Deal”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “President Obama said Sunday that his administration”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will walk away from negotiations with Iran over its nuclear program unless the United States can verify that Iran is not developing nuclear weapons”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety, trust

2. D
   i. Who: [Obama]
   ii. What: “If we cannot verify that they are not going to obtain a nuclear weapon -- that there's a breakout period so that even if they cheated we would be able to have enough time to take action -- if we don't have that kind of deal ... If there's no deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “then we're not going to take it … then we walk away”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety, trust

3. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “The United States and its allies”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “have until March 24 to reach an agreement with Iran”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “wants to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons while still allowing the country to enrich uranium to use for energy production”

   c. Values
      i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

5. D
   i. Who: “Obama”
   ii. What: “Over the next month or so”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “we're going to be able to determine whether or not their system is able to accept what would be an extraordinarily reasonable deal if in fact, as they say, they are only interested in peaceful nuclear programs … if we have unprecedented transparency in that system, if we are able to verify that in fact they are not developing weapons systems, then there's a deal to be had,
but that's going to require them to accept the kind of verification and constraints on their program that so far, at least, they have not been willing to say yes to.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust, safety

6. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “talks with Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “have not cost the United States anything”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “abiding by an interim agreement not to advance its nuclear program”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

8. d
   i. Who: “Obama”
   ii. What: [U.S.]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “not losing anything through these talks”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

9. d
i. who: author
ii. what: “Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, also appearing on Face the Nation, said he and Obama”
iii. to whom: same
iv. how: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “have the same ultimate goal in trying to ensure that Iran doesn't develop nuclear weapons”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “Netanyahu”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “doesn't trust that inspections will prevent the Iranians from cheating and developing weapons”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

11. D
    i. Who: “Netanyahu”
    ii. What: “inspections with totalitarian regimes”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: interview
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “do not trust”
   ii. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “suggesting is that you contract Iran's nuclear program, so there's less to inspect”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
    i. Who: author
    ii. What: “Netanyahu”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language
b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “spoke to Congress last Tuesday, warning U.S. lawmakers against a deal with Iran”
c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Senate must weigh in on whatever deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “is reached”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
14. D
   i. Who: “McConnell”
   ii. What: “Iranians”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview
b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “fomenting trouble in Syria, in Lebanon, in Gaza, in Yemen”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
15. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “McConnell”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “working to put together a veto-proof majority to support a measure giving Congress the authority to approve or disapprove of any deal”
c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

ii. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

16. D

   i. Who: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC

   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “agreed that Congress has a role in whatever deal may be reached”

c. Values

   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

17. D

   i. Who: “Schumer”
   ii. What: “Congress”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC

   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “passed the sanctions itself, so Congress has very much an interest in the sanctions … shouldn't be done before there's an agreement … but after that, yes, Congress has a right to weigh in and I support it”

c. Values

   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “House”
   iii. To whom: readers of USA Today, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Votes for Review of Iran Nuke Deal … seek guarantees against bad agreement … overwhelmingly approved a bipartisan bill Thursday that would require President Obama to let Congress review any final nuclear deal with Iran” … voted 400-25 to pass the bill, which would give lawmakers 60 days to review a deal and bar Obama from lifting any economic sanctions imposed by Congress against Iran during that review … could pass a joint resolution of disapproval”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust, safety

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would then have to decide whether to veto that resolution”

c. Values
   i. prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Senate”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “approved an identical version of the Iran Nuclear Review Act last week by a vote of 98-1. The legislation goes to the president, who has said he will sign it”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

3. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “bill's passage”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “ensures "Congress is in a position to effectively and
decisively judge and constrain President Obama's nuclear deal
with Iran, should a bad deal be struck”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength, trust

4. D
   i. Who: “Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman Ed Royce, R-Calif”
   ii. What: [U.S]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “hope that Iran's march toward a nuclear weapon can be
diplomatically stopped”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale; appeal to hope

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “legislation”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “should strengthen the administration’s hand at the
negotiating table, but Secretary (of State John) Kerry must put its
added leverage to use immediately so that the U.S. can gain much-needed ground”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength

6. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Negotiations”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “continue”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Diplomats”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “trying to reach a final agreement by June30 on a deal aimed at stopping Iran from developing nuclear weapons in exchange for the lifting of economic sanctions”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety, trust

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. what: “Both Republicans and Democrats”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same

b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “made it clear Thursday that they are skeptical of any deal with Iran”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Lawmakers”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will look closely to make sure Iranians agree to thorough inspections that can occur anytime and anywhere at military and civilian sites to ensure weapons are not secretly developed”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope, trust
   ii. Justice
      1. rationale: appeal to trust, fairness, safety
10. d
   i. who: “Rep. Steny Hoyer of Maryland, the No. 2 Democrat in the House”
   ii. what: “for us to trust Iran”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: interview
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “no reason”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to faith
11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “final agreement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. how; same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “should include the most intrusive inspections in order to ensure compliance. The United States must never permit Iran to develop a nuclear weapon”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust safety
12. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iranian leaders”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will not allow inspections of their military bases”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Kerry has said any deal with Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “must include unfettered international inspections … will not agree to any deal that would enable Iran to develop nuclear weapons”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust, safety

14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “initially opposed any legislation that could derail a deal”
   ii. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “later said he would support the bill after it became clear it had bipartisan support”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “compromise legislation”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “unanimously approved by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iran nuke deal”
   iii. To whom: readers of USA Today, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “now a campaign hot button”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Donald Trump, Ted Cruz and Tea Party Republicans”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “came together Wednesday to denounce a landmark foreign policy deal that is quickly becoming a major 2016 campaign issue: the Iran nuclear agreement”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
2. D
   i. Who: “Trump”
   ii. What: [USA]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. quotes: “led by very, very stupid people”
c. values
   i. prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom
3. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: [deal]
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
1. Quotes: “"incompetently" negotiated”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who; author
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “will not honor its commitment to forgo nuclear weapons”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Cruz told the crowd that the Iran deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “represents "the single greatest national security threat facing America.""

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “Cruz, a Texas senator”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “noted that the deal eliminates economic sanctions on Iran, providing it billions of dollars to finance terrorist activities, and effectively making the Obama administration "the world's largest financier of radical Islamic terrorism."”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “Both Republican candidates”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “made campaign pitches as part of their anti-agreement speeches”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “Trump”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “pledged to negotiate better deals on a variety of topics, from trade to foreign policy”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: [Trump]
   ii. What: “if I get elected”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “We will have so much winning … you may get bored with winning”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale; appeal to hope/faith

10. D
    i. Who: author
    ii. What: “Obama and aides said the agreement”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How; author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “best way to prevent the Tehran regime from obtaining a nuclear arsenal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

11. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “White House officials said Cruz and other speakers at the rally”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “using false arguments to defame the agreement”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

12. D
i. Who; “White House spokesman Eric Schultz”
ii. What: “Opponents”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How; public statement

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “gone to great lengths to derail this deal … by using many of the same arguments that date back to the 2002 decision to invade Iraq.”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
ii. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
i. Who; author
ii. What: “rally”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “came the same week Obama secured enough congressional voters to block GOP attempts to void the Iran agreement”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “While Cruz and other speakers denounced Obama's push for the deal”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “sought to put pressure on Republican congressional leaders to stop the deal from going into effect”
c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
i. Who; “Cruz”
ii. What: “‘terrible deal’ with Iran”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “will not stop a virulently anti-American and anti-Israeli regime from getting a nuclear bomb.”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D
i. Who; author
ii. What: “Several hundred opponents of the deal”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “gathered in 90-degree weather to hear Cruz, Trump and other Tea Party leaders denounce the Iran deal as members of the House and Senate debated it”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “former secretary of State and Democratic presidential candidate Hillary Clinton”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “endorsed the agreement.”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “If Iran cheats”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
Acclaim
1. Quotes: “Clinton said, as president she would "not hesitate to take military action" to block Iran from getting nuclear weapons”

Values
i. Fortitude
1. Rationale: appeal to strength

19. D
i. Who; same
ii. What: “All the Republicans”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
1. Quotes: “oppose the Iran deal”

c. Values
i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

20. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Tea Party rally”
iii. To whom; same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “brought together two Republican presidential candidates in Cruz and Trump who have spoken well of each other in an otherwise fractious race”

c. Values
i. Fortitude
1. Rationale: appeal to hope

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “U.S. credibility”
   iii. To whom: readers of USA Today, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “at stake in Iran deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Vice President Biden”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “delivered an impassioned defense of the Iran nuclear deal Thursday, telling a Jewish group in Florida that U.S. credibility around the world is at stake”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “If Congress scuttles the international agreement, Biden said”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “it will impair the president's ability to muster allies to deal with Russia and China”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: “Biden”
   ii. What: [Biden]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Attack
1. Quotes: “been doing foreign policy for 42 years. I cannot think of a single time since I've been involved where our ability to conduct foreign policy has been so strained because of the dysfunction in Washington and in Congress.”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “one question I get from every single person, friend and foe”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “can you do it? Your government is dysfunctional. Can you deliver”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Biden's Iran speech”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
   
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “his most extended public comment on the issue”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [Biden]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “spent most of the summer keeping a lower public profile while he mourned the death of his son Beau, who had brain cancer. The vice president has emerged with an even higher profile as reporters follow him, looking for signs of a nascent presidential campaign … spoke at the David Posnack Jewish Community Center in Davie, Fla., at the invitation of Rep. Debbie Wasserman Schultz, D-Fla. A prominent Jewish Democrat and chairwoman of the Democratic National Committee, she says she's undecided on the Iran deal”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [Schultz]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “vote may not be necessary”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “became the 34th senator to endorse the deal, giving
President Obama the votes he needs to sustain any veto of an effort
   to block it”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. rationale; appeal to strength

9. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “Biden's remarks on Iran”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “were off-the-cuff, departing from the talking points given
to him by staff and using colorful analogies -- even comparing the
   international verification regime to "Saran wrap."
   ”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
    i. Who: [Biden]
    ii. What: “so people can understand”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: public statement
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes; “I think it's important that we speak plainly”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
   i. Who; author
   ii. What: “deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
   
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will require Iran to put two-thirds of its centrifuges in storage”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

12. D
   i. Who; [Biden]
   ii. What: “by store, I mean”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: public statement
   
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “24/7 observation … bands wrapped around them. Imagine them covered, figuratively speaking, in Saran wrap. And if a band cuts, an alarm goes off in Geneva. That's literally the technical means we have to detect this”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Biden's opening remarks on the deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
   
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “were open to reporters, a question-and-answer session was not”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
   i. Who: “Wasserman Schultz”
   ii. What: “I expect”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “what is said in this room will remain in this room … This is important, so we can have some integrity in the process”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust

15. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Wasserman Schultz”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “asked a question about whether Iran would be allowed to do "self-inspections" of its nuclear sites”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D
   i. Who: “Biden”
   ii. What: “inspections”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “no self-inspections … Let me go into more detail when the press is not here”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “protesters”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “waved an Israeli flag and held signs that read, "Stop Iran deal," "Nuke the deal before they nuke us" and "We need a better deal.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
ii. Justice
   1. Rationale; appeal to fairness, safety

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “If Iran deal survives”
   iii. To whom: readers of *USA Today*, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “more U.S. aid likely to region”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “If the Iran nuclear accord goes into effect”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “U.S. should and presumably would increase military aid to Israel and the friendly Gulf states pushing for the deal's demise”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
2. D
   i. Who: “Maryland Sen. Ben Cardin”
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would be able to use their own resources without the current restrictions … general agreement that we must reinforce our commitment to the security of our friends.”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety
3. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Cardin”
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “hasn't made up his mind whether to support the agreement … being lobbied by leaders on both sides, including a call from Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu opposing it and a 90-minute session with Energy Secretary Ernest Moniz on Tuesday addressing technical questions from Cardin and Foreign Relations Chairman Bob Corker, R-Tenn”

c. Values
i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “committee”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “opens hearings Thursday with testimony”

c. Values
i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Congress”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “has the option of passing a resolution of approval or disapproval … may well pass a resolution of disapproval”

c. Values
i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
i. Who: “House Speaker John Boehner”
ii. What: [deal]
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
i. Attack
1. Quotes: “bad … already has declared -- although that would require 60 votes in the Senate”

c. Values
i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “vowed to veto the resolution, and the White House would need just 34 votes in the Senate to avoid an override”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “discussions underway about addressing concerns in Israel, Saudi Arabia and elsewhere if and when the accord goes into effect”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “reflect a sense by some that the White House is likely to be able to sustain the president's veto, if it comes to that”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Cardin”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “wrestling with his stance”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
   i. Who: [Cardin]
   ii. What: [USA]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “can’t trust them … major concern is, what is their ultimate goal? Are they trying to figure out a way they can cheat?”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust

11. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Maryland senator”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “indicated on USA TODAY’s weekly video newsmaker series that some key questions about the accord had been answered to his satisfaction … noted that Moniz expressed confidence that the 24-day waiting period wouldn't prevent inspectors from detecting if Iran was cheating”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
   i. Who: [Cardin]
   ii. What: “whether U.S. negotiators could have reached a better deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “can't really try to second-guess … question is, is it good enough”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “congress”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “blocks Iran deal”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Senate Foreign Relations Chairman Bob Corker”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “warned the White House on Thursday there is a "strong possibility" enough congressional Democrats would join Republicans to block a nuclear deal with Iran if they believe it makes too many concessions to Tehran … came as negotiators in Vienna face a deadline of next Tuesday to reach a deal … said they should take more time if it's needed”
   ii. Attack
      1. Quotes: “expressed skepticism about President Obama's willingness to walk away from a "bad deal," as he has pledged to do, and about the president's resolve to launch military action against Iran if necessary to destroy its nuclear capabilities”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
2. D
   i. Who: [Corker]
   ii. what: [USA]
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: interview
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “want a strong agreement, but we're going to have to live with it for a long time, so if it takes another month, two months, three months, we're better off where we are with the interim agreement than we are with a bad agreement”
c. Values
   i. Temperance
      1. rationale: appeal to patience
   ii. prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. d
   i. who: author
   ii. what: “Iran”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “hardened its positions … rejected a long-term freeze on nuclear research and declared that Iran would sign a deal only if international economic sanctions were first lifted … ratified legislation that bans access to military sites -- access the United States views as critical”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength

4. D
   i. Who: “Corker”
   ii. What: [uranium enrichment]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “for domestic consumption”

c. Values
   i. prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: [lawmakers]
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “laying down "markers" for the U.S. negotiating team, led by Secretary of State John Kerry … important to remind people of the red lines that we said we would never cross”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
   i. Who: author
ii. What: “Corker”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language
b. FTC
i. attack
   1. Quotes: “has become increasingly critical of the Iran negotiations, released a letter Monday decrying "breathtaking" concessions made in the negotiations”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
7.  D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “a group of experts, including five former senior aides to Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “released a similar open letter, cautioning that the pending deal "may fall short of meeting the administration's own standard of a 'good' agreement."”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
8.  D
   i. Who: “Corker”
   ii. What: “Secretary Kerry”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “sees this as a legacy issue, the people around the president see this as such a legacy issue, there's a great concern by people on both sides of the aisle that they are willing to cross some lines that should not be crossed just to get a deal … ”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
9.  D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: [Corker]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Attack
1. Quotes: “neither he nor the Iranian leadership believes Obama would take military action to stop Iran's nuclear capability, if necessary. He noted the president's reluctance to take action after Syria crossed a "red line" of using chemical weapons against rebels. "I think that sent lots of messages," he said. "So after watching that, do I think he would do it? I have significant doubts as to whether that would occur."

ii. Acclaim

1. Quotes: “negotiated legislation that commanded broad bipartisan support -- it passed the Senate 98-1 -- that gave Congress a role in reviewing an Iran deal. It would require opponents to get 60 votes in the Senate to pass a resolution of disapproval. "It's a heavy lift," he said, "and yet I think again with all the hearings and briefings we had, that if it's a bad deal, that's a strong possibility."

iii. Acclaim

1. Quotes: “is the best tool”

iv. FT

1. D: sentence one

i. Who: same

ii. What: “Speaker of the House John Boehner's invitation to Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu to address a joint session of Congress”

iii. To whom: same

iv. How: same

b. FTC

1. Acclaim

1. Quotes: “comes at a key moment for both the U.S. and Israel”

iv. Values

1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D

i. Who: same
ii. What: “More than a decade of U.S. and European efforts to dissuade Iran from developing nuclear weapons”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes; “coming to a head”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iranian regime”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “refused to compromise … repression of the Iranian people and support for terrorist groups continue unabated”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “White House claims that Prime Minister Netanyahu's visit to Washington next month”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “inappropriate”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “American people”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “should also be able to hear from our Israeli allies, especially since Israel will be the nation most directly and immediately impacted by the consequences of a nuclear Iran …
should be clear-eyed about the predicament of our allies and the intentions of our adversaries”

c. Values
  i. Justice
     1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

6. D
  i. Who: same
  ii. What: “Iran's supreme leader”
  iii. To whom: same
  iv. How: same
  b. FTC
     i. Attack
        1. Quotes: “wrote about the destruction of the "barbaric, wolflike, & infanticidal regime of Israel.""
  c. Values
     i. Prudence
        1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
     ii. Justice
        1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

7. D
  i. Who: same
  ii. What: “Israelis”
  iii. To whom: same
  iv. How: same
  b. FTC
     i. Acclaim
        1. Quotes: “endured weeks of rocket attacks by Iranian-backed terrorists in Gaza”
     ii. attack
        1. Quotes: “two Israeli soldiers were killed by Iran's proxy, Hezbollah, in an attack in northern Israel”
  c. Values
     i. Fortitude
        1. Rationale: appeal to strength
     ii. Justice
        1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

8. D
  i. Who: same
  ii. What: “For President Obama, the outcome of the negotiations with Iran”
  iii. To whom: same
  iv. How: same
  b. FTC
     i. Acclaim
        1. Quotes: “is a legacy issue”
  c. Values
     i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. **D**
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “For Israel”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “it's a matter of life and death”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety

10. **D**
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “unfortunate that the White House”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “is focused on derailing Prime Minister Netanyahu's visit and denigrating the very real bipartisan concerns in Congress”
   ii. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “rather than achieving a deal with Iran that will permanently dismantle Iran's nuclear program”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. **D**
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “Iran's behavior thus far”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “shows that additional pressure is the best tool we have to avoid the nightmare outcome of an Iran with nuclear weapons”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. **D**
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “time”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “for Congress to act”

c. Values
   i. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to time
I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iran deal”
   iii. To whom: readers of USA TODAY, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “give Iran deal a chance”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “If Republicans in Congress scuttle the nuclear deal with Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “what alternatives do they have -- more sanctions? Sanctions do not work”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “has a solution: pre-emptive strikes”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [pre-emptive strikes]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
1. Quotes: “How successful would airstrikes be if Iran's nuclear program is spread throughout the country? Would Republicans support such strikes and bring the U.S. closer to yet another war? Or create a situation where Iran accelerates its nuclear program because it feels its security is at risk?”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “much better than the alternatives”
   ii. attack
      1. quotes: “which would not succeed and might make things worse”

c. values
   i. prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. d: title
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “concessions”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “fail”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Appeasement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “not the way to win a diplomatic negotiation”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “how the inspections worked in Iraq”
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “wild goose chase”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
**ARTICLE**: Despite big fears, some see Iran deal as triumph. (2015, Aug 14). *USA Today*
Retrieved from [https://search.proquest.com/docview/1703984993?accountid=26417](https://search.proquest.com/docview/1703984993?accountid=26417)

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “some”
   iii. To whom: readers of *USA Today*, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “see Iran deal as triumph”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “tried to portray himself as the heir to President Kennedy's legacy by promoting his Iran nuclear deal at American University, where Kennedy once spoke”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “true "profile in courage" for his studied and principled decision to oppose this dangerous capitulation to Iran and demand a better deal, even at the risk of jeopardizing his Senate leadership position”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to courage

1. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “Commentary writer David Andelman's conclusion that if Congress rejects the Iran nuclear deal, then the United States will be drawn into a war with Iran”
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “off base”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “elites in Washington”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “may feel compelled”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “American people”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would take to the streets if a war against Iran were declared”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

1. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “Conflict resolution by diplomacy”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “something the George W. Bush/Dick Cheney apologists and their adherents in the Congress news media and think tanks have a hard time learning”
   ii. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “it is what the president of the United States has achieved in the Iran conflict”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “if you want to "get tougher against ISIL" inflaming the Middle East”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “go to the epicenter of funding for Islamic extremism”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “jihadists”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “problem and the threat to all of us”
      ii. attack
         1. Quotes: “not Iran and not "a sense that Obama is pulling back in foreign policy."
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “debacle of epic proportions”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [author]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “research independently and write my representatives in Congress daily asking them to vote no”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “GOP plan”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “what is … I’d like to hear it”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “alternative plan”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “should be simple. Keep the sanctions in place maybe even increase them. Support any effort by the Iranian people to overthrow the current regime”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: [negotiators]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “do not free up billions of dollars to allow this radical regime possibly to use the money for terrorism and nuclear development”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Approve the deal”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: [deal]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How; same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “not perfect ... better than the alternative ... war or no deal”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. quotes; “Block this deal and force Iran back to the table by raising sanctions and also dropping the gift of billions of dollars”
c. values
   i. prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iran nuclear deal”
   iii. To whom: readers of USA Today, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “bigger than partisan politics”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama administration”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “defended the Iran deal before the House Foreign Affairs Committee this week”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “agreement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “kicks the can down the road a decade … Iran not only regains frozen assets but profits from economic interaction”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “problem”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “not trying to get American voters on board so the polling looks better, but to get Congress to understand that this deal is bigger than placating Israel and Iran having nuclear technology. Future political ramifications and potential conflicts are what's at stake”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety

1. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “war”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “used to change the attitude of the enemy when negotiations break down”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. d
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Soldiers”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “trained to kill and destroy”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. d
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “than mongering war”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “better ways”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: same
ii. What: “Mongering peace”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “can work if given a chance”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “war”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “is costly”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. rationale; appeal to wisdom

1. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “One of the most disconcerting consequences of the disagreement regarding the Iran nuclear accord”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. quotes; “highlighted by President Obama's statement that he would veto any legislation blocking the deal”

c. values
   i. prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “Americans”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would have appreciated a statement suggesting Obama would welcome input on the terms of the deal … would not negate the option of ultimately responding with a veto after the healthy exchange of contrasting viewpoints”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Congress”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “has not always been cooperative, but if the president were
         "willing to unclench" his fist, maybe it would "extend a hand."”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iran deal”
   iii. To whom: readers of USA Today, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “sidelines U.S. business”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rational: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “President Obama's Iran agreement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. quotes: “designed to address nuclear weapons proliferation, but the sanctions relief it provides will disadvantage U.S. business in ways that few people have discussed … companies in other countries will have the ability to capitalize on the economic opportunities the accord will open up. U.S. companies will be forced to stand on the sidelines watching their competitors in Europe, Russia and China reap the economic benefits”

   c. values
      i. justice
         1. rationale: appeal to fairness

2. d
   i. who; same
   ii. what: “Iran”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same
b. FTC
   i. acclaim
      1. quotes: “hostile to the United States for decades”
   c. values
      i. prudence
         1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. d
   i. who: same
ii. what: “Sanctions”
iii. to whom: same
iv. how: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “imposed since 1995 targeting Iran’s weapons of mass destruction and missile proliferation activities, support for international terrorism, and human rights practices”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

4. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Iran”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “wanted all sanctions to be lifted immediately”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. rationale: appeal to fairness

5. d
i. who: same
ii. what: “U.S.”
iii. to whom: same
iv. how: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “insisted that it would only lift its nuclear-related sanctions, though in a final effort to seal the deal it agreed to lift the arms embargo after five years and the missile embargo after eight … Other U.S. sanctions will remain in place”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

6. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “nuclear-related sanctions that the U.S. will lift”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “target foreign, rather than U.S., companies … prohibit foreign companies from, among other things, investing in Iran’s oil sector, trading oil, and financing and insuring such transactions,
as well as doing business with Iranian banks and other companies designated by the sanctions”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “the other U.S.-imposed sanctions -- the ones that will remain in place”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “all direct sanctions that prohibit U.S. companies from doing business with Iran”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Sanctions on Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “have been effective because they have been multilateral”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “European Union”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “imposed its own nuclear-related sanctions that prohibited EU companies from doing business with Iran”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “Russia and China”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “restrained their companies”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “under the Iran deal, other countries' restrictions”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will be lifted”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “problem”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes; “not continuing U.S. sanctions.”
   ii. attack
      1. Quotes: “It's the asymmetry between the U.S. and other countries built into the accord that will prejudice U.S. business”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “For U.S. companies, this means that regulations”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. quotes: “still in force prohibiting U.S. persons from exporting goods or services to Iran ... prohibit investing in Iran and dealing in Iranian-origin goods. They prohibit exports of virtually all U.S. goods and technology to Iran”

c. values
   i. prudence
1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. d
   i. who; same
   ii. what: “Iran”
   iii. to whom; same
   iv. how: same

b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. quotes: “will still be off-limits for U.S. companies, except in the limited circumstances permitted by the accord, such as the sale of commercial passenger aircraft and imports of Iranian carpets, pistachios and caviar”

c. values
   i. prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “foreign subsidiaries of U.S. companies”
   iii. to whom; same
   iv. how: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “will be licensed to do business with Iran, their U.S. parent companies will be prohibited from facilitating the subsidiaries’ transactions”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

16. d
   i. who; same
   ii. what: “U.S. banks”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes; “will not be able to process overseas transactions in dollars because these payments must clear through U.S. bank accounts”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

17. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “Reports have indicated that Iran”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. quotes: “eyeing $185 billion in foreign investment in its-oil-and-gas sector after sanctions are lifted”

   c. Values
      i. prudence
         1. rationale; appeal to wisdom

18.  d
   i. who; same
   ii. what: “U.S. companies”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same

   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “will not be able to participate in these projects, nor will they be able to develop power projects, sell heavy equipment, process credit card transactions or provide consulting services”

   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale; appeal to fairness

19.  D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “flood of Iranian oil expected to enter the global market”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “will depress prices, putting even more pressure on domestic energy producers”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

20.  D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “competitors' economic gains”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

   b. FTC
      i. attack
         1. Quotes: “will be locked in because the so-called snapback of sanctions if Iran violates the nuclear terms of the deal is not really a snapback at all”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

21.  D
   i. Who; same
ii. What: “Even if sanctions are re-imposed, contracts entered into by EU, Russian and Chinese companies during the period of sanctions relief”

iii. To whom: same

iv. How: same

b. FTC

i. Attack

1. Quotes: “will not be affected”

c. Values

i. Prudence

1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

22. D

i. Who: same

ii. What: “None of this is to say that U.S. companies”

iii. To whom: same

iv. How: same

b. FTC

i. Acclaim

1. Quotes: “are advocating lifting the remaining U.S. sanctions … definitely are not … good reasons to impose sanctions on Iran; the issues at stake transcend commercial interests”

ii. Attack

1. Quotes: “growing sense that the Obama administration sold U.S. companies down the river in order to achieve its foreign policy goals”

c. Values

i. Prudence

1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

ii. Justice

1. Rationale; appeal to fairness

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “thaw”
   iii. To whom: readers of the New York Times, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “thaw”
c. Values
   i. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patience
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to diplomacy

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Talks”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “reinforced the hope” “may finally be serious about resolving”
c. Values
   i. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patience

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “negotiations”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “start on what could be a productive”
c. Values
   i. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patience

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “On the plus side, Iran offered its own proposal to resolve”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: recognize willingness to negotiate, honest effort

4. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: [Iran]
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “had previously resisted putting forth specific ideas until international sanctions were lifted.”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: wise to lift sanctions

5. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “significant details”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “could actually be a positive sign”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: recognize good signs

6. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “participants”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “suggests that, for now at least, the participants see value in giving serious consideration to what has been put on the table instead of trying to sabotage it with strategically placed leaks”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom of participants and reading of sign
7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “American and Iranian negotiators”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “positive development”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom (positivity of sign)

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Iran had rejected previous administration requests for this kind of direct exchange, which is needed if the two sides are to reduce the enormous mistrust that has built up over 30 years.”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “phone call”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “phone call last month between Hassan Rouhani, Iran’s more moderate president, and President Obama broke the ice and opened the way”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to moderation, wisdom

10. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “rare joint statement”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “encouraging” “rare joint statement praising Iran's proposal as an "important contribution."

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “American and Iranian negotiators”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “agreed to another negotiating session” “develop practical steps to a deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom of negotiators/”technical experts”

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “remarks”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “There were also upbeat remarks from American and European officials, who described the talks as substantive and forward-looking.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom and trust in leadership

13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “note from Russia's deputy foreign minister, Sergei Ryabkov”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “foolhardy, however, to ignore” “the two sides are far apart and that there was no guarantee of further progress.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom, over-optimism
14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “gulf”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “The gulf between them on the nuclear issue has been wide and deep for a long time.”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to lack of wisdom (bad situation)

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “major powers”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “The major powers have demanded”
   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness/safety

16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Mr. Rouhani and his aides”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: repeatedly asserted that Iran has no intention of producing weapons,”
   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness/safety
   d. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “but the country's history of hiding its program, in whole or in part, requires strict limits and monitoring.”
   e. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness/safety

17. D
FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “A certain patience is needed” “bring them to a constructive end.”

Values
i. Temperance
   1. Rationale: appeal to patience of reps

18. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “hard-liners”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “trying to undercut them.”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

19. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu of Israel … members of Congress”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “warning against trusting Iran … threatening new and harsher sanctions”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: Appeal to fairness

20. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “sign of good will”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “could begin to persuade both sides that real progress is possible”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Republican”
   iii. To whom: readers of the New York Times, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “should halt”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: wise stipulation

1. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Republican chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Laying down a marker … should require that Tehran stop enriching uranium”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: wise stipulation

2. D
   i. Who: “the chairman, Ed Royce of California”
   ii. What: “key issue”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “whether a final agreement would allow Iran … can't be trusted … verification efforts can never be foolproof”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: recognize situation

3. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Comments”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “effectively shifted the terms of the debate”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: recognize situation

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “interim agreement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “is for six months, but it can be renewed for an additional six months by mutual consent”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: wise agreement

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “goal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “to buy time so that a more sweeping agreement can be negotiated”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: wise agreement

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “interim agreement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “outlines some of the provisions of such a follow-on agreement, saying that Iran could continue to enrich uranium "under mutually agreed parameters" and under "enhanced monitoring."”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
1. Rationale: wise provisions

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Kerry”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “did not know if a comprehensive agreement could be achieved, but that the United States had an obligation to try”
   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: doing what’s moral

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “imposing new penalties”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “would poison the atmosphere”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: recognize situation

9. D
   i. Who: “Kerry”
   ii. What: “obligation”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “to give these negotiations an opportunity to succeed”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: recognize situation

10. D
    i. Who: author
    ii. What: “scope of any future Iranian enrichment activity”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: author language
    b. FTC
       i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “need to be "mutually agreed" and would be linked to legitimate civilian needs”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “interim agreement”
   iii. To whom:” same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “in the best interest of the United States”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

12. D
   i. Who: “Kerry”
   ii. What: “national security of the United States”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “stronger under this first-step agreement than it was before … asserted that Israel and Persian Gulf Arab states were also more secure”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

13. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Obama administration”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “would go to Congress for tougher sanctions if the effort to negotiate a comprehensive nuclear accord with Iran faltered”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
14. D
   i. Who: “Kerry”
   ii. What: “additional sanctions”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement
b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “committed to asking you for additional sanctions if we fail … We will need them”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

I. Decontextualization: Title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iran Deal”
   iii. To whom: readers of New York Times, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “possible trap”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: deal unwise

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “nuclear deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “effort to blunt a diplomatic offensive by Iran, plans to warn the United Nations next week that a nuclear deal with the Iranian government could be a trap similar to one set by North Korea eight years ago”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: deal unwise, Korean deal similarly bad

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Netanyahu”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “scheduled to address the General Assembly next Tuesday, a week after President Obama and Iran’s new president, Hassan Rouhani, are to speak at the United Nations.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: speaking after proponents to counter them

3. D
   i. Who: same
ii. What: “Israeli government”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “offered a preview Sunday of Mr. Netanyahu's hard-edged message, in which he will set the terms for what would be acceptable to Israel in any agreement concerning Iran's nuclear ambitions.”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: what Israeli government considers fair

4. D
i. Who: “Israeli official”
ii. What: “bad agreement”
iii. To whom: same
iv. Public statement

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “A bad agreement is worse than no agreement at all”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: better to have no agreement (status quo) than a bad one

5. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “President Rouhani”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “signaled a willingness to negotiate”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: cooperation, give/take, wisdom

6. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Obama administration”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “intrigued by the possibility of resolving a problem”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: problem solving, wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [possibility of resolving a problem]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “deeply unsettled the Israelis”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: unwise motive(s)

8. D
   i. Who: “Israeli official”
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “Iran must not be allowed to repeat North Korea’s ploy to get nuclear weapons”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: learn from past mistakes

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: Same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “Just like North Korea before it,” he said, “Iran professes to seemingly peaceful intentions”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: learn from Korean past, “seemingly”

10. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: same
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same
    b. FTC
i. Attack
  1. Quotes: “it talks the talk of nonproliferation while seeking to ease sanctions and buy more time for its nuclear program”

c. Values
  i. Prudence
     1. Rationale: recognize deception

11. D
  i. Who: author
  ii. What: “Netanyahu”
  iii. To whom: same
  iv. How: author language

b. FTC
  i. Attack
     1. Quotes: “history of North Korea's negotiations … when the North Korean government, in what was then seen as a landmark deal, agreed to abandon its nuclear weapons program in return for economic, security and energy benefits.”

c. Values
  i. Prudence
     1. Rationale: similar deceptive situation

12. D
  i. Who: same
  ii. What: “North Korea”
  iii. To whom: same
  iv. How: same

b. FTC
  i. Attack
     1. Quotes: “A year later, North Korea tested its first nuclear device.”

c. Values
  i. Prudence
     1. Rationale: similar deceptive situation

13. D
  i. Who: same
  ii. What: “Israeli officials”
  iii. To whom: same
  iv. How: same

b. FTC
  i. Attack
     1. Quotes: “warn something similar could happen if the United States were to conclude too hasty a deal with Mr. Rouhani.”

c. Values
  i. Prudence
     1. Rationale: similar deceptive situation
14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “North Korea”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “As Iran is doing today, the North Koreans insisted on a right to a peaceful nuclear energy program.”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: similar deceptive situation
15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “differences”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “There are differences between the two cases.”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: cases not perfectly analogous
16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “North Korea”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “At the time that it concluded the deal in 2005, North Korea said it had already produced a nuclear bomb.”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: delineating differences from previous
17. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “American intelligence experts”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Defense
1. Quotes: “believe Iran is still many months, if not years, away from having such a weapon.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: delineating differences from previous

18. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “troubling precedent”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “nuclear negotiations in which a rogue nation repeatedly extracted concessions from the United States and other countries, only to renege later and fire missiles or test nuclear devices.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: similar deceptive situation

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “list of demands”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will offer”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: what Israeli’s consider fair/safe

20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “What is new”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “explicit comparison of Iran to North Korea -- a rhetorical device devised to undermine Mr. Rouhani’s image as a moderate leader”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: similar deceptive situation

21. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “North Korea's reclusive dictators”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Defense
   1. Quotes: “have not traveled to the United Nations to plead their country's case to the world.”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: delineating differences from Iran deal

22. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Netanyahu”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “recognized that he would be labeled a naysayer for his pessimism.”

c. Values
i. Courage
   1. Rationale: doing what’s right in face of opposition

23. D
i. Who: “official”
ii. What: [Netanyahu]
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “feels morally impelled to stake out this position”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: wise/moral leader

24. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “The White House”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Defense
   1. Quotes: “sought to allay the fears of Israel officials, assuring them”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: prudent actions

ii. Justice
   1. Rationale: “will judge Mr. Rouhani by his actions, not his words”
      “not planning to prematurely ease the economic sanctions”;

25. D
   i. Who: “Benjamin J. Rhodes, a deputy national security adviser”
   ii. What: “Israel's significant concerns”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “recognize and appreciate”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: right to be concerned

26. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Israeli officials”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Israeli officials are not mollified”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: unwise course

27. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Netanyahu”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “most dramatic moment, brandishing a simple drawing
         that he said demonstrated how close Iran was to producing a
         nuclear bomb.”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: recognize dangerous situation

28. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Israeli officials”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “fear” “not happened for decades and which they worry would leave Israel more isolated in dealing with Iran.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: recognize dangerous situation

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: readers of the *New York Times*, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “opens Mideast door”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: Obama wise

1. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “preliminary nuclear deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “whose popularity and second-term agenda have been ravaged by the chaotic rollout of the health care law”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: Obama roll-out unwise

d. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “more than a welcome change of subject”

e. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: Obama deal wise

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “seminal moment”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “presents Mr. Obama with the chance to chart a new American course in the Middle East for the first time in more than three decades.”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: course wise

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “final agreement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “won't be easy, and huge challenges remain ahead.”

c. Values
   i. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to cautious patience

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “diplomatic accord”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “after 34 years of estrangement … opens the door to a range of geopolitical possibilities available to no American leader since Jimmy Carter.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: deal wise
   ii. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patience

5. D
   i. Who: “Vali R. Nasr, the dean of the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies”
   ii. What: “historic deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “historic deal … seismic shift … rearranges the entire chess board”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: deal wise
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: deal fair
6. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would pursue "aggressive personal diplomacy" with Iranian leaders, and ruling out the concept of leadership change”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: Obama tactics wise

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “president”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “sought to avoid being consumed by the Middle East, in part so he could shift America's gaze to Asia”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: Obama wise

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [Obama]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “tended to view Iran through two narrower prisms: his goal of curbing the spread of nuclear weapons and his desire to avoid entangling the United States in another war in the region”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: Obama tactics wise

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “huddled in the Oval Office with Secretary of State John
      Kerry over the fine points of a proposal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to cooperation, wisdom

10. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [Obama]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “intent on making sure that Iran halted all testing at a
         heavy-water reactor … and in tying any reference to Iran's
         enrichment of uranium only to a final agreement.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: Obama wise

11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “broader diplomatic opening”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “could alter other American calculations in the region …
         Iranians could be helpful in brokering a postwar settlement with
         the Taliban.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: Obama wise

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “prospect of such a long-term strategic realignment”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “precisely what has so alarmed American allies …
         condemned the deal as a "historic mistake."”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
1. Rationale: deal unwise

13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [deal]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “opposition from lawmakers … who complain that the
deal eases pressure on Iran without extracting enough concessions”
   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: deal unfair

14. D
   i. Who: “Senator Charles E. Schumer, Democrat of New York”
   ii. What: “strong sanctions”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “not the goodness of the hearts of the Iranian leaders, that
brought Iran to the table”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: recognize situation

15. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Schumer”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “would support a push in the Senate to pass additional
sanctions against Iran”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: sanctions wise

16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “warned that new sanctions would "derail this promising first step, alienate us from our allies and risk unraveling the coalition that enabled our sanctions to be enforced in the first place."”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: more sanctions unwise

17. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “administration officials”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “called lawmakers to defend the deal and head off the legislation while Mr. Obama called Mr. Netanyahu to hear his concerns before the next round of talks.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to negotiation, wisdom

18. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “predicament”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Obama finds himself in a predicament”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: wisdom needed to exit predicament

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Some experts”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “tensions over Iran would only deepen because the administration would be determined to prevent the deal from unraveling.”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: Obama unwise

20. D
   ii. What: “administration”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement
   
   b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “hostage to Iran's behavior”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: deal unwise

21. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran's bad behavior”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   
   b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “ayatollah's vicious speeches about Israel -- it's going to be linked to the deal”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: deal unwise

22. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “bitterness in Israel”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
   
   b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “may hurt another of Mr. Obama's priorities”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: recognize negative consequences

23. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Administration officials”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   
   b. FTC
i. Defense
   1. Quotes: “they believed Mr. Netanyahu would be able to separate
      his anger about the Iran deal from any decision about whether to
      make concessions to the Palestinians”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: project wise choice

24. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “outside experts”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “have their doubts.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: future projection

25. D
   i. Who: “Bruce O. Riedel, a former administration official who is now a
      senior fellow at the Brookings Institution”
   ii. What: “Palestinian issue”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “big casualty of this deal … strong objections of Israel …
         going to be very hard to persuade Netanyahu to do something on
         the Palestinian front”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: future projection

26. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “resolving the threat of Iran's nuclear program might be
         worth taking that chance”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
1. Rationale: future projection

27. D
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “secret negotiations”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “risked angering European allies”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: unwise move

28. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “talks”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Defense
         1. Quotes: “fleshed out many of the principles that wound up in the interim agreement”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: wise move

29. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “briefed on their progress”
   c. Values
      i. prudence
         1. Rationale: Obama prepared

30. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “became well-versed in the minutiae”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: Obama prepared
31. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [Obama]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “ticked off the elements of sanctions relief”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: Obama prepared
32. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “the provision that will allow Iran to enrich uranium, a privilege it does not currently have from the United Nations.”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: move unwise
33. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “not the fine details but the big picture that is likely to dominate his attention”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: Obama wise
34. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “decisions”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “whether to treat Iran's nuclear program as a discrete problem to be solved, freeing him up to focus more on Asia, or as the opening act in a more ambitious engagement with Iran that might give it a role in Syria, Afghanistan and other trouble spots.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: Obama wise

35. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “he is open to that, but that it will depend on factors that are out of America's control”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: future projection

36. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “White House”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “being careful to cast the coming negotiations narrowly”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: administration wise

37. D
   i. Who: “Tom Donilon, the former national security adviser to Mr. Obama, who coordinated Iran policy before leaving the White House in July”
   ii. What: “process”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. quotes: “First and foremost, this has been a multifaceted, multiyear process to address a serious security concern”

c. values
i. prudence
   1. rationale: process wise

ii. temperance
   1. rationale: appeal to patience

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Netanyahu”
   iii. To whom: readers of the New York Times, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Netanyahu can only fume”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: Netanyahu has no wise words

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Netanyahu”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “doing what he is best known for, and perhaps best at”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: Netanyahu wise
      ii. Courage
         1. Rationale: “despite the inevitable discomfort”

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “condemned the agreement”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: agreement unwise

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “agreement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “a very dangerous and bad deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: deal unwise

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “remarks”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “highlighted the growing gulf and heightened tensions”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: seeing the signs

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “limited tools left for Mr. Netanyahu”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “negotiations over Iran's nuclear program, which he views as an existential threat”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: future projection

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Netanyahu”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “has few options beyond serving as the hawkish scold”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: recognize situation

7. D
   i. “Dan Gillerman, a former Israeli ambassador to the United Nations”
   ii. What: “magic wand”
To whom: same
How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “I don't see any magic wand he can really produce … very
difficult and trying time for the Israeli prime minister”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: recognize situation

8. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Netanyahu's declaration”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “raised anew the specter of an Israeli military strike on
Tehran, experts here say such an attack is all but impossible to
imagine while negotiations proceed -- and without American
support.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: recognize situation

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Netanyahu”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “taking his case directly to Capitol Hill poisoned his
relationship with the White House early on and could be too risky
with the fate of Iran's nuclear ambitions in the balance.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: recognize situation

10. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “most potent possibility”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “in hopes of pushing forward amid swelling signs of crisis.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: talks wise

11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Kerry”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “clearly frustrated Mr. Kerry criticized Israel”
      2. Quotes: “Netanyahu declared on Friday that "pressure has to be put where it belongs, that is, on the Palestinians who refuse to budge”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: settlements unfair
      2. Rationale: settlements fair

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [Netanyahu]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “He made clear he was in no mood to compromise.”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: status quo fair

13. D
   i. Who: “Itamar Rabinovich, a former Israeli ambassador to the United States”
   ii. What: [Netanyahu]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “The more he's unhappy about Iran, the less likely he is to move on the Palestinians … I'm not happy with what I hear about Geneva, and I definitely am not going to please you by giving you, the secretary, or you, the president, the deal on the Palestinians you so much want”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: future projection
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: quid pro quo

14. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Hanan Ashrawi, a member of the Palestine Liberation Organization's executive committee”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “denounced Mr. Netanyahu's statements on Iran as "arrogant," "childish" and "an insult" to Mr. Kerry, and said they reflected a relentless focus on Israel's security that has prevented progress in the peace talks”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: statements unwise

15. D
   i. Who: [Hanan Ashrawi, a member of the Palestine Liberation Organization's executive committee]
   ii. What: “temper tantrum response”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “just an extension of that mentality … I want to do what I want to do, I want to get away with everything, and I want to dictate to everyone, including the U.S., how they should behave regarding Israel's security the way Israel exclusively defines it”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: Netanyahu unfair

16. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Netanyahu”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Defense
1. Quotes: “contends that like a tiny hole in a tire, even a limited lifting of sanctions against Iran threatens to unravel the entire package”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: lifting sanctions unwise

17. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “fear”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “track record of using such hard-line stances to force the West's hand on Iran”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: recognize situation

18. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [Netanyahu’s] “statements”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “overreaction to what Mr. Kerry and others have made clear they see as only a small, first diplomatic step”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: Netanyahu unwise

19. D
   i. Who: “Amos Yadlin, the director of the Institute for National Security Studies in Tel Aviv”
   ii. What: [Netanyahu]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. Public statement

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “he thinks that this is the final agreement -- it is not … The real judgment of whether it's a bad deal or an acceptable deal will be in the end of the negotiating period”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
1. Rationale: Netanyahu unwise

20. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: [Netanyahu]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “Mr. Yadlin said the prime minister seemed to be "crying wolf too early," adding, "You should keep the wolf for the final agreement."
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: Netanyahu unwise

21. D
   i. Who: “Efraim Halevy, a former head of the Israeli intelligence agency Mossad”
   ii. What: “endgame”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement
   b. FTC
      i. Defense
         1. Quotes: “agreed that "the endgame" was what mattered, but noted that "the more you enter stages, the less you can be certain that you will get what you need in the end."
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: Netanyahu wise

22. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “"reversibility" of the provisions”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
   b. FTC
      i. Defense
         1. Quotes: “key question, Mr. Halevy said, is the "reversibility" of the provisions of an agreement that would lift some sanctions on Iran in exchange for a freeze of uranium enrichment”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: Netanyahu wise
      ii. Justice
         1. Rationale: fair demands
23. D
   i. Who: [Efraim Halevy, a former head of the Israeli intelligence agency Mossad]
   ii. What: “sanctions”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Once you begin to relieve sanctions, to reimpose them is not a light matter -- getting the sanctions in place took a long time … Whereas reversing the enrichment doesn’t take time, you simply get the machines going again within hours”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: recognize situation
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: fair provisions

24. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Netanyahu's response”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Washington and Jerusalem may be entering another era of disagreement and distrust.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: future projection

25. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “repeated promises by the Obama administration”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Netanyahu told the American lawmakers Thursday -- twice -- that he was "absolutely stunned" to learn that a deal was in the works”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: Obama unfair

26. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “photo opportunity”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “canceled amid the friction”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: photo not appropriate

27. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “underscored his strong commitment to preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: Obama fair

28. D
   i. Who: “Jonathan Spyer, a senior research fellow at the Interdisciplinary Center in Herzliya, Israel”
   ii. What: “fundamental difference of understanding”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “fundamental difference of understanding between this Israeli government and this U.S. administration, and it's reflecting in the reality that's emerging on a variety of tracks”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: recognize situation

29. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [Obama] “administration”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
1. Quotes: “Israeli government, even though it won't say so openly, regards this administration as bungling across the Middle East.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: administration unwise

30. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Netanyahu”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “he has to deal with that right now … is to state his case bluntly rather than adhere to another view which he regards as fundamentally flawed and dangerous”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: Obama unwise

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Saudi Arabia”
   iii. To whom: readers of the New York Times, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “rejects” “protest”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: wise protest
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: UN [Iran deal] unfair

1. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Saudi Arabia … rejecting a highly coveted seat on the Security Council”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “decision that underscored the depth of Saudi anger over what the monarchy sees as weak and conciliatory Western stances toward Syria and Iran”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: stances unfair

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Saudi decision”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “appeared to be unprecedented”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: wise protest

3. D
   i. Who: same
ii. What: “statement rejecting the seat”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “rejecting the seat”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: wise protest

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Some analysts”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “self-destructive temper tantrum.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: unwise move

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “usefulness of a seat”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “where Russia and China have repeatedly drawn Saudi anger by blocking all attempts to pressure Syria's president, Bashar al-Assad.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: seat waste of resources

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Abdullah”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “voiced rising frustration with the continuing violence in Syria”

c. Values
7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [Abdullah]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “deeply disappointed”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: unwise decision

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Saudi officials”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “fear that a nuclear deal between Iran and the West … could come at their expense, leaving them more exposed to their greatest regional rival.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: deal unwise

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Saudi decision”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Saudis have long resisted taking a seat on the Security Council, believing it would hamper their discreet diplomatic style.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: wise decision

10. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “sudden about-face”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: unwise allies
11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “American ambassador to the United Nations, Samantha Power”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “issued a statement congratulating the five new nonpermanent members”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: just move
12. D
   i. Who: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “had no immediate comment.”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: officials stunned, lack answer
13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Russia”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “sharply critical of the Saudi gesture”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: gesture unwise
14. D
   i. Who: [Russian] “Foreign Ministry”
ii. What: “surprised”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “surprised by Saudi Arabia's unprecedented decision”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: decision unwise

15.  D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “kingdom's arguments”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “arouse bewilderment and the criticism of the U.N. Security Council in the context of the Syria conflict is particularly strange”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: arguments unwise

16.  D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “Saudi political elite”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “shock and dismay”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: decision unwise

17.  D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “spokesman for the Saudi Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Osama Nugali”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “celebrating the kingdom's election to the Security Council.”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: wise election

18. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “message”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “journalist with links to the ruling elite”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: wise election

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Many other prominent Saudis”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “congratulated the kingdom” “team of the best Saudi diplomats”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: wise election, representatives
   ii. Temperance
      1. Rationale: “sought for more than two years” appeal to patient work

20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Many experts”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “assumed that Saudi Arabia’s pursuit of a Security Council seat signaled a new desire to be more public and assertive in its stances toward the Syrian civil war and the Arab-Israeli conflict.”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: Pursuit wise

21. D
   i. Who: same
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “was clearly elated after the General Assembly vote”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: Just vote
22. D
   i. Who: [Saudi ambassador to the United Nations, Abdallah Y. al-Mouallimi]
   ii. What: “election”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “We take this election very seriously as a responsibility to be able to contribute to this very important forum to peace and security of the world”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: wise election
23. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Our election”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “reflection of a longstanding policy in support of moderation and in support of resolving disputes by peaceful means.”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: wise election
24. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “statement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “struck a far different tone, calling for changes to enhance the Security Council's contribution to peace”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: status quo unwise

25. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [statement]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “It did not say what those should entail.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: no further info

26. D
   i. Who: [statement]
   ii. What: “ruling regime in Syria”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: quote

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Allowing the ruling regime in Syria to kill and burn its people by the chemical weapons, while the world stands idly, without applying deterrent sanctions against the Damascus regime, is also irrefutable evidence and proof of the inability of the Security Council to carry out its duties and responsibilities”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: Council unjust, irresponsible

27. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “statement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “accused the Security Council of failing to find a "just and lasting solution" to the Israel-Palestinian conflict, and of failing to free the Middle East of "all weapons of mass destruction,”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: council unjust, irresponsible

28. D
i. Who: “one Saudi political insider”
ii. What: rejection of seat
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: interview statement

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “very bad for the image of the country”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: move unwise

29. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: rejection of seat
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “It's as if someone woke up in the night and made this decision.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: unwise decision

30. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “some others in Riyadh”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “not entirely surprised … ambivalence about assuming a position that would strain friendships and alliances … volatility of the Security Council's recent decisions”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: decision wise

31. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “kingdom”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “seen its reputation suffer … perception that it was combating the democratic aspirations”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: kingdom unwise

32. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “poll”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “indicating that Saudi Arabia's popularity had declined”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: Saudi Arabia unwise

33. D
   i. Who: “Bernard Haykel, a professor of Middle East studies at Princeton University and an authority on Saudi Arabia.”
   ii. What: “Saudis”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “being on the U.N.S.C. would mean they could no longer pursue their traditional back seat and low-key policies and therefore decided to give it up”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: wise decision

34. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “a seat on the U.N.S.C.”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “may have also meant that Saudi Arabia would be more constrained in backing the Syrian opposition”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
1. Rationale: seat unwise

35.  D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “Diplomats at the United Nations”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “did not believe the Saudi decision would be reversed, given its unequivocal and accusatory language”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: reading situation/language

36.  D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “vote on replacement”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “unclear when the 193-member General Assembly would take a vote on a replacement”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: council unprepared

37.  D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Suadi’s”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “not officially notified the United Nations of their decision”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: situation unstable information/communication stalled

38.  D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Aaf Konja, a spokeswoman for John W. Ashe, the ambassador for Antigua and Barbuda, who is the current president of the General Assembly”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “had not received formal notification nor had held any meetings”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: situation unclear
39. D
   i. Who: “spokeswoman”
   ii. What: “next steps”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “yet to be determined”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: lack of info
40. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “council”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “met before without a full membership”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: council prepared
41. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Soviet Union”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “refused to sit at the council table”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: similar situation
d. FTC
   i. Attack
1. Quotes: “though it did not repudiate its seat”

e. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: situational differences

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [negotiation participants]
   iii. To whom: readers of the New York Times, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Inching forward”

c. Values
   i. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patience

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “negotiations between the major powers and Iran over its nuclear program”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “no doubt … have been productive”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “All the nations involved”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “appear committed to reaching a deal that will go beyond November’s interim agreement and produce a permanent one”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “chief negotiators”
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC

i. Acclaim

1. Quotes: “completed a third round of talks in Vienna on Wednesday and plan to meet again on May 13, after which they expect to begin drafting actual text”

c. Values

i. Prudence

1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D

i. Who: same

ii. What: [negotiators]

iii. To whom: same

iv. How: same

b. FTC

i. Acclaim

1. Quotes: “They hope to wrap it all up by July 20”

c. Values

i. Prudence

1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D

i. Who: same

ii. What: “to understate how hard it will be to remove the threat of Iran’s producing a nuclear weapon and begin to ease three decades of hostility between Tehran and Washington”

iii. To whom: same

iv. How: same

b. FTC

i. Attack

1. Quotes: “it would be naïve”

c. Values

i. Prudence

1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D

i. Who: same

ii. What: “Negotiators”

iii. To whom: same

iv. How: same

b. FTC

i. Acclaim

1. Quotes: “said this week that significant gaps remained on core issues”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “two sides”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “reached a six-month agreement under which Iran suspended some nuclear activities in exchange for modest relief from sanctions that have hurt Iran’s economy”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

8. d
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “that both Iran and the major powers appear to be fulfilling their commitments under that interim agreement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “is reassuring”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “the powers”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “want Iran to permanently pare back its nuclear activities so that it will not be able to quickly produce a nuclear bomb”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety
10. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “That would mean”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “reducing its centrifuges and curbing operations at facilities that are designed to produce nuclear fuel”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “In return”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would be substantially more sanctions relief for Iran’s battered economy”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “the supreme leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “sounded pretty implacable on Wednesday when he said, “We will not cede any of our gains in nuclear research and development.””
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
13. D
   i. Who: same
ii. What: “hard-line forces on both sides”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “working to undermine any deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Israel and some members of Congress”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “insisting that Iran must abandon all nuclear enrichment activities, even for nonweapons purposes”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety, trust
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [Iran enrichment abandonment]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “would be ideal, but it is unrealistic, and insisting on it would scuttle any chance of an agreement”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “hard-liners”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “know that, which puts them in the curious position of making a huge political fuss about Iran’s nuclear program while blocking any realistic diplomatic solution”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [opposition]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “could cause problems for President Obama as he tries to push talks forward”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “latest controversy”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “centers on the nomination of Hamid Aboutalebi as Iran’s new ambassador to the United Nations”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Mr. Aboutalebi”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “reportedly served as an interpreter for the students who took over the American embassy in Tehran in 1979 and held 52 Americans hostage for 444 days”

c. Values
   i. Justice
1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust, safety

20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Mr. Aboutalebi”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “moderate at home and is opposed by Iran’s hard-liners”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

21. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Here, spurred by Senator Ted Cruz, a Texas Republican, who called Mr. Aboutalebi a terrorist, and Senator Charles Schumer, Democrat of New York”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “Congress voted to deny him a visa”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
      ii. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

22. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “President Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “set an unfortunate precedent on Friday by saying he would deny Mr. Aboutalebi a visa anyway”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
      ii. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

23. D
   i. Who: same
ii. What: “United States”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “supposed to admit whomever a country designates as its ambassador, barring a direct national security threat”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

24. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Muammar el-Qaddafi, Yasir Arafat and Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, the former Iranian president”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “were all allowed to visit”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

25. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “the appointment”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “a real misstep by President Hassan Rouhani”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

26. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “hard to believe”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
Attack
1. Quotes: “he does not know how acutely the embassy takeover affected Americans and did not realize that he was handing hard-liners a new issue”

c. Values
  i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

27. D
  i. Who: same
  ii. What: “none of this”
  iii. To whom: same
  iv. How: same

b. FTC
  i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “should divert the two sides from pushing hard to secure a final nuclear deal”

c. Values
  i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

28. D
  i. Who: same
  ii. What: “If the major powers and Iran can do that”
  iii. To whom: same
  iv. How: same

b. FTC
  i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “they will create an opportunity for dealing with other important challenges, including Afghanistan, drug trafficking, Syria and Iran’s support for extremist groups”

c. Values
  i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

29. D
  i. Who: same
  ii. What: “consequences of failure”
  iii. To whom: same
  iv. How: same

b. FTC
  i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “equally enormous”

c. Values
  i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iran deal”
   iii. To whom: readers of the *New York Times*, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “keep pushing”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patience

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “unreasonable optimism”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “surrounded nuclear talks between Iran and the major powers”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Unreasonable pessimism”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “should not surround the failure to reach an overall agreement and the decision to extend negotiations for seven months”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Anwar Sadat, the former Egyptian president”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “believed 70 percent of the Israeli-Arab conflict was psychological”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “same” [conflict]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “true of the American-Iranian confrontation at the heart of the standoff between Tehran and the West”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “barrier … 35-year-old trauma”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “has fallen”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust, safety

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “immense achievement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “does not in itself assure success”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Plenty of people”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “want enmity preserved”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “seven questions for the next seven months”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “may prove helpful”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “still by far the best option”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “alternatives”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. quotes: “continuation of the relentless buildup of Iranian nuclear capacity seen over the past decade or yet another American war in the Middle East that would do little to dent the program, lock in hard-liners for a generation and likely prompt an Iranian dash for a bomb, setting off a regional arms race”

c. values
   i. prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “idea of the United States at war with the Sunni killers of Islamic State and at war with Islamic State's sworn enemy, Shiite Iran”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “scenario may hold appeal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “looks like a nightmare”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “double down on diplomacy”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “extension of talks favor Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “no”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

14. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “interim agreement”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “proved effective”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “had about 200 kilograms of 20-percent-enriched uranium. Today, it has none. The number of operational centrifuges has been frozen. International inspections have been redoubled. Not for a decade had the pause button been hit in this way. Yes, Iran has received some sanctions relief, bringing in about $700 million a month, but that scarcely offsets plunging oil revenue”

   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Israel's call for complete dismantlement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “not achievable in the real world … perfect cannot be the enemy of the good”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Diplomacy”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “about tough compromise, not ideal outcomes”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “nuclear know-how attained by Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “cannot be undone”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “aim”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “must be to ring fence for at least a decade a strictly monitored program, compatible only with peaceful use of nuclear power”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
      ii. Justice
         1. rationale: appeal to fairness, trust, safety

20. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “Iran”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will not renounce the right set out in that treaty to "nuclear energy for peaceful purposes" at the behest of a nuclear-armed nonsignatory of that treaty, Israel”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

21. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [renunciation]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “This is reality; deal with it”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

22. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran's nuclear program”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “has the emotional resonance the nationalization of its oil had in the 1950s”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

23. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “nationalization”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “prompted a never-forgotten Anglo-American coup”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

24. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Calls for dismantlement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “seen in Iran through this prism”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

25. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “if you seek "a zero-sum game”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “doomed to failure”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

26. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Setting impossible targets”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “code for favoring war.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

27. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “main dangers now to the negotiations”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same

b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “Republican Congress, hard-liners in Tehran around Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, and Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu will try to undermine the talks”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

28. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “new Congress”
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “may push for new sanctions”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

29. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “talk of "appeasement,"
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “the cheap Chamberlain riff … favorite sound bite of naysayers”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

30. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “A sanctions push”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “would be extremely foolish”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

31. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “would constitute a potential talks-breaker that may prod President Obama into a veto”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

32. D
i. Who: same  
ii. What: [Obama veto]  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: same  

b. FTC  
i. Acclaim  
1. Quotes: “reinforce Washington chatter about "an imperial presidency"”  

c. Values  
i. Prudence  
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom  

33. D  
i. Who: same  
ii. What: “Obama”  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: same  

b. FTC  
i. Acclaim  
1. Quotes: “should respond that he's less interested in chatter than the history books”  

c. Values  
i. Prudence  
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom  

34. D  
i. Who: same  
ii. What: “Iran [as] America's enemy”  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: same  

b. FTC  
i. Attack  
1. Quotes: “Yes, Iran supports Hezbollah. It supports Syrian President Bashar al-Assad. Its operatives have killed or plotted to kill Americans since the birth of the Islamic Republic in 1979, especially in the early years”  

c. Values  
i. Justice  
1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety, trust  

35. D  
i. Who: same  
ii. What: “Iran”  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: same  

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “has overlapping interests with the United States in Afghanistan and Iraq. It is a relative island of stability in a violent Middle East. Its young population is overwhelmingly pro-American. Most of them place Israel at the bottom of their list of priorities”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

36. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “United States”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “does business with plenty of strategic adversaries, including Russia”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

37. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Middle East”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “stymied”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

38. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “a cold American-Iranian understanding”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “could redraw the map of the region”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
39. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Khamenei call[ing] the shots”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “supreme leader and the president need each other”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
40. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iranian economy”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “is a shambles”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
41. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Khamenei”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “needs Rouhani to fix it”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
42. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Rouhani”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “needs Khamenei as a shield from the toughest hard-liners”
c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

43. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “West”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will never find better interlocutors than Rouhani and Zarif”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

44. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “other reasons to favor an accord”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Iran is the last sizable emerging market economy not integrated in the global economy. Integrating it will provide a huge boost. The more contact there is between Iran and the West, the more moderating forces will be reinforced”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iran deal”
   iii. To whom: readers of the New York Times, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
2. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “final dash”
3. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “the major powers and Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
2. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “face a Nov. 24 deadline for completing an agreement that would limit Iran’s nuclear program in exchange for lifting sanctions”
3. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “high-level talks”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
2. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “failed to achieve a breakthrough on important issues, leading to growing speculation that the deadline will not be met”
3. Values
   i. prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “talk”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “nobody wants to see the process collapse … about extending the negotiations and even codifying, in broad terms, the considerable progress that has been achieved already”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patience

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “momentum … chances for a comprehensive permanent agreement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “must be preserved … kept alive; anything less would be a tragedy”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran's nuclear program”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “viewed as a threat by the international community from the day it was first disclosed”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety, trust

6. D
   i. Who: same
ii. What: “size and scope of its [Iran] activities”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “raised fears that Tehran might one day produce a weapon”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety, trust

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Any deal that can be accepted, or sustained”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “must be structured so that Iran cannot one day make a dash to build a nuclear weapon without the world having enough warning to intervene”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “A successful agreement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “offers benefits for both sides”

   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
      ii. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Sanctions on Iran”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “would be lifted gradually, bolstering the country's economy and opening the door to Iran's reintegration into the international community”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
ii. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “an agreement”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “would reassure the world that Iran is interested only in nuclear energy, not in a nuclear weapon, and could make possible cooperation on other challenges, including the fight against the Islamic State”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
ii. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to trust, safety

11. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “diplomatic obstacles”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “lie mainly with Iran and its refusal to reduce its ability to produce enriched uranium”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
ii. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

12. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “A recent report”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “suggests that Iran is considering a compromise”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
ii. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

13. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Russia”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “would build two nuclear power reactors for Iran”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

14. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Such steps”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “would assure Iran that its power needs would be met indefinitely and that it would have no need for industrial-size uranium enrichment capacity”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to trust, fairness, safety
ii. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Such arrangements”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would give the United States and its partners … more flexibility on how many centrifuges … Iran could continue to operate”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “The major powers”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “proposed limiting Iran's operating centrifuges”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

17. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “resisted any reduction”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

18. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Other unresolved issues”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “include how quickly economic sanctions would be lifted and whether international inspectors would be free to visit suspect facilities”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “consequences of failure to reach an accord”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would be serious, including the weakening of President Hassan Rouhani of Iran and his foreign minister, Mohammad Javad Zarif, who count as moderates in Iran, and who, like President Obama, have taken a political risk to try to make an agreement happen”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “adhered to an interim agreement that froze and rolled back its nuclear program”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

21. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “experience”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “offers some hope that, subject to a rigorous verification regime, Iran will be able to fulfill a more permanent agreement”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust
22. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “President Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “took the right step recently when he wrote to Iran's supreme leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, to nudge him toward a nuclear deal”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

23. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “other leaders”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “should weigh in as well”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to duty
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

24. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “agreement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “too important to let slip away.”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
Opposing Viewpoints in Context,

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iran’s nuclear program”
   iii. To whom: readers of the New York Times, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “impasse”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “the moment”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “to break the logjam on a comprehensive deal limiting Iran's nuclear program.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “so far”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “no real sign of movement, much less a breakthrough”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “fault”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “lies mainly with Iran”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Both sides”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “publicly committed to a deal”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “President Hassan Rouhani of Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “denounced Western-led sanctions”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “President Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “put the onus on Iran, warning”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: same
ii. What: “negotiators”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “made progress on several issues”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “biggest stumbling block”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “how much enriched uranium Iran would be allowed to continue producing”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Israel and its hard-line allies in Congress”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “want to end the enriched uranium program altogether”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

10. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “Mr. Obama and the other big powers”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “have said that Iran can keep a limited program for research purposes”

c. Values
   i. Justice
1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “caveat”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “program must be structured so that Iran cannot one day make a dash to build a nuclear weapon without the world having enough warning to intervene”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust, safety

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “The big powers”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “want to reduce Iran's enrichment capacity so that it would take a year or more to produce enough weapons grade material for one nuclear bomb”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iranians”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “have 19,000 centrifuge machines”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Americans”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “proposed cutting the number of operating centrifuges”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iranians”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “insisted on many thousands more”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “would give them an industrial-size capacity”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “to produce the enriched uranium they say they need to fuel nuclear energy reactors”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

17. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [industrial-size capacity]
   iii. To whom: Same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “not cost-effective … does not need such capacity”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Russia”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “providing fuel … and can do so indefinitely”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “For Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “more about politics and saving face than about real needs”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “nuclear program”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “cost billions of dollars and is a source of great national pride”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
21. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “unwilling to eliminate any centrifuges because it fears it would look weak”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

22. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “deserves credit for honoring an interim accord that is already curbing production”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust

23. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “refusing to budge on the centrifuges invites doubts about its claims to not want a nuclear weapon”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust

24. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Proposals under discussion”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “could be the basis for a win-win compromise”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

25. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “reports”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “Americans were considering letting Iran keep 4,500 operating centrifuges instead of 1,500”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

26. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Other ideas”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “include disabling centrifuges by disconnecting pipes and replacing Iran's older operating centrifuges with a smaller number of advanced centrifuges.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

27. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Mr. Rouhani and Mr. Zarif”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “brought negotiations to this point”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

28. D
   i. Who: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “must decide if he has the courage to defy the forces in his country who will always see America as an enemy and let his negotiators bring a deal to a close”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

29. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: [defying forces]
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would allow sanctions to be lifted and unfetter Iran to grow economically, shed its diplomatic isolation and, ideally, become a more constructive participant in regional affairs”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iran’s Nukes”
   iii. To whom: readers of the New York Times, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “keep negotiating”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patience

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Despite six months of negotiations”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “seems unlikely that Iran and the major powers will complete an agreement limiting Iran’s nuclear program by a self-imposed July 20 deadline”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [talks]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “left open the possibility of extending talks for up to six more months”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [negotiators]
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “should not hesitate to do so”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “whole point of this exercise”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “to ensure that Iran cannot produce a nuclear weapon”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “goal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “within reach, and it would be irresponsible not to make
         the maximum effort to bridge the final gaps”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Weekend talks in Vienna involving Secretary of State John Kerry;
         the Iranian foreign minister, Mohammad Javad Zarif; and their European
         counterparts”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “suggested enough movement, so far, to justify an
         extension”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [extension]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “will enrage Iran’s fiercest critics in Congress”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “if talks are allowed to collapse on Sunday”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “the interim agreement reached in November, with which Iran has complied, would dissolve”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “would free Iran from temporary restraints on its nuclear activities and allow the United States and Europeans to reimpose the limited sanctions that are now suspended”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety

10. D
    i. Who: same
ii. What: “talks”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “also involve Russia, China, Britain, France and Germany”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “progress reported by Mr. Kerry on Tuesday”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “seems to reflect Iran’s new flexibility on the main issue”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Iran”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Defense
   1. Quotes: “insists its program is aimed solely at producing energy for domestic use”
ii. Attack
   1. Quotes: “history of hiding its nuclear program has caused legitimate suspicions and forced Western negotiators to exact detailed guarantees”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to trust, fairness, safety

13. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Mr. Zarif”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “gave an idea of what this flexibility might entail”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [flexibility]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “in return for a gradual lifting of sanctions, his
government would freeze Iran’s current enrichment capacity”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust
15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would be treated like any other nation with a peaceful
nuclear program”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust
16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “proposal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would effectively extend limited concessions Iran made
in the interim deal”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
17. D
   i. Who: same
ii. What: “Mr. Zarif’s proposal”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “falls short because Iran would not be required to
dismantle any of its centrifuges and might not provide sufficient
guarantees that it would not reverse course at some point and
produce a bomb”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust, safety

18. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “deal”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “would only last for three to seven years”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Americans”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “want a commitment of at least a decade not to exceed the
current level of centrifuges”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust, safety

20. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Such differences”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “not insurmountable”
c. Values  
   i. Prudence  
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

21. D  
   i. Who: same  
   ii. What: “Arms Control Association and others”  
   iii. To whom: same  
   iv. How: same  

b. FTC  
   i. Acclaim  
      1. Quotes: “argued, one alternative would be to limit Iran’s enrichment program for six to 10 years at current capacity and let it expand later, providing that Iran cooperates with international inspectors. Another would be for the major powers to supply Iran with the fuel it needs and thus give them no incentive to expand their own abilities to produce the fuel.”

c. Values  
   i. Prudence  
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

22. D  
   i. Who: same  
   ii. What: “negotiators”  
   iii. To whom: same  
   iv. How: same  

b. FTC  
   i. Acclaim  
      1. Quotes: “made progress on other issues”

23. D  
   i. Who: same  
   iii. To whom: same  
   iv. How: same  

b. FTC  
   i. Attack  
      1. Quotes: “None of that has impressed … determined to sabotage any deal”

   c. Values  
   i. Prudence  
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom  
   ii. Justice
1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

24. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Some in Congress”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “demanding conditions that would tie President Obama’s hands and make it impossible to lift sanctions on Iran, essential to any agreement”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

25. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Representative Eliot Engel, Democrat of New York”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “predicted that even if a nuclear deal is reached, Congress will not lift all sanctions unless Iran “ceased to be a bad actor” in the Middle East, an absurdly vague and unachievable standard”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

26. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Representative Ed Royce, Republican of California”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “wants to impose new sanctions”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

27. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “statement last week by Iran’s supreme leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, saying that Iran ultimately wants 190,000 centrifuges — far beyond anything the Americans would allow or Iran could plausibly use”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “provided ammunition for opponents”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust, fairness
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

28. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “in any deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “risks”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

29. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “if there is no deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “many more [risks] … Iran’s program resumes unchecked and an opportunity to work with Iran on other regional challenges slips away”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “E.U. Official”
   iii. To whom: readers of the *New York Times*, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “’No Guarantee’ of Final Nuclear Deal With Iran”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “European Union's foreign policy chief, Catherine Ashton”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “no guarantee” that Iran and world powers would be able to reach a final, comprehensive agreement over Iran's nuclear program”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Ms. Ashton”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “reached an interim agreement with Iran in November to limit its nuclear program”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “after more than a decade of talks”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “It was a breakthrough”
c. Values
   i. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patience
4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “The six-month, renewable agreement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “obliged Iran to stop enriching uranium to high levels and to reduce its stockpile of near-weapons-grade uranium”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety, trust
5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “In return”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “some economic sanctions were lifted”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Ms. Ashton”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “tried to temper optimism about a final deal.”
c. Values
   i. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patience
i. Who: “Ms. Ashton”
ii. What: “interim agreement”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “really important, but not as important as a comprehensive agreement”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “the "difficult" and "challenging" nature of the process”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “"there is no guarantee that we will succeed,"”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: [Iran's foreign minister, Mohammad Javad Zarif]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “emphasized that his negotiators would agree only to a deal that respected Iran's "rights," a reference to the nation's ability to enrich uranium independently on its own soil”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

10. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu of Israel”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
1. Quotes: “said Sunday at the start of a cabinet meeting that Ms. Ashton should ask the Iranians about a merchant ship Israel seized in the Red Sea last week, carrying what Israel described as an Iranian shipment of weapons intended for Palestinian militants in the Gaza Strip”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust, safety

11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “rejected Israel's allegations”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust

12. D
   i. Who: “Mr. Netanyahu”
   ii. What: “actions of the regime in Tehran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Nobody has the right to ignore the true and murderous”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust, safety

13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “proper”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “for the international community to give its opinion regarding Iran's true policy, not its propaganda”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
   ii. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “many in Iran”
   iii. To whom: readers of the *New York Times*, internet searchers
   iv. How: same

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “bullish”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
      ii. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “text message”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “gave Fatemeh Moghimi a thrill she had been waiting years to feel. "The deal," it read, "was done."”

   c. Values
      i. Temperance
         1. Rationale: appeal to patience
      ii. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Ms. Moghimi”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “a second to absorb the news. When she did, she recalled recently in her Tehran office, she fairly screamed to herself, "We're in business!"”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “message”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same
b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “bad joke, and instead the nuclear negotiations were extended for seven more months -- bad news for Iran's battered, inflation-ridden economy”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Ms. Moghimi”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “unfazed”

c. Values
   i. fortitude
      1. rationale: appeal to courage

5. d
   i. who: “Ms. Moghimi”
   ii. what: [sanctions ending]
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: interview
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “not giving up hope," she said with a smile. "It is going to be over soon. It is as if the sun is peeking through the clouds after a terrible rainstorm”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to courage
   ii. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patience
   iii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “Ms. Moghimi's unyielding optimism”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. attack
   1. Quotes: “dented briefly last month when nuclear negotiators agreed to a second extension of the talks without even a framework for further negotiations”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

7. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “latest extension”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “only the postponement of an inevitable thaw between Iran and the rest of the world”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
i. Who: “Ms. Moghimi”
ii. What: “world”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: interview

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “needs this deal … It will happen”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “moderates and conservatives”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. attack
   1. Quotes: “have expressed concerns about the unchecked rise in expectations, among the public as well as among elite business classes, that a deal will be cinched … warning that the enthusiasm could turn to bitter disappointment if the negotiations, set to resume in Geneva next week, should fail, possibly touching off unrest”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
   i. Who: “Farshad Ghorbanpour, a political analyst”
   ii. What: “prospect of a better future”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “enough to make them forget their problems for now … we will see if that state of mind will prove to be costly for us”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “confidence”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “beginning to take on a life of its own, with executives in the major export industries -- oil and gas, transportation and carpets -- feverishly preparing for what they envision as gloriously prosperous days ahead … Meeting with foreign businesspeople at the conferences that are springing up regularly in Tehran, they are knocking out memorandums of understanding and other nonbinding agreements and even some contracts -- all with caveats saying sanctions must be lifted first”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Temperance
1. Rationale: Appeal to patience
   iii. Justice
1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

12. D
   i. Who: “Mohammad Javad Hassannejad, the chief executive of an oil and
gas consultancy, Petrosadian”
   ii. What: “contracts with Europeans and Arabs”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview
   
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “signed … to design five refineries”
   
c. Values
   i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

13. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “contracts”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
   
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “potentially worth many millions of dollars for his
company and would inject billions of dollars into the stagnant
Iranian economy”
   
c. Values
   i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

14. D
   i. Who: “Hassannejad”
   ii. What: “spirits”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “are high … growing confidence. After the deal we will
witness an unbelievable boom”
   
c. Values
   i. fortitude
   1. Rationale: appeal to courage
   ii. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

iii. Justice
  1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

15. D

  i. Who: author
  ii. What: “Tehran's Chamber of Commerce”
  iii. To whom: same
  iv. How: author language

b. FTC

  i. Acclaim
     1. Quotes: “organizing an international conference for foreign investors”

c. Values

  i. Prudence
     1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D

  i. Who: “Ms. Moghimi”
  ii. What: [Iranian businesses]
  iii. To whom: same
  iv. How: interview

b. FTC

  i. Acclaim
     1. Quotes: “inform them where and how foreigners can invest, and help them to come to Iran … ready to start working”

c. Values

  i. Prudence
     1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. D

  i. Who: author
  ii. What: “When Ms. Moghimi thinks of Iran's future”
  iii. To whom: same
  iv. How: author language

b. FTC

  i. Acclaim
     1. Quotes: “sees a thriving nation at the heart of the crossroads between Asia, Europe and the Middle East”

c. Values

  i. Prudence
     1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. D

  i. Who: same
  ii. What: “Her fleet of trucks”
  iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will grow beyond imagination … predicted that foreign companies would choose not the glitter of Dubai, in the United Arab Emirates, but the future boomtown Tehran for their regional headquarters”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
19. D
   i. Who: “Ms. Moghimi”
   ii. What: [sanctions ending]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “should start preparing now … we will be ready once there is an end to the sanctions”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope
20. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “wave of optimism”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “began with the election of a moderate president, Hassan Rouhani, who promised to mend Iran's ties with the world”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope
21. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Mr. Rouhani”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “continues to encourage that thinking, saying just last week that the "nuclear issue would be brought to its destination."

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

22. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “foreign minister and chief nuclear negotiator, Mohammad Javad Zarif”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “promised after the most recent extension that a nuclear deal could happen "within weeks."

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

23. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “heightened expectations”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “not solely to be found among Iranians”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

24. d
i. who: same
ii. what: “flow of foreign delegations to Iran”
iii. to whom: same
iv. how: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “continues at a steady pace, bringing eager businessmen who in conferences laud Iran's unique geographical position, its stability and its largely untapped market of middle-class consumers”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

25. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “a French executive”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “acknowledged that the potential for business with Iran was stunning indeed”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

26. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [conference businessmen]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “just viewed a 3-D movie showing workers in blue overalls manning robots in the Iran Khodro factory, which churns out hundreds of thousands of cars each year”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

27. D
   i. Who: “executive, Arnaud de David-Beauregards”
   ii. What: “working together”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. Interview

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “sooner … the better … hope our dear colleagues will wait for us”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope
   iii. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patience

28. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iran's national carmaker”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “feels like the cutest girl in the bar”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

29. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “industry”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “being showcased by the Iranian government as a symbol of Iranian potential, a treasure to be sold off to the highest-bidding foreign partner”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

30. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “hopes”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “are soaring”

c. Values
i. Fortitude
   1. Rationale: appeal to hope

31. D
   i. Who: “Hashem Yekehzare, the president of Iran Khodro”
   ii. What: [Iranian businessmen]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “planning our future irrespective of any deadline”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
      ii. Fortitude
         1. Rationale: appeal to hope

32. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “his company”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “partnered with the French automaker PSA Peugeot Citron under a deal worth more than $2.5 billion a year …
      ii. Attack
         1. Quotes: “French were forced to pull out in 2012 because of the American-led sanctions.”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
      ii. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

33. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [the French]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “eager to return, but Mr. Yekehzare said the company now had a bevy of suitors to choose from”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

ii. Fortitude
   1. Rationale: appeal to hope

34. D
   i. Who: “Mr. Yekehzare”
   ii. What: “all big American carmakers”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “showing interest in cooperating with us … future is bright”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

35. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “optimism about the future”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “stands in stark contrast to the grim reality of Iran's deepening economic plight”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

36. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “40 percent drop in oil prices”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “forcing the government to start making cuts in popular subsidies and other government programs”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

37. D
   i. Who: same
ii. What: “price of bread”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “raised by 30 percent”

c. Values
   i. justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

38. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “government”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “quietly begun phasing out monthly cash handouts of roughly $11 per person to some groups of Iranians”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

39. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “the battered local currency”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “allowed to fall by 8 percent recently”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

40. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iranians”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “sloughing off the bad news”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to courage
ii. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

41. D
   i. Who: “Ms. Moghimi”
   ii. What: “if the nuclear negotiations fail and sanctions are continued, or even toughened further”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “I will be very depressed”
   ii. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “I really have the feeling that will not happen”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

42. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “continuing support for the nuclear talks from Iran's supreme leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “beacon of hope for many in Iran's private sector”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

43. D
   i. Who: “Mr. Hassannejad, the oil and gas consultant”
   ii. What: “leader of the revolution”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would not be backing a failing project”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

44. D
   i. Who: author
ii. What: [Mr. Hassannejad]
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “already made a round of hires in recent months in anticipation of a deal -- and a subsequent wave of work”

c. Values
i. Fortitude
   1. Rationale: appeal to hope
ii. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

45. D
i. Who: [Mr. Hassannejad]
ii. What: “past years”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: interview

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “really difficult”

c. Values
i. justice
   1. Rationale: Appeal to fairness

46. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “quicker the talks end”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “sooner we can start”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

47. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “Iranians”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “gazed at the latest car models from Iran Khodro”

c. Values
i. Fortitude
   1. Rationale: appeal to hope

48. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “An investor, Massoud Ranajee”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “he too was optimistic”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

49. D
   i. Who: [An investor, Massoud Ranajee]
   ii. What: “to be honest”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “sold all my shares in this company”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

50. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “If they sign a deal with a foreign company”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “might consider buying, but for now, it's all way too risky and uncertain”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
      ii. What: “President of Iran”
         iii. To whom: readers of the New York Times, internet searchers
         iv. How: author language
   b. Functional theory categories
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “vows nuclear deal”
   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety, trust

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
      ii. What: “Iran's president”
         iii. To whom: same
         iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “stressed on Monday that he was determined to cinch a nuclear deal and prepared to take on the conservative forces who would prefer not to see an agreement with the West, even if that means continued economic sanctions on Iran.”
   c. Values
      i. Fortitude
         1. Rationale: appeal to courage
      ii. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
      iii. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: “Hassan Rouhani”
      ii. What: “Some people”
      iii. To whom: same
      iv. How: public statement
   b. FTC
      i. attack
         1. Quotes: “may not like to see the sanctions lifted … numbers are few, and they want to muddy the waters”
   c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

ii. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

3. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “deadline for those talks”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “extended by seven months”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Rouhani”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “continuing to maintain that a deal will be concluded”

c. Values
   i. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patience
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “foreign minister, Mohammad Javad Zarif”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “agreement could be reached in a matter of "weeks."”

c. Values
   i. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patience
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. d
   i. Who: same
ii. what: “Both men”
iii. to whom: same
iv. how: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “tied their political future to the deal”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Rouhani”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “stays on message on what he says is Iran's bright future”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “came to office this year promising not just to strike a nuclear deal that would lift economic sanctions but to end Iran's isolation from the world economy and to promote individual freedoms”
c. Values
   i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
9. D
   i. Who: “Rouhani”
   ii. What: “The people”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “will achieve their rights … prepare for interaction with
the world … in the near future many investors will come to our
country”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: [Rouhani]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “acknowledged that there are groups in Iran opposed to a
nuclear deal, presumably those who benefited from sanctions by
tightening their grip on the economy, often officials connected to
hard-line clerics and commanders”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Arrayed against these powerful figures”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “is the entire Iranian elite”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

12. D
   i. Who: [Rouhani]
   ii. What: “overwhelming majority”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “in favor of getting the sanctions removed”

c. Values
   i. Justice
1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

13. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “United States and Iranian diplomats”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “had a preliminary meeting on Iran's nuclear program”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “wants sanctions lifted, while the world powers are demanding more control over Iran's nuclear facilities”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety, trust

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “how far Iran may still have to go in guaranteeing individual rights”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “a spokeswoman for Mary Rezaian, the mother of the arrested American-Iranian journalist Jason Rezaian, said that Ms. Rezaian, an American, would travel to Tehran on Wednesday to try to meet him”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Rezaian a correspondent for The Washington Post”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “has been held in Evin prison since July 22”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Kerry and Iran Minister”
   iii. To whom: readers of the New York Times, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “confer on nuclear issue”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran's foreign minister, Mohammad Javad Zarif, met for an hour on Sunday with Secretary of State John Kerry”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “another sign of serious efforts to solve the crisis around Iran's nuclear program”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Mr. Zarif”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “said on a public panel that Iran "will go to those negotiations with the political will and good faith to reach an agreement."
   c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust
3. D
   i. Who: same
ii. What: “Mr. Kerry”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “reiterated the importance of both sides negotiating in good faith”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

4. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: same
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “urged Iran to keep to "its commitments"”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

5. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: same
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “told Mr. Zarif that the United States would continue to enforce existing sanctions … emphasized that Washington would keep its commitment not to create new sanctions while the temporary, six-month deal was in force”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

6. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Mr. Zarif”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “said publicly that Iran wanted to negotiate seriously for as long as necessary, which could take longer than six months, and he offered to begin a dialogue on human rights issues with the European Union”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran and the world”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “at a crossroads, despite decades of mistrust on both sides”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust
   ii. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patience

8. D
   i. Who: “Mr. Zarif”
   ii. What: “opportunity”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “is there, and we need to seize it”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “fully cooperating with the International Atomic Energy Agency, the organization that monitors compliance with the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, which Iran has signed”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

10. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “Iran”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “complying so far but that important questions about its nuclear program, which Iran insists has no military component, remained to be clarified”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust

11. D
    i. Who: “Mr. Zarif”
    ii. What: “important questions”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: public statement
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “prepared to address them”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

12. D
    i. Who: author
    ii. What: “Iran”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “agreed to halt its enrichment of uranium to 20 percent”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety, trust

13. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “European Union and the United States”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “agreed to lift certain sanctions temporarily and return $4.2 billion of Iran's assets”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

14. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “A comprehensive deal”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “expected to be difficult to achieve”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Iran and the United States”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “seem committed to trying -- Iran to end its isolation and the sanctions imposed upon it, and Washington to solve at least one big Middle East problem and avoid the possibility of military action to prevent the development of an Iranian bomb”

c. Values
   i. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patient hard work
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety
   iii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “failure of the talks”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would bring the military option quickly back to the fore”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
17. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Senator John McCain”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “critical of the Obama administration's policy in the Middle East and said Iran had a long history of deception around its nuclear program”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust
18. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [McCain]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “advised a policy of "don't trust, but verify" with Iran”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust
19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Defense Minister Moshe Yaalon of Israel”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
1. Quotes: “castigated Iran as being dedicated to a nuclear weapon and acting to deceive, and he repeated Israel's warning that it would not allow Iran to get a nuclear weapon, a commitment also made by President Obama”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust, fairness, safety

20. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “Mr. Kerry”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “spoke to Mr. Zarif about the delay in moving Syrian chemical weapons to port … and about the dire situation of refugees and displaced people in besieged areas of Syria”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

21. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “Shiite Iran”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “close ally of President Bashar al-Assad of Syria and has provided crucial military and financial support to him”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust, safety

22. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “Mr. Zarif”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “not authorized to discuss Syria”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

23. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran's policy on Syria”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “not controlled by the Foreign Ministry”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

24. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Mr. Kerry”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “raised the cases of three American citizens detained or missing in Iran and urged that they be returned”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust, safety

25. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “found himself at the center of a dispute a day after warning that the risk of foreign boycotts of Israel over its policies toward the Palestinians would intensify should his current Middle East peace effort fail”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
26. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu of Israel and some of his senior ministers”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “strongly criticized those who are threatening a boycott of Israel”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

27. D
   i. Who: “Mr. Netanyahu”
   ii. What: “Attempts to impose a boycott on the state of Israel”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “are immoral and unjust …will not achieve their goal”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

28. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Mr. Kerry”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. defense
      1. quotes: “always opposed calls for boycotts and expected "all parties to accurately portray his record and statements”
c. values
   i. justice
      1. rationale: appeal to fairness, trust
   ii. prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

29. d
i. who: “Jennifer Psaki, a State Department spokeswoman”
ii. what: “Mr. Kerry”
iii. to whom: same
iv. how: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “described some well-known and previously stated facts about what is at stake for both sides if this process fails, including the consequences for the Palestinians”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

30. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: same
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Defense
   1. Quotes: “only reference to a boycott was a description of actions undertaken by others that he has always opposed”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Appeal to wisdom
      ii. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust
New York Times

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: readers of the New York Times, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Altering Reactor in Bid for Nuclear Deal”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Atomic power engineers in Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “started redesigning a partly constructed reactor in the northwest city of Arak to limit the amount of plutonium it produces, the country’s top nuclear official said Wednesday, expressing hope that the change would help alleviate Western objections that the plutonium could be used in weapons”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “The official, Ali Akbar Salehi, the director of the Atomic Energy Organization of Iran”
   iii. To whom: Same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “did not specify how much plutonium would be produced under the redesign of the reactor, which officials have said was constructed for the peaceful purpose of creating medical isotopes”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Mr. Salehi”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “said experts at the facility had offered to “redesign the heart of the reactor in order to allay the concerns of some countries”

c. Values
   i. Courage
      1. Rationale: appeal to courage
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “plutonium and uranium”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “can be used as the fuel of nuclear weapons”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “The Arak reactor”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “one of the unresolved issues”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “negotiators”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “reached a temporary accord that froze most of Iran’s uranium enrichment and other nuclear work in exchange for limited relief from Western economic sanctions, in hopes that the extra time would enable them to finalize a permanent agreement”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
ii. Temperance
   1. Rationale: appeal to patience

7. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: same
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “agreed to extend the negotiation”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Iran”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Defense
   1. Quotes: “insisted its nuclear development is for civilian use”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust, safety

9. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “The P5-plus-1 group”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “it needs guarantees that Iran will not create nuclear weapons for an agreement to be reached”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety, trust

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “U.S.”
   iii. To whom: readers of the *New York Times*, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Actions to Enforce Iran Sanctions”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust, safety

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “The United States government”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “escalated enforcement of its Iran sanctions”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “government”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “offered a $5 million bounty”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “announcements”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “charged in a previously sealed indictment with several federal offenses, including conspiracy to commit money laundering, bank fraud and wire fraud”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “announcements”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “signaled the first significant enforcement of American sanctions directed at Iran in about three months, and seemed aimed at dispelling what Obama administration officials have called a misimpression that economic relations with Iran are moving toward normalization”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “administration officials”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “emphasized that most restraints on dealings with Iran remain in place”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

6. D
   i. Who: “Treasury”
   ii. What: “actions”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement
b. FTC  
i. Acclaim  
1. Quotes: “intended to deter future sanctions evasion and prevent Iran from procuring sensitive technologies while we negotiate a comprehensive solution that will prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon and ensures its nuclear program is exclusively peaceful”

c. Values  
i. Justice  
1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust, safety

7. D  
i. Who: author  
ii. What: “reaction from Iran”  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: author language

b. FTC  
i. Attack  
1. Quotes: “no immediate … regards the sanctions as arrogant bullying by the United States and other Western powers”

c. Values  
i. Justice  
1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

8. D  
i. Who: same  
ii. What: “eight Chinese companies”  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: same

b. FTC  
i. Acclaim  
1. Quotes: “described as fronts for Mr. Li, who had been previously identified as a supplier of parts for Iran's ballistic missile activities”

c. Values  
i. Prudence  
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D  
i. Who: sam  
ii. What: “Mr. Li”  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: same

b. FTC  
i. Attack
1. Quotes: “used these companies to illicitly move millions of dollars through United States-based financial institutions to conduct business with Iran”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust, safety

10. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “The Dubai company, … and the two Dubai-based businessmen”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “accused of "shady and deceptive oil deals with Iran,””

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

11. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “violators”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “banned from doing business in the United States, and any properties they hold under American jurisdiction can be seized”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

12. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “The last significant sanctions enforcement actions”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “were in late January and early February”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

13. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “Treasury Department”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “announced what it described as a landmark $152 million settlement of sanctions violations by Clearstream Banking … for having permitted Iran to evade restrictions on dealings with American banks”

c. Values
i. Justice
1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

14. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Treasury Department”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “announced a $9.5 million settlement with the Bank of Moscow, which was accused of illicitly moving money through the American banking system on behalf of Bank Melli, an Iranian bank hit with sanctions”

c. Values
i. Justice
1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

15. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Treasury”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “announced that it had penalized companies and individuals in eight countries”

c. Values
i. Justice
1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

16. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “announcements”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Defense
   1. Quotes: “intended partly as a message to dispel conjecture that the sanctions were unraveling”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

17. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “some critics”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “accused the administration of being willing to play down sanctions violations so as to not jeopardize the success of the nuclear negotiations”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

18. D
   i. Who: “Mark Dubowitz, executive director of the Foundation for Defense of Democracies”
   ii. What: “the Obama administration”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “trying to counter charges that it is willing to overlook all Iranian provocations in order to ensure that nothing interferes with a nuclear deal … may be part of that pushback strategy”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Kerry”
   iii. To whom: readers of the New York Times, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “progress … gaps remain”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Secretary of State John Kerry”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “‘tangible progress’ had been made in negotiations on Iran’s nuclear program, and that he would return to Washington to consult with President Obama over whether to extend a Sunday deadline for a final agreement”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “‘very real gaps’ remained, but his tone — and his acknowledgment that Iran had complied with all of its commitments under a temporary agreement that took effect in January — left little doubt he wanted to extend the talks by weeks or months”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
3. D
i. Who: “one of his [Kerry’s] top advisers”
ii. what: “headed”
iii. to whom: same
iv. how: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “That’s where we’re headed”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Mohammad Javad Zarif, Iran’s foreign minister”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “embraced the idea of extending talks beyond the
deadline”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: [Mohammad Javad Zarif, Iran’s foreign minister]
   ii. What: “now”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “made enough headway to be able to tell our political
bosses that this is a process worth continuing … This is my
recommendation. I am sure Secretary Kerry will make the same
recommendation”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “When the talks began six months ago”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “assumed that if an accord to roll back Iran’s nuclear program was to be reached, the compromises would be negotiated at the 11th hour”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “as the July 20 deadline approaches”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “accord is not yet in hand”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “temporary agreement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “allows for an extension of the talks”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: “Mr. Kerry”
   ii. What: “returning to Washington”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “to consult with President Obama and with leaders in Congress over coming days about the prospects for a comprehensive agreement as well as a path forward if we do not achieve one by the 20th of July, including the question of whether or not more time is warranted.””

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
10. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “complexity of the talks and Mr. Kerry’s negotiating style”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “indication”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patience

11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Mr. Kerry”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “declined to comment on the proposal that Mr. Zarif
         outlined in an interview with The New York Times for what would
         amount to an extension of the current short-term agreement for a
         number of years”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Under Mr. Zarif’s proposal, Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would not have to dismantle any of its existing
         centrifuges, but would use a combination of technologies and
         inspection to provide assurances they could not produce weapons-
         grade material”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust safety
b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “annoyed that Mr. Zarif had discussed details of his proposals”
ii. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “Mr. Kerry said that he would not negotiate in public”

c. Values
  i. Prudence
     1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
  i. Who: [Kerry]
  ii. What: “real negotiation”
  iii. To whom: same
  iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
  i. defense
     1. Quotes: “not going to be done in the public eye … tough negotiations”

c. Values
  i. Prudence
     1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. d
  i. Who: author
  ii. What: “American officials”
  iii. To whom: same
  iv. How: author language

b. FTC
  i. Attack
     1. Quotes: “concerned about several major elements of Mr. Zarif’s proposal”

c. Values
  i. Prudence
     1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D
  i. Who: same
  ii. What: “Mr. Zarif”
  iii. To whom: same
  iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “wants a short agreement of three to seven years”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

17. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “United States and its allies”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “insist on limitations on Iran for at least a decade, preferably longer”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

18. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “speculation”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “that Mr. Zarif’s hints of flexibility, and the progress Mr. Kerry reported on Tuesday, will be enough to provide a basis for continuing the nuclear talks”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. what: “The Iranian proposal”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “runs counter to the goal that Mr. Kerry and others laid out last year”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “The whole negotiation”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “is about adding substantially to the time it would take Iran to produce a nuclear device if it reneged on the agreement”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

21. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Gary Samore, a former senior official on the staff of Mr. Obama’s National Security Council, and president of an advocacy group called United Against Nuclear Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “said that Mr. Zarif’s proposal was “not enough for a deal but enough for an extension of the negotiations.””
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

22. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Olli Heinonen, the former deputy director of the International Atomic Energy Agency, the United Nations nuclear monitor”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “said in an interview that Mr. Zarif’s proposal would not add to the time Iran would need to break out of an accord and produce enough enriched uranium for a nuclear weapon”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

23. D
   i. Who: “Mr. Heinonen”
   ii. What: “What Zarif suggests”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: interview

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “is actually to maintain a status quo … I do not see that this proposal opens any avenues for a deal”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. rationale: appeal to fairness
   ii. Prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

24. d
   i. who: author
   ii. what: “David Albright, a nuclear expert who has been highly critical of Iran”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: author language

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “said that the proposal indicated that broad gaps remained between the two sides”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

25. D
   i. Who: “Mr. Albright”
   ii. What: “Iranians”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “have returned to earth but are not yet in the ballpark of reasonable offers”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: readers of the *New York Times*, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Greets France's Leader, but Warns Against Doing Business With Iran”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
      ii. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “President Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “vowed on Tuesday to come down on companies that evade sanctions against Iran "like a ton of bricks"”

   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “spoke a week after a delegation of French corporate executives traveled to Tehran looking for business opportunities amid diplomatic efforts to reach a nuclear deal”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “French executives’ visit to Tehran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “crystallized fears that the interim nuclear agreement with Iran is setting off a horse race to get back into that country, and could fracture the international sanctions regime cobbled together by the United States and Europe”
   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fear, fairness, safety
4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Administration officials”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “complained publicly and privately”
   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety, trust
5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Mr. Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “delivered the most pointed warning yet”
   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust
6. D
   i. Who: “Mr. Obama”
   ii. What: “Businesses”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “may be exploring, are there some possibilities to get in sooner rather than later if and when there is an actual agreement to be had”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [businesses]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “do so at their own peril right now because we will come down on them like a ton of bricks.”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

8. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Mr. Hollande”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “warned the companies not to sign commercial agreements with Iran before sanctions were lifted”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “French government”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “no control over whether French businesses made a private trip, noting, "The president of the republic is not the president of the employers' union in France.””

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “rare moment of tension”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “joint appearance in which both leaders tried to project an
         image of trans-Atlantic harmony, celebrating a rejuvenated French-
         American partnership on issues from Iran and Syria to
counterterrorism operations in North Africa”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “partnership”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “done little to ease the bloodshed and deepening despair”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety, fairness

12. D
   i. Who: “Mr. Obama”
   ii. What: “horrendous situation on the ground in Syria”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “enormous frustration here”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: [Obama]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “skeptical that further military intervention would solve
         the problem, although he appeared to be groping for other options”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
   i. Who: “Mr. Obama”
   ii. What: “situation”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “fluid … continuing to explore every possible avenue to
         solve this problem”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

15. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Both leaders”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “rebuked Russia for threatening to veto a United Nations
         Security Council resolution demanding that President Bashar al-
         Assad open relief corridors to allow the delivery of food, medicine
         and other supplies to people trapped in besieged cities”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “If Russia blocked the resolution”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
1. Quotes: “it would share blame with the Syrian government for starving civilians in Homs and other cities”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

17. D
   i. Who: “Mr. Hollande”
   ii. What: “object to humanitarian corridors … prevent the vote on a resolution”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “How … Why”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

18. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Both leaders”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “tried to put a good face on what was easily their most difficult moment”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [Obama & Hollande]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “defended the fallback agreement with Russia”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

20. D
   i. Who: “Mr. Hollande”
   ii. What: “process”
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: public statement  
b. FTC  
i. Attack  
1. Quotes: “very long-winded … only partial destruction and it doesn't go nearly far enough”  
c. Values  
i. Justice  
1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety  
21. D  
i. Who: author  
ii. What: “two leaders”  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: author language  
b. FTC  
i. Defense  
1. Quotes: “sought to play down lingering tensions over the National Security Agency's spying on foreign leaders and collection of telephone records overseas.”  
c. Values  
i. Justice  
1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust  
22. D  
i. Who: same  
ii. What: “Mr. Obama … Hollande”  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: same  
b. FTC  
i. Defense  
1. Quotes: “reiterated his pledge to protect the rights of non-Americans, while Mr. Hollande said that after an air-clearing phone call with Mr. Obama, "mutual trust had been restored."”  
c. Values  
i. Justice  
1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust, safety  
23. D  
i. Who: same  
ii. What: “Mr. Obama”  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: same  
b. FTC  
i. Attack
1. Quotes: “appeared to balk at extending to France the special arrangement -- often called a "no-spying agreement" -- that the United States has with Britain, Canada, Australia and New Zealand”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

24. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “France”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “sought closer intelligence cooperation with the United States, though French officials said they were not seeking the same terms as Britain”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

25. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Mr. Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “disputed that any country was immune to American surveillance”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

26. D
   i. Who: “Mr. Obama”
   ii. What: “no spying agreement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “no country where we have a no-spy agreement”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust
27.  D
   i.  Who: author
   ii. What: “United States”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv.  How: author language
b.  FTC
   i.  Acclaim
      1.  Quotes: “in talks with France about ways to deepen its intelligence sharing.”
c.  Values
   i.  Prudence
      1.  Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “bill”
   iii. To whom: readers of the New York Times, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Stokes Debate, and Doubt, on Iran Deal”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom, trust

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Senate sponsors”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “describe it as a "diplomatic insurance policy" that will help President Obama cut a better nuclear deal with Iran”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “White House”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “condemns it as a deal-killer that could put the United States on a path to war”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Senate bill, the Nuclear Weapon Free Iran Act of 2013”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “enshrouded in a fog of overheated talk, as the White House, Congress and a growing legion of lobbyists clash over the wisdom of passing new sanctions against Iran while pursuing diplomacy”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “the question of whether sanctions would cause Iran to leave the bargaining table”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “cannot be answered in Washington”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “That decision”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “is up to the Iranians, who have talked tough about sanctions but have plenty of reasons not to walk away”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “where the legislation may have an effect, and why it so worries the White House”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “lays down the contours of an acceptable final nuclear deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “administration officials”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “insist that many of those conditions are unrealistic, it
         basically sets Mr. Obama up for failure”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “White House”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “under pressure … released technical details of how it is
         carrying out an interim deal with Iran”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “document”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “contained few surprises, though it raised enough
         questions … likely to feed the doubts of skeptics”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

10. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “doubts”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same

b. FTC
    i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “run through the Senate bill, which would require Mr.
Obama to certify, every 30 days, that a host of conditions have
been met in order to defer the new sanctions”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust, safety

11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “White House officials”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “zeroed in on three of the conditions”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust, safety

12. D
   i. Who: “Daryl G. Kimball, executive director of the Arms Control
Association”
   ii. What: [bill proponents]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “arguing for a zero enrichment capacity, with a complete
dismantling of Iran's nuclear facilities ... not attainable, and it's not
necessary to prevent Iran from getting a weapon”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

13. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Joint Plan of Action that Iran signed”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “foresees a final deal that would allow Iran a "mutually
defined enrichment program with mutually defined parameters" --
  enough centrifuges, in other words, to enrich uranium to a level
  adequate to fuel a civilian nuclear reactor”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Proponents of the bill”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “deny it would deprive Iran of the right to modest enrichment”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “language on enrichment”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “intentionally vague to mollify both Republicans … and Democrats”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust, safety

16. D
   i. Who: “David Albright, an expert on Iran's nuclear program at the Institute for Science and International Security”
   ii. What: “no language”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “that says a centrifuge is prohibited or allowed”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

17. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “ambiguity”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “reflected the fact that the lawmakers who sponsored the bill are "doing it in a bipartisan way, but they have disagreements on what the end state should look like."

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

18. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Mr. Albright”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “said the provision on ballistic missile testing could pose a problem”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Proponents”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “merely echoes prohibitions on such tests that are in United Nations Security Council resolutions”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran's missile program”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
1. Quotes: “was not part of the interim deal, and introducing it now, Mr. Albright said, would inject a combustible element into an already fraught negotiation”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

21. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “requirement that Iran not engage in terrorism against Americans”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “seems self-evident”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

22. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “United States”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “not about to make a deal with a country that attacks its citizens”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety, trust

23. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “language”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “vague on the time frame”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

24. D
   i. Who: same
ii. What: “Iran”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “was certainly guilty of terrorism against Americans in the past -- and broad in its scope, including Iranian proxies like Hezbollah”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust, safety

25. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran’s foreign minister, Mohammad Javad Zarif”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “placed a wreath this week at the grave of a Hezbollah commander, Imad Mughniyeh, who was accused of being a mastermind of the 1983 bombing of the Marine Corps barracks in Beirut, Lebanon”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust, safety

26. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Any future attack by Hezbollah”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “would be grounds to cut off diplomacy with Iran”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

27. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Proponents”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “say the bill would give Mr. Obama leeway to waive the sanctions”

   c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

28. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Administration officials”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “counter that the sanctions would still kick in legally -- a violation, at least in spirit, of the agreement”

   c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

29. D
   i. Who: Same
   ii. What: “White House officials”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “shake their heads at a provision that would commit the United States to support Israel, militarily if necessary, if it decided to strike Iran's nuclear facilities in "legitimate self-defense."”

   c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

30. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Defenders of the bill”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “say the provision is nonbinding and merely repeats an expression of solidarity with Israel that passed the Senate last year”

   c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
ii. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

31. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Mr. Albright”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   
   b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “he believed that the Senate and White House could still negotiate a final version of the bill that would allay the administration's concerns”

   c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

32. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “White House”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   
   b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “seems uninterested”

   c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

33. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “diplomats”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   
   b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “that would be just as well”

   c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

34. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “bill”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   
   b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “might not torpedo the negotiations, "it might give Iran an excuse to leave the table."”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

35. D
   i. Who: “R. Nicholas Burns, a former State Department official”
   ii. What: “idea that the Senate would intervene in the middle of a negotiation to alter the outcome of the negotiation”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “not sensible”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

36. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [US]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “We can only have one president negotiating with Iran, not 525 presidents negotiating”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Book”
   iii. To whom: readers of the New York Times, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Faults Handling of Iranian Defector”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “the suicide bombing of the American Embassy in Beirut, Lebanon, in April 1983”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “often called “the forgotten bombing” — overshadowed by an even deadlier attack on a Marine barracks at the Beirut airport six months later”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “a new book”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “shines a spotlight on the embassy bombing”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “One of those”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Mr. Bird”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “explores Mr. Ames’s shadowy path in the Middle East, where he formed an unlikely friendship with the intelligence chief of the Palestine Liberation Organization and used it to try to draw the Israelis and Palestinians together in peace negotiations”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “makes a startling assertion: that an Iranian intelligence officer who defected to the United States in 2007 and is still living here under C.I.A. protection, oversaw the 1983 bombing, as well as other terrorist attacks against Americans in Lebanon”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
   i. Who: “Mr. Bird”
   ii. What: “When it comes out that at least one of the intelligence officers associated with planning these truck bombings is living in the U.S”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “relatives of these victims are going to go ballistic”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [revelation]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “classic intelligence dilemma … When do you deal with bad guys? When do you agree to give them asylum?”
   ii. Attack
      1. Quotes: “In my opinion, this goes over the line”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

8. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Mr. Bird”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “who shared a Pulitzer Prize with Martin J. Sherwin for their book … spoke to more than 40 current and retired C.I.A. officers, though the agency declined to cooperate with him”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “consulted numerous sources in the Israeli Mossad and in Lebanon, including a Lebanese businessman with ties to the Palestine Liberation Organization”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “A spokesman for the C.I.A., Todd Ebitz”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “declined to comment on Sunday about Mr. Bird’s assertion”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
   i. Who: “Mr. Ebitz”
   ii. What: “the C.I.A.”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “does not comment on allegations that someone may or may not have worked as a source for the agency”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “disclosures in “The Good Spy””
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “are timely, given that the United States is in a critical phase of negotiating a nuclear deal with Iran”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “decision to grant asylum to the Iranian intelligence officer, Ali Reza Asgari”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “made by the George W. Bush administration in 2007, Mr. Bird writes, because he had valuable information about Iran’s nuclear program, including that it had built a uranium enrichment facility at Natanz”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Mr. Asgari’s information”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “superseded by new disclosures, including that a second enrichment facility had been built in a mountain near the holy city of Qum”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “critical negotiating issue”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “how many centrifuges Iran will be allowed to operate at these facilities”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust, safety

16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Ali Reza Asgari”
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would be a treasure trove for the C.I.A.”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “joined the Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps soon after the 1979 revolution, and was sent to Lebanon in 1982, when Iran was bankrolling a wave of terrorism against Americans, through its proxy, the Islamic militant group Hezbollah … returned to Iran and rose to a senior post in the Revolutionary Guards, which oversees the nuclear program”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. D
   i. Who: “Robert Baer, a retired C.I.A.”
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “He would have the crown jewels”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Mr. Baer”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Mr. Bird’s reporting is persuasive”
   ii. Attack
1. Quotes: “he knows some of the sources the author consulted in the region — he noted that the book contains no smoking gun establishing Mr. Asgari’s whereabouts”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

20. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Mr. Asgari”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “may no longer be in the United States”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

21. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Mr. Bird”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “when he asked a former senior Bush official about the decision to grant Mr. Asgari asylum, he received a cryptic reply: “At the unclassified level, I cannot elaborate on this issue.””

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to trust

22. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: same
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “cited a report in Der Spiegel, the German newsmagazine, that Mr. Asgari twice called a fellow Iranian defector — from Washington, where he had been held in a C.I.A. safe house, and from “somewhere in Texas.””

c. Values
i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

23. D

   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Stuart H. Newberger, a Washington lawyer who represents victims of the 1983 attack”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC

   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “said he believed the book was accurate, though he could not corroborate the Asgari disclosure himself … he had supplied Mr. Bird with trial transcripts and internal government documents he had obtained for his litigation”

c. Values

   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

24. D

   i. Who: “Mr. Newberger”
   ii. What: “Asgari”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC

   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “got a get-out-of-jail-free card because of the Iran nuclear issue”

c. Values

   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

25. D

   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “For the Obama administration”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC

   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Mr. Bird’s revelations could be awkward”

c. Values

   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

26. D

   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Mr. Newberger”
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “said it should make terrorism an issue in any negotiation about relaxing sanctions against Iran”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

27. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “White House”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “tried to keep the nuclear negotiations tightly focused on technical questions of Iran’s enrichment capability and international inspections”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

28. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “The Good Spy”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “vivid reminder of Iran’s prolific sponsorship of terrorism against the United States — a not-so-distant legacy”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

29. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran’s foreign minister and the leader of its nuclear negotiating team, Mohammad Javad Zarif”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “laid a wreath at the grave of Imad Mugniyeh, a lethal Hezbollah operative who the C.I.A. believes had an operational role in the embassy and barracks bombings”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

30. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Mr. Mugniyeh”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “was assassinated in 2008, probably by the Mossad, on information supplied by Mr. Asgari, who acted as his control officer during the 1980s, according to Mr. Bird.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

31. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “None of this history”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “is helpful to a White House eager to conclude a landmark nuclear deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

32. D
   i. Who: “Mr. Baer”
   ii. What: “Nobody”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “has the appetite to dig this up. You focus on the battle you can win, which is nuclear.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
33. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Mr. Bird’s book”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “solved a mystery of who masterminded the attack that nearly killed her”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

34. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Anne Dammarell, a retired American aid officer gravely injured in the Beirut bombing”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “not outraged by the disclosure about Mr. Asgari”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

35. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “murky world of spying”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “trade-offs were sometimes necessary”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust, safety

36. D
   i. Who: “Anne Dammarell”
   ii. What: “Most people”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “understand that deals get cut”

ii. Attack
   1. Quotes: “can be a very corrupt person and still die in your sleep”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
      ii. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iran deal”
   iii. To whom: readers of the New York Times, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “don’t undermine”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “two ways to keep Iran from developing a nuclear weapon”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “negotiations or military action.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “after 34 years of mostly diplomatic silence between Iran and the United States”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “in the midst of negotiations with the potential to eliminate the threat of a nuclear-armed Iran”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patient hard work

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “some members of Congress”
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: same  
b. FTC  
i. Attack  
1. Quotes: “circulating proposals that seek to impose additional sanctions in the middle of the negotiations”  
c. Values  
i. Prudence  
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom  
ii. Justice  
1. Rationale: appeal to fairness  

4. D  
i. Who: same  
ii. What: “This step”  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: same  
b. FTC  
i. Attack  
1. Quotes: “risks scuttling the process and could have damaging ramifications for the United States as well as our regional allies and partners, especially Israel”  
c. Values  
i. Prudence  
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom  
ii. Justice  
1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety  

5. D  
i. Who: same  
ii. What: “increasingly stringent economic sanctions that have been imposed on Iran over the last three decades”  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: same  
b. FTC  
i. Attack  
1. Quotes: “worked”  
c. Values  
i. Prudence  
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom  
ii. Justice  
1. Rationale: appeal to fairness  

6. D  
i. Who: same  
ii. What: “Iran's new president, Hassan Rouhani”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “came to office last year promising an improved economy, and he seems to have quickly realized that the only way to deliver on this promise is by achieving relief from the sanctions”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “finally come to the table”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “If the sanctions have worked”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “won't additional sanctions work even better … increase the pressure, won't we get a more favorable outcome”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “That logic”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would make sense only if Iran were a politics-free zone where a consensus existed in support of negotiations to end the country's nuclear program”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “all evidence -- from public statements as well as available intelligence”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “suggests that there is no such consensus”

c. Values
   i. Prudence

11. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “hard-line elements within the Iranian government and military”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “who don't like the idea of negotiations, are not terribly worried about new sanctions (oligarchs always get what they need anyway), and feel that the nuclear program is a matter of national pride and, perhaps, national survival”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

12. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “For us to impose additional sanctions under these circumstances (or threaten to impose additional sanctions)”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “could be an "I told you so" moment for these hard-liners, providing the very excuse they're looking for to kill the negotiations and, with them, what is probably the best chance we
have of resolving this incredibly dangerous situation without resorting to military action”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety

13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “risk analysis”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim

14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “potential upside of legislating further sanctions”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “the hope that increased pressure might elicit more concessions or push Iran to conclude a more favorable deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [more favorable deal through sanctions]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “unlikely”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “potential downside”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “more likely and more dangerous: Iran's decision makers could conclude that the United States government was not negotiating in good faith -- a view that Iranian hard-liners already espouse”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

17. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: [situation]
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “could prompt Iran to walk away from the negotiations or counter with a new set of unrealistic demands while redoubling its efforts to produce nuclear weapons”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety

18. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “such legislation”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “could actually accelerate its quest for atomic weapons, leaving a stark choice: Either accept the possibility of a nuclear-armed Iran, or use military force to stop it.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
ii. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to safety

19. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Worse still”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “could alienate our international partners”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

20. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “sanctions”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “have been effective largely because of the active participation of many countries”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

21. D
i. Who: Same
ii. What: “When the United States alone doesn't buy Iranian oil”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “has little effect on Iran's economy … when the European Union stops, and other major oil customers of Iran such as China, Japan, South Korea, India and Turkey significantly reduce their purchases (which they have)”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

22. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “countries that have joined America in ratcheting up the economic pressure on Iran”

iii. To whom: same

iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “support the interim agreement”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

23. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Legislation to impose additional sanctions by the United States”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “could be interpreted by our partners as undermining the negotiations”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

24. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [situation]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “could have the adverse effect of lessening the international community's economic pressure on Iran, spooking our partners and diminishing their commitment to the cause”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

25. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iranians”
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “have six months to prove they are serious about this process”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patience

26. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “If they fail this test, the United States”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will surely act immediately to impose additional sanctions, and our international partners, understanding that we have given a negotiated approach a chance to succeed, are likely to join us”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

27. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “whether Iran can be persuaded to peacefully give up its nuclear weapons ambitions”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “very much in our interest to give this diplomatic process every chance to succeed”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “to press Iran”
   iii. To whom: readers of the New York Times, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Right Way”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “United States and its allies”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “finally begun to work out the terms of a nuclear deal with Iran”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “agreement that forecloses Iran's pursuit of nuclear weapons”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “hopeful … enormously beneficial”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Such a comprehensive accord”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would build on the Joint Plan of Action signed last November”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “preliminary deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “in which Iran agreed to pause its nuclear program in return for some modest relief on sanctions”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “set to expire in July, but can be renewed for another six months”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Washington”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “focused on limiting the numbers and types of centrifuges that Iran would be allowed to possess, as well as the quantities and qualities of uranium it would be allowed to keep”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “those issues”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “not the keys to getting the best deal with Iran”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [current government focus]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “important, but they should not be the White House's highest priority”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama administration”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “should focus on three other factors: conducting intrusive inspections, designing a mechanism to easily reimpose sanctions if Iran cheats, and extending the duration of the agreement”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety, trust
10. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “International inspectors”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “must be a constant presence at Iran's nuclear sites and they need to be able to go anywhere and see anything -- immediately and without being blocked by the government”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety, trust
11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “already agreed to abide by the Additional Protocol to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, which does establish somewhat more expansive inspections and monitoring”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety, trust
12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “America”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “given Iran's history of lying about its nuclear program … needs what it had in Iraq: the right of the inspectors to have completely unfettered access”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety, trust
13. D
   i. Who: same
ii. What: “highly intrusive inspections”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “can only be as effective as their enforcement mechanism”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “history of arms control and arms limitation agreements”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “suggests that states abide by them when they believe it is likely that they’ll get caught and might pay a heavy price for getting caught”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “In Iraq, Libya and Iran today, that punishment”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “taken the form of powerful sanctions”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “1994 nuclear agreement with North Korea”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “didn't work because it was predicated mostly on offering Pyongyang carrots that could be withheld, while the threatened sticks were ephemeral and inadequate”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “biggest diplomatic obstacle America is likely to face after signing a comprehensive agreement with Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “getting the United Nations Security Council (and the European Union) to reimpose sanctions if Iran were to ever restart its prohibited nuclear programs -- especially if the evidence of cheating was ambiguous”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

18. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “to have intrusive inspections”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “not enough”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “America”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “needs a "snap-back" mechanism to be able to quickly and easily reimpose the sanctions if the United States and its allies decide that Iran is violating the agreement”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety, trust

20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “best way to create such a mechanism”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “to suspend the United Nations and European sanctions
            rather than lifting them outright”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

21. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “a new resolution”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “could be passed every six months that would suspend all
            of the effects of the sanctions for six months, renewable in
            perpetuity”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

22. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [suspension rather than removal of sanctions]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “would avoid the difficult process of going to the Security
            Council and getting a new sanctions resolution passed by a
            majority of the 15 members without any (Russian or Chinese)
            vetoes … can be diplomatically impossible no matter how
            convincing the evidence”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
23.  
   D  
      i.  Who: same  
      ii.  What: [Iran deal]  
      iii.  To whom: same  
      iv.  How: same  
   b.  FTC  
      i.  Acclaim  
          1.  Quotes: “question of duration”  
   c.  Values  
      i.  Prudence  
          1.  Rationale: appeal to wisdom  

24.  
   D  
      i.  Who: same  
      ii.  What: “considerable evidence”  
      iii.  To whom: same  
      iv.  How: same  
   b.  FTC  
      i.  Acclaim  
          1.  Quotes: “that Iran's president, Hassan Rouhani, is sincere in his desire for a nuclear deal”  
   c.  Values  
      i.  Prudence  
          1.  Rationale: appeal to wisdom  

25.  
   D  
      i.  Who: same  
      ii.  What: “Mr. Rouhani”  
      iii.  To whom: same  
      iv.  How: same  
   b.  FTC  
      i.  Acclaim  
          1.  Quotes: “will be president of Iran for another seven years at most and it is impossible to know who will succeed him”  
   c.  Values  
      i.  Prudence  
          1.  Rationale: appeal to wisdom  

26.  
   D  
      i.  Who: same  
      ii.  What: “In 2005, the reformist Mohammed Khatami”  
      iii.  To whom: same  
      iv.  How: same  
   b.  FTC  
      i.  Acclaim  
          1.  Quotes: “replaced by a zealot, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

27. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “America”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “must therefore seek an enduring deal, one that will last beyond Mr. Rouhani’s term in office”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

28. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “rumors suggest”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Washington may be ready to agree to as little as 10 years”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

29. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Twenty years”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would be better”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

30. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “30 or 50”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would be better still”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

31. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iranians”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will probably object to all of this”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

32. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will protest that intrusive inspections violate their sovereignty”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

33. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will argue that last year's Joint Plan of Action specified the lifting of sanctions, not merely their suspension”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
ii. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

34. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will complain that Western officials suggested to them in private that the agreement would only last for 10 to 12 years”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

35. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “United States”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will have both legal and practical leverage with which to push back”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

36. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Joint Plan”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “stated that in the final, comprehensive agreement, Iran would be treated as a normal nuclear power after the terms of that treaty had ended”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
ii. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

37. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: same
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “implicit acceptance by Iran that it would not be treated as a normal nuclear power until then”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

38. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Iranian government”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “desperately needs to rid the economy of the burden of the sanctions”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

39. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Suspension”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “serves all of Iran's real needs”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust, safety

40. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: [suspension]
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “creates exactly the kind of deterrent that has made the
difference between success and failure in previous nuclear deals”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

41. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran's leaders”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “already demonstrated that they are willing to sacrifice
principles for practical benefits”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

42. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “no reason to believe”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “that they cannot be convinced to do the same in a
comprehensive agreement”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

43. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Intrusive inspections coupled with sanctions suspension”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will grant them the economic revival, even prosperity,
that they crave while giving America and its allies the greatest
assurance that a future Iranian leadership won't resume a prohibited weapons program.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “building nuclear weapon”
   iii. To whom: readers of the New York Times, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “would take years, not months”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust, safety
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iranian Government”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “published its first detailed study of how long it estimates it would take its scientists and engineers to assemble a nuclear weapon, saying that with its current infrastructure, “the required time span is in years.””
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust, safety
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “described the estimate as entirely hypothetical, and it was clearly intended to allay fears that Iran has the ability to race for a bomb.”
c. Values
   i. Justice
1. Rationale: appeal to trust, safety

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “American officials”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “disputed the conclusions, which contradicted both classified assessments by the United States government and many estimates by outside experts”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “fact that Iran’s nuclear energy establishment wrote the eight-page report”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “notable”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran’s public position”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “its program is entirely peaceful and that it has never studied what it would take to amass the fuel for a weapon”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust, safety

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iranians”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “disputed estimates”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust, safety
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iranian officials”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “announcing that they had agreed to change the design of a heavy water reactor near the Iranian city of Arak in ways that would limit Iran’s ability to forge a second path to a bomb”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust, safety

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “American officials”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “studying the new proposal … saw it as a hopeful sign”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “two officials”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “met again with their Iranian counterparts, trying to get the negotiations back on track before a July 20 deadline for a final agreement”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patient hard work

10. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “State Department”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “said almost nothing about the content of the discussion, other than that it was “constructive.””

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Talks between Iran and the six nations discussing a possible deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “resume next week in Vienna”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “United States”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “argues that much of Iran’s infrastructure for producing nuclear fuel must be dismantled to significantly extend the time that Iran would need to produce a weapon”

c. Values
   i. Justice
1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust, safety
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iranians”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “talk of more than doubling their current number of centrifuges”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
   i. Who: “France’s foreign minister, Laurent Fabius”
   ii. What: [West]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “We say that there can be a few hundred centrifuges, but the Iranians want thousands.”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
   i. Who: “senior official involved in the talks”
   ii. What: “American insistence that we can’t live with the status quo and the Iranian insistence that they want to be able to produce all their own civilian nuclear fuel”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “huge gap”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “American officials”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “declined to be quoted by name discussing the report”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “discussions”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will almost certainly go beyond the initial deadline”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
      ii. temperance
         1. rationale: appeal to patience

18. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “terms of their temporary deal”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “extension of the negotiations is possible”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran’s report”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “cited in a Twitter post by the country’s chief negotiator … punctured the myth about a breakout”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “report”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “quoted the American official who Iranians say is the chief mythmaker: Secretary of State John Kerry”
   c. Values
      i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust

21. D
   i. Who: “Mr. Kerry”
   ii. What: “public knowledge”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “we are operating with a time period for a so-called breakout of about two months”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

22. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: [breakout]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
   b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “extended if the United States and its allies were to have enough warning to react”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

23. D
   i. Who: “Kerry”
   ii. What: “Six months to 12 months”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview
   b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “significantly more”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

24. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “figure”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “rattled some Israeli officials, who say they would insist on much more warning time”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

25. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Israel and the United States”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “debated the issue for months”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

26. D
   i. Who: “Amos Yadlin, the former chief of Israeli military intelligence in Israel”
   ii. What: “Iranian strategy to reach a nuclear bomb”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “to do it not as fast as possible”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

27. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “Iran”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “wants to do it “as safely as possible,” meaning in a way that would not provoke a military response”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

28. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Mr. Yadlin”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “now the executive director of Israel’s Institute for National Security Studies”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

29. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Iranians”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “argue that Mr. Kerry is alarmist and that it will take far longer”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

30. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Iranian report”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “understates the number of centrifuges Iran has in place”
c. Values
  i. Prudence
    1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

31. D
  i. Who: same
  ii. What: “breakout time”
  iii. To whom: same
  iv. How: same

b. FTC
  i. Acclaim
    1. Quotes: “refers to the number of months Iran would need to produce enough fuel for a single weapon”

c. Values
  i. Prudence
    1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

32. D
  i. Who: same
  ii. What: “Most of the Iranian report”
  iii. To whom: same
  iv. How: same

b. FTC
  i. Acclaim
    1. Quotes: “deals with the whole process of producing fuel and then making it into a weapon”

c. Values
  i. Prudence
    1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

33. D
  i. Who: same
  ii. What: “American officials”
  iii. To whom: same
  iv. How: same

b. FTC
  i. Attack
    1. Quotes: “note that many of those processes could happen simultaneously, reducing the amount of time needed.”

c. Values
  i. Prudence
    1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
  ii. Justice
    1. Rationale: appeal to trust

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: readers of the *New York Times*, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “sees an Iran deal skirting Congress”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “if the Obama administration will manage in the next five weeks to strike what many in the White House consider the most important foreign policy deal of his presidency”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “no one knows”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “White House”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “If agreement is reached, President Obama will do everything in his power to avoid letting Congress vote on it”
   ii. Values
      1. Prudence
         a. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
      2. Justice
         a. Rationale: Appeal to fairness

3. D
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would accept, at least temporarily, a "suspension" of the stringent sanctions that have drastically cut their oil revenues and terminated their banking relationships with the West”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Treasury Department”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “concluded Mr. Obama has the authority to suspend the vast majority of those sanctions without seeking a vote by Congress”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Mr. Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “cannot permanently terminate those sanctions”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Congress”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “can take that step”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

7. D
   
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Mr. Obama's advisers”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “concluded they would probably lose such a vote”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

8. D
   
   i. Who: “one senior official”
   ii. What: “We”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “wouldn't seek congressional legislation in any comprehensive agreement for years”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “White House officials”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “say Congress should not be surprised by this plan”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
    
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: [negotiators]
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “point to testimony earlier this year when top negotiators argued that the best way to assure that Iran complies with its obligations is a step-by-step suspension of sanctions -- with the implicit understanding that the president could turn them back on as fast as he turned them off”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

11. D
   i. Who: “Bernadette Meehan, the spokeswoman for the National Security Council”
   ii. What: “we”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “have been clear that initially there would be suspension of any of the U.S. and international sanctions regime, and that the lifting of sanctions will only come when the I.A.E.A. verifies that Iran has met serious and substantive benchmarks … must be confident that Iran's compliance is real and sustainable over a period of time”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

12. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “many members of Congress”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “see the plan as an effort by the administration to freeze them out, a view shared by some Israeli officials who see a congressional vote as the best way to constrain the kind of deal that Mr. Obama might strike”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Ms. Meehan”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “says there "is a role for Congress in our Iran policy," but members of Congress want a role larger than consultation and advice”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “An agreement between Iran and the countries it is negotiating with”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would not be a formal treaty, and thus would not require a two-thirds vote of the Senate”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
   i. Who: “chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Robert Menendez, the New Jersey Democrat”
   ii. What: “If a potential deal does not substantially and effectively dismantle Iran's illicit nuclear weapons program”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement
b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “Congress will respond. An agreement cannot allow Iran to be a threshold nuclear state”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

16. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: [Menendez]
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “sponsored legislation to tighten sanctions”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

17. D
i. Who: “A leading Republican critic of the negotiations, Senator Mark S. Kirk of Illinois”
ii. What: “Congress”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “will not permit the president to unilaterally unravel Iran sanctions that passed the Senate in a 99 to 0 vote”

c. Values
i. justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

18. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “Such declarations”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. attack
   1. Quotes: “have the Obama administration concerned”

c. Prudence
i. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: same
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “reminder that for a deal to be struck with Iran, Mr. Obama must navigate not one negotiation, but three”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “first”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “is between Mr. Obama's negotiators and the team led by Mohammad Javad Zarif, the savvy Iranian foreign minister”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

21. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “second”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “is between Mr. Zarif and forces in Tehran that see no advantage in striking a deal, led by many in the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps and many of the mullahs”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

22. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “critical player in that effort”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

23. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “third”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “is between Mr. Obama and Congress”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

24. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Mr. Zarif”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “said that Mr. Obama "has a harder job" convincing Congress than he will have selling a deal in Tehran”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

25. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [Obama convincing]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “may be bluster, but it may not be entirely wrong”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

26. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Many of the details of the negotiations”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “remain cloaked”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

27. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “lead negotiator, Wendy Sherman, the under secretary of state for political affairs”
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “struck a deal with congressional leaders that enables her to avoid public testimony when the negotiations are underway”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

28. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “conducts classified briefings for the key congressional committees”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

29. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “negotiations”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “focused intently on how sanctions would be suspended”

c. Values
   i. justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

30. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “To the Americans, the sanctions”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: Same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “their greatest leverage”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

31. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: [sanctions to Iranians]
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “what this negotiation is all about: a chance to boost the economy, reconnect with the world and end Iran's status as a pariah state”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

32. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “many”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “think Mr. Obama's best option is to keep the negotiations”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

33. D
   ii. What: “Obama's goal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “to avert an Iranian bomb and avert bombing Iran”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety

34. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “If Congress feels obliged to pass additional sanctions”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “create a deterrent -- basically to say if you recommence activities Iran has halted, here are new sanctions”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

35. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Mr. Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “feeling pressure as well”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

36. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “cracks”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “appearing in the sanctions regime”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

37. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “administration”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “alarmed to see a spike in Chinese purchases of Iranian oil, seeming to undercut the sanctions”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust
38. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “figures”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
     1. Quotes: “have declined again”
c. Values
   i. Justice
     1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

39. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [Chinese oil purchases]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
     1. Quotes: “subject of behind-the-scenes talks between American and Chinese officials”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
     1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

40. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iranians”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
     1. Quotes: “want far more than a suspension of American-led sanctions: They are also pressing for an end to United Nations Security Council resolutions that bar "dual use" exports that have civilian uses but also could be used in nuclear and missile programs; those resolutions give the United States and its allies a legal basis for demanding inspections of shipments to Iran that could be part of a covert program”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
     1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
     1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

41. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “biggest concern”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “Iran, concluding that its existing facilities are under too much scrutiny, would once again turn to covert means to obtain nuclear technology”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

42. D
i. Who: “a senior intelligence official”
ii. What: “covert programs”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “uncovered three covert programs in Iran, and there's no reason to think there's not a fourth out there”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
ii. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

1. Decontextualization: title
t. Who: author
t. What: “U.S.”
t. To whom: readers of the New York Times, internet searchers
t. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
t. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “Hopes Face-Saving Plan Offers a Path to a Nuclear Pact With Iran.”

c. Values
t. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
t. Who: same
t. What: “United States”
t. To whom: same
t. How: same
b. FTC
t. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “has shown considerable ingenuity in its effort to slow Iran's production of nuclear fuel”
c. Values
t. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
t. Who: same
t. What: “negotiators”
t. To whom: same
t. How: same
b. FTC
t. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “attempting a new approach, suggesting that the Iranians call in a plumber”
c. Values
t. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
t. Who: same
t. What: “idea”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “convince the Iranians to take away many of the pipes that connect their nuclear centrifuges”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Iranians”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “could claim they have not given in to Western demands”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “experts at America's national nuclear laboratories”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “told the Obama administration, the United States and its allies could accurately claim that they have extended the time Iran would need to produce enough fuel for a bomb -- and given the West time to react”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: [pipe elimination]
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “that may offer a glimmer of hope in closed-door negotiations”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “when greater progress seemed in the offing”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “appeared likely that the two men would move on from
         the first phone call between the two nations’ leaders in three
decades to the first meeting in person”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “No one”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “betting on that now”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: “a senior Obama administration official”
   ii. What: [meeting]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “open to it”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
    i. Who: author
    ii. What: “time”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “ripe”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “atmosphere”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “is sour”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [situation]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “gotten more complicated”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Tentative agreements”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “suddenly seem back on the table”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “global nuclear inspectors at the International Atomic Energy Agency”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
1. Quotes: “report stonewalling by Iran on details of the "possible military dimensions" of past research, while, within the country, the Revolutionary Guards push back against Mr. Zarif”

c. Values
i. Justice
1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust, safety

15. D
i. Who: “another participant in the negotiations”
ii. What: “sense of desperation”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
i. Attack
1. Quotes: “about coming up with ways to break the logjams”

c. Values
i. Justice
1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

16. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: [situation]
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “if we don't figure this out in the next few months, it is not clear the opportunity is going to come again”

c. Values
i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “Iranians”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “clearly doing far better in public diplomacy in New York than are the United States or its allies”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Mr. Zarif”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “American-educated, media savvy, and often humorous”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [Zarif]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “taken many pokes at President Obama for being slow to
            confront the Islamic State, he has also mocked the conspiracy
            theorists in Tehran who claim the Sunni group was invented by the
            C.I.A”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama administration”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “rarely allowed its negotiating counterparts to Mr. Zarif to
            go on the record”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

21. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “complain that Mr. Zarif talks a good game, but has offered few meaningful cuts”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

22. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Both sides”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “clearly worried … where the plumbing comes in”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

23. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Disconnecting the pipes”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “one of several ideas that have emerged”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

24. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “proposal”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “not without flaws”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

25. d
i. who: “Robert Einhorn, a former member of the negotiating team who is now at the Brookings Institution”
ii. what: [idea]
iii. to whom: same
iv. how: public statement
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would have to keep the Iranians from restoring operations for a considerable period of time”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety
26. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “those suspicious of the deal, in Congress and in Israel, would buy it”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “far from clear”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
27. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [situation]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “considerable opposition within the Iranian establishment”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
28. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Mr. Zarif”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “cannot go home with a deal that seems to violate the course that the ayatollah wants to set”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

29. D
   i. Who: “Mr. Einhorn”
   ii. What: “Unless the Iranians are talking about reducing their currently operational enrichment capability by around a half”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “not very impressive”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “expert”
   iii. To whom: readers of the New York Times, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “still has hold on Iran talks”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “one mysterious figure”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “conspicuously missing”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Mohsen Fakhrizadeh”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “considered by Western intelligence officials to be the closest thing Iran has to J. Robert Oppenheimer”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “identified as the relentless force behind on-again, off-again programs to design a nuclear warhead that could fit atop one of Iran’s long-range missiles ... keeper of Iran’s greatest nuclear secrets ... looms over the talks that he never attends”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: “one member of the Iranian team”
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “dodging assassins ... ‘Wouldn’t you?’”
   ii. Attack
      1. Quotes: “widely believed to be the work of Israel, that killed important members of Mr. Fakhrizadeh’s staff as they drove to work.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

5. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Mr. Fakhrizadeh’s absence”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “underscores a central reality of the increasingly tense negotiations over the Iranian program: If an agreement is reached by July 20, the ostensible deadline, it will be without any real understanding of how close Iran has come to cracking the technologies of building a nuclear warhead”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “international nuclear inspectors”
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “told that Mr. Fakhrizadeh is unavailable to talk, and his empire of laboratories and testing grounds is off limits”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “empire door”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “being cracked open … will take months or years to get any answers”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “any agreement among the United States and its five negotiating partners”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will be shrouded by uncertainty about how long it would take for Iran, if it produced or bought bomb-grade fuel, to make a nuclear weapon”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “American negotiators”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “steering away from forcing a full historical accounting from the Iranians before any accord is signed, arguing that
excavating the past is less important than assuring Iran does not have the raw material to make a weapon”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “head of the International Atomic Energy Agency, Yukiya Amano”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “said in an interview last week that no one should expect a complete historical accounting”

c. Values
   i. prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
   i. Who: “Mr. Amano, a former Japanese diplomat”
   ii. What: “to find out everything”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “not possible”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Some documents”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “disappeared”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Some people”
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “died”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “does not give access”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “interviewing Mr. Fakhrizadeh himself”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “not yet made a specific request”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [inspectors]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would like to have access to the sites, the documents and the people — including him”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. D
   i. Who: author
ii. What: “a new effort”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “hardly”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Mr. Amano’s predecessor, Mohamed ElBaradei”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “negotiated an ineffective “work plan” with Iran to resolve the issues in 2007 … never implemented”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “the C.I.A.”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “had a sizable team of experts to study Mr. Fakhrizadeh and his network of government facilities and university laboratories”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

20. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: same
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “obtained a laptop, quickly given the wry moniker “The Laptop of Death,” that contained documents slipped out of the
country by an Iranian technician that contained some of the
evidence that Iran was trying to design a weapon”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

21. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “When the data was shared with the I.A.E.A.”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “the Iranians and others, said it was filled with
         fabrications”
   ii. Values
      1. Justice
         a. Rationale: appeal to trust

22. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “many of those documents”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “remain at the core of the I.A.E.A’s inquiry”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

23. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Mr. Amano”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “waved aside the claim that they were fictitious”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

24. D
   i. Who: “Mr. Amano”
   ii. What: “information”
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: interview
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “is included”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

25. D
i. Who: same
   ii. What: [inspectors]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
  i. Acclaim
     1. Quotes: “spent long hours checking it, and determined the information is broadly credible”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

26. D
i. Who: author
   ii. What: [data]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
  i. Acclaim
     1. Quotes: “consistent with other data, independently gathered by the agency itself”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

27. D
i. Who: “Mr. Amano”
   ii. What: [inspectors]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview
b. FTC
  i. Acclaim
     1. Quotes: “can’t say 100 percent, but it is not nonsense information”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

28. D
Who: author

What: “Mr. Amano”

To whom: same

How: author language

b. FTC

i. Attack

1. Quotes: “received responses from Iran on only one of the dozen technologies on his list, and those answers have prompted more questions”

c. Values

i. Justice

1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust, safety

29. D

i. Who: same

ii. What: same

iii. To whom: same

iv. How: same

b. FTC

i. Acclaim

1. Quotes: “unfazed by the thought that his investigation will extend far beyond the deadline for a final agreement with Iran, one that will be made amid considerable uncertainty about how much more work the country would have to complete before it was ready to convert bomb-grade fuel — if it had it — into a weapon”

c. Values

i. Temperance

1. Rationale: appeal to patience

30. D

i. Who: same

ii. What: “gaining any certainty about how much progress the Iranians have made”

iii. To whom: same

iv. How: same

b. FTC

i. Acclaim

1. Quotes: “requires getting inside the laboratories, looking at evidence of suspected experiments and digging into reports that Iranians reportedly wrote memorializing their accomplishments”

c. Values

i. Prudence

1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

31. D

i. Who: “Olli Heinonen, the former chief inspector of the I.A.E.A”
ii. What: [inspectors]
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “don’t need to see every nut and bolt”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

32. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “taking a heck of a risk if you don’t establish a baseline of
         how far they went … because it would be far more difficult to
         understand Iran’s timelines to a weapon”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

33. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Getting inside”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “particularly important because American intelligence
         agencies, stung by their mistakes in Iraq, have changed their views
         about the pace and political limits of Mr. Fakhrizadeh’s work”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

34. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “President George W. Bush”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “released an intelligence assessment that Mr. Fakhrizadeh had been told by Iran’s leaders to stand down at the end of 2003”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

35. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “some of those efforts”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “were resumed in different forms, and under different organizations, but never with the kind of focused effort believed to exist through 2003”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

36. D
   i. Who: “Robert Einhorn, a nuclear expert who worked on the issue until leaving the State Department”
   ii. What: [the West]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “probably have to assume that Iran already has a pretty good understanding of how to make a nuclear explosive design work”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

37. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “access”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “has a lot to do with monitoring whatever agreement is reached, “because we would have to keep track of the weapons scientists, and know what they are working on”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

38. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “Obama administration officials”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “say they have no illusions that they will get visibility into many of Iran’s most heavily protected sites, even if a deal is reached in the next month”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

39. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “verification of the accord reliant on the American intelligence community’s ability to track covert nuclear activity”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “a record that is littered with failures”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

40. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Iraq’s progress”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “famously, and wildly, overestimated 11 years ago, helping create the rationale for war”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

41. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “American intelligence experts”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “often underestimated how long it would take to make a bomb”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

42. D
i. Who: “one senior intelligence official”
ii. What: “obvious fear”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “of repeating Iraq, but anyone with a long memory fears making the opposite mistake”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: readers of the New York Times, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “providing information on its detonators, atomic agency says.”

   c. Values
      i. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patience

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “international nuclear inspectors”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “demanding that Iran turn over evidence of experiments that they suspect could have been part of a secret effort to solve the complex science of detonating a nuclear weapon”

   c. Values
      i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety, trust

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “International Atomic Energy Agency”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “finally beginning to see the information it had long sought”

   c. Values
      i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

3. D
   i. Who: same
ii. What: “Iran”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “insisted that the detonators were for non-nuclear purposes”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety, trust

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “disclosure”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “buried in a report by the atomic agency that detailed major progress Iran had made in diluting most of its stockpile of medium-enriched uranium, nuclear fuel that the West has long feared could be converted relatively quickly into weapons-grade material”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust, safety

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Getting Iran to dilute that uranium”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “biggest single accomplishment of the interim deal … creating room for the current negotiations”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “disclosure that a substantive discussion had begun with the agency”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “suggested a significant change in tactics in Tehran”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iranian officials”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “refused to answer questions about what the agency blandly calls “possible military dimensions” of Iran’s program”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust, safety

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iranians”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “claimed the queries are based on what they call Western fabrications of evidence and lies propagated by the C.I.A”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “detonator issue”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “one of many questions about a suspected secret weapons-design program buried inside university laboratories and institutes”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “heightened nearly a decade ago, when evidence emerged from a laptop computer smuggled out of the country by an Iranian scientist recruited by Western intelligence agencies”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “data he provided”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “included diagrams, videos and other results that appeared to strongly suggest interest in weapons design”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “disagreements in the intelligence agencies of different countries”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “about whether, and how intensely, it was resumed”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “negotiations over the evidence of weapons work”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “taking place on a separate track from the talks between Iran and the major powers about its nuclear enrichment program”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “atomic agency inspectors”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “permitted to visit fuel production areas daily”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety, trust

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iranians”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “continue to block access to the scientist that the United States, Israel and others say ran many of the main weapons-research operations, Mohsen Fakrizadeh”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Some other Iranian researchers believed involved in the program”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “assassinated in recent years, in operations that have been attributed to Israel”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. d
   i. who: same
ii. what: “Israeli officials”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “never confirmed or denied responsibility”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “atomic agency’s report”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “issued at a moment when negotiators have reached a roadblock with Iran over how much it is willing to dismantle its nuclear fuel-making infrastructure”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “American officials”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “want Iran to reduce the number of centrifuges”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

20. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Iranians”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “want to expand the number … saying they need such capacity to produce fuel for civilian reactors yet to be built”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

21. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “complying with all the elements of its interim agreement”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

22. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “report of the atomic agency”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “showed that Iran had “halted nuclear activities in the areas of greatest proliferation concern and rolled back its program in other key areas”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

23. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “detonators”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “invented during the Manhattan Project”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

24. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “similar to blasting caps”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

25. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: same
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: used in nuclear devices, they are also essential in mining and rocketry, as well as explosive welding and metal forming”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

26. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Iran”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “provided “additional information and explanations,” including documents, to substantiate its claim that it had tested the detonators for “a civilian application.””

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

27. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “agency”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “assessing Iran’s information”

c. Values
i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

28. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “important”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “that Iran continues to engage with the agency to resolve all outstanding issues” related to the nuclear program.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “U.S”
   iii. To whom: readers of the New York Times, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Adds Penalties Amid Resistance”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran’s military”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “resisting efforts to open its nuclear program to deeper inspection, the Obama administration on Friday imposed sanctions on several Iranian organizations”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “sanctions”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “continuation of its strategy to crack down on groups suspected of seeking to avoid or violate existing sanctions, even as “the United States remains committed” to striking an accord by late November that includes “a long-term, comprehensive solution that provides confidence that Iran’s nuclear program is exclusively peaceful.””

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
   ii. Temperance
1. Rationale: appeal to patience

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “missed a major deadline to provide information about its nuclear research, declared it will not allow visits to a military site suspected of being part of nuclear component testing, and said it is completing work on far more powerful centrifuges to make nuclear fuel”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “sanctions”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “in the works long before those declarations from Tehran”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “most notable of the new penalties”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “against the Organization of Defensive Innovation and Research”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Mohsen Fakhrizadeh”
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “[started] one of several reconfigurations of the Iranian nuclear infrastructure that American and European intelligence agencies believe are part of an effort to hide the size and scope of Iran’s activities.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Mr. Fakhrizadeh’s expertise”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “central to any Western effort at stopping Iran from building a nuclear weapon”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Mr. Fakhrizadeh”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quote: “loomed over the talks, but has never attended them”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iranian officials”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “suggested in June that his absence was wise, since he is at the top of Israel’s hit list for Iranian scientists, several of whom have been assassinated in recent years”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: same
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “on United Nations’ lists of officials subject to sanctions”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

11. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: same
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “believed to travel widely, if secretly”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “State Department waited so long to add his new organization to the sanctions list”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “not clear why”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “announcement”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same
b. FTC
Acclaim
1. Quotes: ‘comes just days after Iran said it would not allow inspectors in Parchin’

Values
i. Justice
1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

14. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “deadline for turning over data”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
1. Quotes: “passed”

c. Values
i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “process”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
1. Quotes: “expected to take months or years, long after the deadline for negotiations expires”

c. Values
i. Justice
1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

16. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Iran”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “declared that it is speeding ahead with the manufacture of a new generation of centrifuges that could enrich uranium up to 24 times faster”

c. Values
i. Justice
1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

17. D
i. Who: “head of Iran’s atomic energy agency, Ali Akbar Salehi”
ii. What: “Manufacturing and production of new centrifuges”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “our right”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

18. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iranian reports”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “indicated that only mechanical testing of the new centrifuges had been conducted; it is not clear whether that would constitute a violation of the agreement Iran signed last year to freeze nuclear activity”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “that the new centrifuges have been fed with nuclear fuel”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “no evidence”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “announcement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “may be devised to appease those in Iran who believe the country must press ahead with its research and development”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

21. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Mr. Salehi”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “indicated that Iran is redesigning its nuclear reactor near the town of Arak so that it will produce less plutonium”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

22. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “State Department sanctions”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “aimed at the Arak reactor [and] … Iran’s Nuclear Science and Technology Research Institute”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

23. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “at work on a process that seemed aimed at allowing the country to reprocess plutonium, much as North Korea has, to fabricate weapons fuel”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

24. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “that reprocessing has taken place, and Iran so far is not known to have produced any plutonium — or bought any from North Korea”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “no evidence”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

25. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “designations”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “may have little effect on these organizations, which hide their procurement activities well”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

26. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “whether the Western-led sanctions are having much effect in Iran”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “debate”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

27. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Payam Mohseni, who runs the Iran Project at the Harvard Kennedy School”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “concluded that the sanctions had little effect on Iran’s elite, and made many of them richer as they traded in scarce goods”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

28. D
   i. Who: “Payam Mohseni”
   ii. What: “Iranians”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “very confident about their rising power and regional standing, and there was no sense of urgency or need to compromise and resolve the nuclear standoff”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Courage
      1. Appeal to bravery

29. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “believed to have gained much from the regional turmoil, including in Syria and recently in Iraq with the rise of ISIS. This perception was particularly striking during my discussions with leading conservative figures of the state”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Courage
      1. Rationale: appeal to bravery

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Pro-Israel group”
   iii. To whom: readers of the New York Times, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “went 'all in,' but suffered a stinging defeat”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength, hope

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Officials at the American Israel Public Affairs Committee”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “knew the odds were against them in the fight to block President Obama's nuclear deal with Iran from surviving a congressional vote … handed a stinging defeat … saw its power and reputation in Washington diminished”
      ii. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “threw itself into a nearly $30 million advertising and lobbying effort to kill the accord anyway”
c. Values
   i. fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

2. D
   i. Who: “Clifford Kupchan, an Iran expert and the chairman of the Eurasia Group, a consulting firm”
   ii. What: “Aipac”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “They failed -- they couldn't even get a vote” … had gone "all in" and tried everything to stop the deal. "It's among the biggest setbacks for Aipac in recent memory."”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope, strength
3. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “loss”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “raised difficult questions about the future of Aipac, a group formed in 1951 just a few years after the birth of Israel”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope, strength
4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Aipac”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “long drawn its political potency from its reservoirs of loyalty among members of both parties”
   ii. Attack
      1. Quotes: “that bipartisan veneer all but vanished in recent weeks as the debate over the Iran deal became increasingly bitter”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. rationale: appeal to hope, strength
5. D
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “Republicans”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “lined up unanimously with Aipac against the accord, which Mr. Obama had made his top foreign policy priority”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “vast majority of Democrats”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
  i. Acclaim
    1. Quotes: “supported it”

c. Values
  i. Prudence
    1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
  i. Who: “Dennis B. Ross, a former senior adviser to Mr. Obama who is a distinguished fellow at the Washington Institute for Near East Policy”
    ii. What: [Aipac]
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: interview

b. FTC
  i. Acclaim
    1. Quote: “will be able to recoup, but it is inescapable that there will be stocktaking … one of the lessons … be very careful about the fights you pick that take on what amounts to a purely partisan character, because that bears a cost to you as an organization.”

    i. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
  i. Who: author
    ii. What: “Aipac”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: author language

b. FTC
  i. Acclaim
    1. Quotes: “faces a debate within its ranks about how to respond to the defeat, whether by exacting a political price from lawmakers -- all of them Democrats -- who defied its wishes and supported the Iran deal, or moving swiftly to mend fences with lawmakers and White House officials angered by the group’s efforts to kill the deal”

    i. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
  i. Who: “Mr. Ross”
    ii. What: [Aipac]
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: interview

b. FTC
  i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “will have a desire to show there are consequences when you go against them … certainly want to maintain a nonpartisan approach, so they will have to think this through.”

c. Values
   i. justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “several people close to the organization said the issue”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “under active discussion”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Marshall Wittmann, Aipac's spokesman”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes; “entire attention had been on the vote, "so we have not yet focused at all on the day after, but we are very committed to ensuring that Israel remains strong in the wake of this decision."”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
      ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “loss”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “only the latest in a string of hard-fought defeats for Aipac, which has found itself at odds with presidents of both parties over issues Israel deemed essential to its security”
      ii. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “emerged from all of them with its reputation for lobbying superiority intact and in some cases stronger”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety

13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Aipac”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “feuded with Jimmy Carter in 1978 over his plan to sell F-15 Eagle fighter jets to Saudi Arabia, and three years later battled with Ronald Reagan over Awacs reconnaissance planes for the Saudis … lost both times and suffered a similar defeat when George Bush opposed loan guarantees for Israel in 1991”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale; appeal to safety

14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Stoking opposition to Iran, which has been openly anti-American and anti-Semitic, and to a nuclear deal that even supporters voiced strong reservations with”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “was in some ways an "organizational imperative" for Aipac, one that allowed it to underline its mission and mobilize its activists, said Aaron David Miller, a former Middle East negotiator now at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars … battle took on an striking degree of partisanship … poses a real challenge to an organization that absolutely requires bipartisanship to maintain its resilience and strength”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Aipac”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “claimed victory on Thursday even in the face of defeat, issuing a statement asserting that a bipartisan Senate majority had opposed the deal. (The bipartisan majority consisted of all Senate Republicans and four Democrats.) That opposition, the statement said, "sent a strong message to the world that the American people are deeply skeptical about Iran's willingness to meet its commitments and the long-term viability of this agreement." … still believed "very firmly that this was a fight worth fighting," even as he noted that the outcome was "not what we would have preferred.""

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength, hope

16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “net effect of the group's effort”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “the Iran nuclear agreement is "clearly going ahead without the support of a bipartisan majority of Congress or the American people, and that's significant given that there was a major lobbying campaign by the entire administration.""

   ii. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “not concerned about losing power or its bipartisan reputation as a result of the battle over the deal, noting the long history of earlier setbacks it sustained without apparent harm to its influence” … Each time, people have said, 'Well, this is the end of the world as we know it,' but we know that the U.S.-Israel relationship goes on and has grown ever stronger”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength

17. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Jeremy Ben-Ami, the executive director of J Street, a pro-Israel group that lobbied intensively in support of the Iran nuclear deal and spent $3.2 million on pro-deal advertising, said the defeat for Aipac”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “had shown that the group no longer had a lock on American Jews, and that lawmakers who might once have feared the political consequences of breaking with the group were no longer intimidated”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength

18. D
   i. Who: “Mr. Ben-Ami”
   ii. What: “politics on this issue”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “have changed in a way that they're not going back, and there's a recognition of different voices for the American Jewish community that haven't been heard before … predicted that after the 2016 elections, lawmakers who backed the deal "will feel like they had the political support that they needed from the Jewish community to win re-election”
      
   ii. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Opponents of the accord were not so sure”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
      ii. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

19. D
   i. Who: “Josh Block, the president of The Israel Project, a pro-Israel public relations group”
   ii. What: “donors withholding or not wanting to write a check to people”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “because they feel betrayed, and there's going to have to be some accountability here … people's votes on the Iran deal are going to be an issue in the next election cycle, and the one after that, and the one after that, and they'll be held accountable”
      
   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iran deal”
   iii. To whom: readers of the New York Times, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “benefits”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. rationale: appeal to fairness

1. d: sentence one
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “Alan J. Kuperman”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “makes a number of flawed assumptions in asserting that the Iran nuclear deal would extend Iran's "breakout time" by only one month”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “A wide range of scientific experts, along with the technical teams of the Western governments”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “agree that a deal would increase the time it would take Iran to amass enough bomb-grade uranium for one bomb from the current two to three months to at least 12 months”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “agreement”
iii. to whom: same
iv. how: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “will require Iran to disconnect and remove some 14,000 centrifuges and put them under the seal of the International Atomic Energy Agency”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

4. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Mr. Kuperman”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “assumes that Iran could immediately reassemble, reinstall and recalibrate the excess centrifuges -- but it would take many months, if not years, to achieve such a feat”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “inspectors”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “would detect any such activity within days”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Mr. Kuperman”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “assumes that the agreement would allow Iran to keep large amounts of its uranium stockpile in solid form”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “must verifiably reduce its current stockpile”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
8. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “Iran deal”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “should be judged based on the facts … facts are clear:
         This deal would verifiably cut off Iran's pathways to a bomb”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety, trust
I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “naysayers”
   iii. To whom: readers of the New York Times, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “are wrong”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Mike Huckabee says President Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “using his nuclear deal to “take the Israelis and march them to the door of the oven.””

   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Mitt Romney”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “describes it as a "generational calamity."”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “while polls diverge, one recently taken by CNN suggests the public”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “wants Congress to reject the agreement by a 52 percent to 44 percent majority.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [Iran deal]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “one of the pivotal foreign policy decisions of the decade, so let's examine the arguments”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “didn't deliver what he promised … we wanted "anywhere, anytime" inspections, but we caved and got a complex system that allows Iran to delay inspections … later years of the agreement, Iran won a significant easing of controls”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

6. D
   i. Who: “Jeb Bush”
   ii. What: “negotiations”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “effort to deny Iran nuclear capabilities, but instead will only legitimize those activities.””

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “U.S.”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Defense
   1. Quotes: “didn't get all it wanted (and neither did Iran) in an imperfect compromise … didn't achieve anywhere, anytime inspections, yet the required inspections program is still among the most intrusive ever … deal isn't just about centrifuges but also about the possibility that Iran will come out of the cold and emerge from its failed 36-year experiment with extremism …hard-liners are so opposed to the deal; they have been sustained by the narrative of the Great Satan as the endless enemy, and conciliation endangers them”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “doves”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “think that a nuclear deal will empower reformers in Iran and turn it once more into the pro-American and pro-Israeli power it was under the shah”

ii. Attack
   1. Quotes: “sanctions relief may just give this regime a new lease on life.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Iran's people”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. defense
   1. quotes: “perhaps the most pro-American and secular of those of any country I've been to in the Middle East. … On my last trip to Iran, I took two of my kids along, and Iranians bought them meals and ice cream, and served them illegal mojitos. … public weariness with the regime's corruption, oppression and economic
failings is manifest. I would guess that after the supreme leader
dies, Iran will begin a process of change like that in China after
Mao died.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [Iran’s future]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “speculative … real impact of the deal is that it will unlock
tens of billions of dollars in frozen assets and new oil revenues,
giving Iranian hard-liners more resources to invest in nuclear
skulduggery and in extremist groups”

c. Values
   i. prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to prudence

11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [Iran supporting extremists, nuclear weapons research]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “will happen anyway … agreement includes Europe,
Russia and China as parties. Even if Congress rejects the
agreement, sanctions will erode and Iran will get an infusion of
cash”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “agreement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “betrayal of Israel … Once Iran gets its hands on
W.M.D.s, it will commit genocide”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust, safety
13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “widely believed to have developed biological and chemical weapons back in the 1980s, and it hasn't used those weapons of mass destruction against Israel … Israel is already a significant nuclear power with a huge military edge, which is why it has deterred Iran so far … more nervous without this deal, which reduces the chance that Iran will acquire a nuclear weapon in the next decade. That's why five former U.S. ambassadors to Israel endorsed the accord. (It's also notable that American Jews are more in favor of the agreement than the American public as a whole.)”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “pretends that the alternative to this deal is war”
   ii. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “alternative is increased economic pressure until Iran yelps for surrender. As Marco Rubio puts it, "Give Iran a very clear choice: You can have an economy or you can have a weapons program.””
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [sanctions]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “apply the same economic pressure that caused the collapse of the Castro regime in Cuba in 1964? The same isolation
that overthrew the North Korean regime in 1993? The same sanctions that led Saddam Hussein to give up power peacefully in Iraq in 2000?"

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “even you admit”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “flawed deal … why risk it? As Rick Perry says, "No deal is better and safer than a bad deal."”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

17. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “If the U.S. rejects this landmark deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “we get the worst of both worlds: an erosion of sanctions and also an immediate revival of the Iran nuclear program”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [discussants]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “glimpse of what might happen. In 2003, Iran seemingly offered a comprehensive "grand bargain" to resolve relations with the United States, but George W. Bush's administration dismissed it. Since then, Iran has gone from a tiny number of centrifuges to 19,000, getting within two months of "breakout" to a nuclear weapon … a multilateral international agreement achieves far more protection than finger-wagging”
ii. Attack
   1. Quotes: “Fulmination is not a substitute for policy”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Diplomacy”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “rarely about optimal outcomes; it is about muddling along in the dark, dodging bullets, struggling to defer war and catastrophe for the time being, nurturing opportunities for a better tomorrow. By that standard, the Iran deal succeeds. Sure, it is flawed, and yes, it makes us safer”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety
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1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “price”
   iii. To whom: readers of the *New York Times*, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “of rejecting the Iran deal”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran nuclear deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “offers a long-term solution to one of the most urgent threats of our time”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Without this deal, Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “would be less than 90 days away from having enough fissile material to make a nuclear bomb”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “greatly reduces the threat of Iran's nuclear program, making Iran's breakout time four times as long, securing unprecedented access to ensure that we will know if Iran cheats and giving us the leverage to hold it to its commitments”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Those calling on Congress to scrap the deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “argue that the United States could have gotten a better deal, and still could, if we unilaterally ramped up existing sanctions, enough to force Iran to dismantle its entire nuclear program or even alter the character of its regime wholesale”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “assumption”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “dangerous fantasy, flying in the face of economic and diplomatic reality”

c. Values
   i. prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “United States”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “does have tremendous economic influence”
   ii. Attack
      1. Quotes: “not this influence alone that persuaded countries across Europe and Asia to join the current sanction policy, one that
required them to make costly sacrifices, curtail their purchases of Iran's oil, and put Iran's foreign reserves in escrow.”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “joined us because we made the case that Iran's nuclear program”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “was an uncontained threat to global stability and, most important, because we offered a concrete path to address it diplomatically -- which we did”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. d
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “In the eyes of the world, the nuclear agreement -- endorsed by the United Nations Security Council and more than 90 other countries”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “addresses the threat of Iran's nuclear program by constraining it for the long term and ensuring that it will be exclusively peaceful”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “If Congress now rejects this deal, the elements that were fundamental in establishing that international consensus”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “will be gone”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
10. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “the international community”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “does not believe that ramping up sanctions will persuade
         Iran to eradicate all traces of its hard-won civil nuclear program or
         sever its ties to its armed proxies in the region”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Foreign governments”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “will not continue to make costly sacrifices at our demand
         … would more likely blame us for walking away from a credible
         solution to one of the world's greatest security threats, and would
         continue to re-engage with Iran”
c. Values
   i. justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Instead of toughening the sanctions, a decision by Congress to
         unilaterally reject the deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. quotes: “would end a decade of isolation of Iran and put the United
         States at odds with the rest of the world”
c. values
   i. prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “Some critics”
   iii. to whom: same
iv. how: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “argue that we can force the hands of these countries by
         imposing powerful secondary sanctions against those that refuse to
         follow our lead”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength

14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [sanctioning other countries]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “would be a disaster”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “countries whose cooperation we need -- including those in the
         European Union, China, Japan, India and South Korea, as well as the
         companies and banks that handle their oil purchases and hold foreign
         reserves”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “are among the largest economies in the world”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “If we were to cut them off from the American dollar and our
         financial system”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “we would set off extensive financial hemorrhaging, not
         just in our partner countries but in the United States as well”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Our strong, open economic relations with these countries”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “constitute a foundation of the global economy”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Nearly 40 percent of American exports”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “go to the European Union, China, Japan, India and Korea -- trade that cannot continue without banking connections”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “The major importers of Iranian oil -- China, India, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan and Turkey”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “account for nearly a fifth of our goods exports and own 47 percent of foreign-held American treasuries”
   ii. Attack
      1. Quotes: “will not agree to indefinite economic sacrifices in the name of an illusory better deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [U.S.]
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “think very seriously before threatening to cripple the largest banks and companies in these countries”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

21. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Bank of Japan”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “key institutional holder of Iran's foreign reserves”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

22. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Cutting off Japan from the American banking system through sanctions”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “would mean that we could not honor our sovereign responsibility to service and repay the more than $1 trillion in American treasuries held by Japan's central bank ... would be a direct consequences of our sanctions, not to mention the economic aftershocks and the inevitable retaliation”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

23. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [U.S.]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “must remember recent history”
c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

24. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “In 1996, in the absence of any other international support for
       imposing sanctions on Iran, Congress”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “tried to force the hands of foreign companies, creating
         secondary sanctions that threatened to penalize them for investing
         in Iran's energy sector … to force international oil companies to
         choose between doing business with Iran or the United States, with
         the expectation that all would choose us”
   ii. Attack
      1. Quotes: “outraged our foreign partners, particularly the European
         Union, which threatened retaliatory action and referral to the
         World Trade Organization and passed its own law prohibiting
         companies from complying”

c. Values
   i. Prudence/fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom/strength
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

25. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “The largest oil companies of Europe and Asia”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How; same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “stayed in Iran until, more than a decade later, we built a
         global consensus around the threat posed by Iran and put forward a
         realistic diplomatic means of addressing it”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

26. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “deal”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How; same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “strong, unprecedented and good for America, with all the key elements the international community demanded to stop Iran from getting a nuclear weapon”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. rationale: appeal to strength
   ii. prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom
   iii. justice
      1. rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

27. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “Congress”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “should approve this deal and ignore critics who offer no alternative”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom
I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “G.O.P. senator”
   iii. To whom: readers of the *New York Times*, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “major player in Iran accord”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Senator Bob Corker”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “conducting his own tense talks … trying to marshal a bipartisan coalition for his bill to force President Obama to send any agreement with Iran to Congress for approval -- a bill that could get enough votes to overcome a veto by Mr. Obama”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: “Mr. Corker”
   ii. What: “Congress”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “likely to weigh in on this deal, that was a positive thing … Voting for this legislation will have a positive effect on the negotiations, not a negative effect”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “people on Capitol Hill more important to the White House right now than Mr. Corker”
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: author language  

b. FTC  
i. Acclaim  
1. Quotes: “few … sees himself as a bridge builder in a Senate known for polarization”  

c. Values  
i. Prudence  
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom  

4. D  
i. Who: same  
ii. What: “At the White House”  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: same  

b. FTC  
i. Attack  
1. Quotes: “nobody likes his bill, which would give Congress a 60-day window to debate the Iran agreement before voting yes or no or taking no action”  

c. Values  
i. Prudence  
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom  

5. D  
i. Who: same  
ii. What: “Mr. Obama and his advisers”  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: same  

b. FTC  
i. Acclaim  
1. Quotes: “see him as someone who might work with them to revise the legislation and ultimately make a deal”  

c. Values  
i. Prudence  
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom  

6. D  
i. Who: same  
ii. What: “White House”  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: same  

b. FTC  
i. Acclaim  
1. Quotes: “spent the last few days publicly stroking Mr. Corker”  

c. Values  
i. Prudence  
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom  

7. D
i. Who: “Mr. Obama”
ii. What: [Corker]
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “decent and good man”

c. Values
i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
i. Who: “president's spokesman, Josh Earnest”
ii. What: same
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “considered this issue in a very principled way”

c. Values
i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “White House”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “views its central challenge as either negotiating a compromise with Mr. Corker or stopping enough Democrats from joining him so that he is short of a veto-proof majority”

c. Values
i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Mr. Obama”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “may be in a stronger position to argue the merits of the accord”

c. Values
i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Conservatives”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “watching carefully to make sure Mr. Corker does not soften”
c. Values
   i. fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength

12. D
   i. Who: “Dan Senor, a former Bush administration official”
   ii. What: “Corker”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “under enormous pressure from the White House to delay or weaken his own bill … been strong on this issue, as has his committee and his caucus. I don’t think he’ll cave”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength

13. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “president”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. acclaim
      1. Quotes: “open to finding a way for Congress to "express itself””
   ii. attack
      1. quotes: “as long as it did not block his ability to carry out the agreement, aides worked on Monday to discourage the impression that he could accept even a nonbinding vote”
c. values
   i. justice
      1. rationale: appeal to fairness

14. d
   i. who: “Mr. Earnest”
   ii. what: same
   iii. to whom: same
iv. how: interview
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “suggesting that we're going to engage with Congress …
         On our two principles here, about protecting the presidential
         prerogative and preventing the implementation of the agreement,
         we're going to stand firm”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

15. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Mr. Corker”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “not interested in a nonbinding vote”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D
   i. Who: “Corker”
   ii. What: “nonbinding vote”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “in essence, not of substance”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Mr. Corker”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “earned a reputation as an eager deal maker willing to dive
         into the details of financial regulation, the auto bailout, entitlement
         spending and government-secured housing”
   ii. Attack
1. Quotes: “a record that has made the White House concerned about whether he can deliver, many of those grand compromises have ended up going nowhere at a time when the two parties have appeared more intent on point-scoring and one-upmanship”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [White House opinion]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “not stopped Mr. Corker from trying”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to faith

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Corker”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “one of two Republicans who helped draft a border security amendment critical to pushing a comprehensive immigration bill through the Senate with broad bipartisan support”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength

20. D
   i. Who: “Mr. Corker”
   ii. What: “issues that we've thrown ourselves into”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “some of the biggest issues our nation faces … shouldn't even attempt to deal with these issues because they're too big”

   ii. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “try to affect the outcome”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength, bravery

21. D
i. Who: author

ii. What: “Mr. Corker”

iii. To whom: same

iv. How: same

b. FTC

i. Acclaim

1. Quotes: “seems like a senator from another time, an era when reaching out to the other side was more the norm … sees his mandate as criticizing the president for his failings but searching for a way to forge agreement … models himself after Tennessee Republicans … always more interested in finding agreement than in passing legislation to be vetoed”

c. Values

i. Prudence

1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

22. D

i. Who: “Gene Sperling, the president's former national economics adviser”

ii. What: [Corker]

iii. To whom: same

iv. How: same

b. FTC

i. Acclaim

1. Quotes: “someone that you could confide in, be brutally candid with and even have heated disagreements with -- and that it only helped build a relationship of trust and respect with him”

c. Values

i. Prudence

1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

23. D

i. Who: same

ii. What: “Senator Mark Warner, a Virginia Democrat on the Senate Banking Committee with Mr. Corker”

iii. To whom: same

iv. How: same

b. FTC

i. Acclaim

1. Quotes: “gravitated to each other as former executives, working together on various financial reforms”

c. Values

i. Prudence

1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

24. D

i. Who: [Senator Mark Warner, a Virginia Democrat on the Senate Banking Committee with Mr. Corker]

ii. What: “In business … in the senate”

iii. To whom: same
iv. How: interview

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “rewarded when you get to ‘yes,’”
   ii. Attack
      1. Quotes: “sometimes just saying no is considered a successful outcome”

c. Values
i. fortitude
   1. Rationale: appeal to hard work

25. D
i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Senator Chris Coons, Democrat of Delaware and a member of the Foreign Relations Committee”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “pointed to Mr. Corker's private sector and local government experience”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

26. D
i. Who: “Senator Chris Coons, Democrat of Delaware and a member of the Foreign Relations Committee”
   ii. What: [Corker]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “not simply trying to engage in a partisan exercise to kill the deal”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

27. D
i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Mr. Coons”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “echoes other praise of Mr. Corker from Democrats, in part for what they see as his determination to make sure Congress
plays its appropriate oversight role, as well as his desire to build a bipartisan coalition”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

28. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “When Senator Tom Cotton, a freshman Republican from Arkansas, wrote an open letter to Iran's leadership warning about making a deal without Congress”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “one of only seven Republicans who refused to sign”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

29. D
   i. Who: “Senator Charles E. Schumer of New York, the No. 3 Democrat”
   ii. What: “When you negotiate with him”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview
   
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “you know he wants to get something done rather than seek partisan advantage … not uncommon for the senator to call him at 11 p.m. and announce, "Corker here."”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength

30. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Senator Benjamin L. Cardin of Maryland, the ranking Democrat on the Foreign Relations Committee”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
   
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “also praised Mr. Corker”
   
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

31. D
i. Who: [Senator Benjamin L. Cardin of Maryland, the ranking Democrat on the Foreign Relations Committee]
ii. What: [Corker]
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: interview

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “have been many occasions where he has very much broken from the Republican message and was very much looking for a common way to move forward”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

32. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “Senator Tim Kaine, a Virginia Democrat on the Foreign Relations Committee”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “shared concerns about an earlier version of Mr. Corker's bill”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

33. D
i. Who: [Senator Tim Kaine, a Virginia Democrat on the Foreign Relations Committee]
ii. What: [bill]
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: interview

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “open to having a substantive conversation about it”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

34. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “Mr. Corker”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “incorporated Mr. Kaine's suggestions, and Mr. Kaine is now a lead co-sponsor of the legislation”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Israeli response to Iran deal”
   iii. To whom: readers of the New York Times, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “may sway relations with U.S. and Palestinians”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “President Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “two days to call Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu of Israel after his March 17 electoral victory, and any congratulations were couched in an excoriation of Mr. Netanyahu's hawkish and divisive campaign rhetoric”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Mr. Obama … Israeli leader”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “two hours to call Mr. Netanyahu after Thursday's announcement of a framework agreement to curb Iran's nuclear program, and this time it was the Israeli leader who lectured the American that the emerging deal "would threaten the survival" of his state”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust, safety
3. D  
   i. Who: same  
   ii. What: “White House account of the call”  
   iii. To whom: same  
   iv. How: same  

b. FTC  
   i. Defense  
      1. Quotes: “conciliatory … president promised to increase security consultations and cooperation with Israel to "remain vigilant in countering Iran's threats."”

c. Values  
   i. Justice  
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust, safety

4. D  
   i. Who: same  
   ii. What: “relationship between the two leaders, and their nations”  
   iii. To whom: same  
   iv. How: same  

b. FTC  
   i. Acclaim  
      1. quotes: “always been asymmetrical: The United States is the world's sole superpower, Israel a small country in a volatile neighborhood”

c. values  
   i. prudence  
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. d  
   i. who: same  
   ii. what: “Mr. Netanyahu”  
   iii. to whom: same  
   iv. how: same  

b. FTC  
   i. Acclaim  
      1. Quotes: “now in a powerful position to undermine the Iran nuclear deal, his counterpart's signature foreign policy initiative”

c. Values  
   i. Prudence  
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D  
   i. Who: same  
   ii. What: “How fiercely Israel fights the deal”  
   iii. To whom: same  
   iv. How: same  

b. FTC  
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “could have broad implications for the strained alliance and the Middle East peace process”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: “Giora Eiland, a former Israeli national security adviser”
   ii. What: “just because of this deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “chance that the Americans will try to compensate Israel somehow if we stop fighting against this deal, and we should exploit it in a smart way … Mr. Obama "rushed to call” Mr. Netanyahu and "tried to be as nice as he could.””

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Mr. Eiland”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “one of several Israeli analysts who said the emphasis should turn to strengthening the verification procedures in the deal and clarifying the consequences if Iran violates it”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

9. D
   i. Who: [Mr. Eiland]
   ii. What: “If Netanyahu chooses this option”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “we can gain some other benefits from the situation rather than to continue to blame and to undermine … time has come to
make a real reassessment in regard to the Israel-American relationship”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Though Israeli and American officials have long denied any link between the Iranian and Palestinian issues”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “playing out simultaneously”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “France”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “plans to introduce a United Nations Security Council resolution regarding Palestinian statehood”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “if Mr. Netanyahu lowers the volume on Capitol Hill”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “not hard to imagine Mr. Obama vowing to block”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Mr. Netanyahu”
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “must assemble a new governing coalition, and the Iran deal could put new momentum behind the idea of a unity government with his center-left rival, something Washington might favor”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: same
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “introduced a new demand for the nuclear negotiations, saying the final agreement must "include a clear and unambiguous Iranian recognition of Israel's right to exist." … noted an Iranian general's recent declaration that "the destruction of Israel is nonnegotiable," and said, "I want to make clear to all: The survival of Israel is nonnegotiable.””

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

15. D
i. Who: [Mr. Netanyahu]
ii. What: “Israel”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “will not accept an agreement which allows a country that vows to annihilate us to develop nuclear weapons, period …
ii. Attack
   1. Quotes: “only alternative to this bad deal is war. That's not true”
iii. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “third alternative -- standing firm, increasing the pressure on Iran until a good deal is achieved.””

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to safety
ii. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “statement”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “followed a special three-hour session of Israel's security cabinet, which Mr. Netanyahu said was "united in strongly opposing the proposed deal." … did not mention Congress or hint at the prime minister's strategy.”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety
ii. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. D
i. Who: “Dore Gold”
ii. What: “for Israel to get into legislation”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: interview

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “not”
ii. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: … world powers negotiating a final deal by June 30 "include parliamentary democracies" and "an active press corps in all countries.””

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “Opponents of the deal in Israel and the United States”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “emphasizing what they view as Iran's expansionary meddling in Iraq, Syria and Yemen as another reason not to trust it”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

19. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Foundation for Defense of Democracies”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. attack
   1. Quotes: “could "further supercharge Iranian aggression in the region" and encourage Iran's Sunni Arab adversaries to develop nuclear capabilities”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

20. D
i. Who: [Dore Gold]
ii. What: “Israel”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: interview

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “battle for ideas … will have to put forth its arguments … past the elections now in both countries. Everybody is making their case, their point.”

ii. attack
   1. Quotes: “If the final agreement reflects what's in this framework, we're talking about something that is nothing less than a historical error”

21. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “framework's provisions allowing Iran to keep much of its nuclear infrastructure intact”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “a primary concern”

22. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “deal”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “looked better than expected, noting that even if it only delays Iran from producing a nuclear weapon by its decade-long duration, that is far longer than what an Israeli or American military strike could achieve”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

23. D
   i. Who: “Ron Ben-Yishai, a security analyst for the news site Ynet”
   ii. What: “Israel”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “could learn to live with it”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

24. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “offering an olive branch to Netanyahu in an attempt to cooperate on the design of the final agreement over the next three months”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

25. D
   i. Who: Same
   ii. What: “Israeli government”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “should warmly embrace the offer without batting an eye”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

26. D
   i. Who: “Nahum Barnea, a columnist for the Israeli daily Yediot Aharonot”
   ii. What: “Israel's crusade against the deal”
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “a resounding failure … clash between Netanyahu and Obama on the Iranian issue heightened, Israel's influence on the course of the negotiations and its outcome lessened”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

27. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “dilemma that Netanyahu faces”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “not an easy one … can push the leaders of the Republican majority in the two houses of Congress to try to torpedo the agreement … doubtful whether doing this would achieve its purpose”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

28. D
   i. Who: “Emily Landau, an Iran expert at Israel's Institute for National Security Studies”
   ii. What: “Israel's campaign in recent months”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview
   
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “succeeded, at least, in preventing critics of the deal from being marginalized as "warmongers or idiots."
      ii. attack
         1. … one of many in Israel who opposed Mr. Netanyahu's speech in Congress last month against White House wishes,
   iii. acclaim
      1. but she said that it helped reframe the debate in newspaper editorials and foreign policy institutes”

c. values
   i. prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

29. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “very serious analysts at the unofficial levels”
   iii. to whom: same
iv. how: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “same interpretations … not just Israel is out of step with
      the international community -- we're past that.

ii. attack
   1. If the Obama administration tries to continue with that line, it's
      getting old and stale.

iii. Acclaim
   1. quotes: “need to confront the serious and important criticism that a
      lot of knowledgeable people have.” … criticism starts with how
      Iranian violations of the agreement would be detected, who would
      determine if such violations warranted confrontation and who
      would "take action if it's deemed necessary to take action that goes
      beyond the sanctions."

iii. Acclaim
   1. quotes: “reminded Mr. Eiland, the former Israeli national security
      adviser, of an Old Testament tale in which King David fasts for
      seven days after Batsheva bears him a very sick son. Once the
      baby dies, the king asks for something to eat, explaining, in the
      book of Samuel: "Why should I fast? I can't bring him back to
      life.""

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

30. D
i. Who: [Mr. Eiland]
ii. What: “situation”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: interview

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “should say to the Americans, "We understand this is a fait
      accompli, it is something that cannot be reversed," Mr. Eiland said.
      "Let's try to solve other problems we have."

   ii. Attack
1. Quotes: “Don't push us to the corner in the Palestinian arena, make sure you're not going to be against us in the U.N.”

iii. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “Let's try to improve what can be improved, let's stop fighting because this specific game is over”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Saudi Arabia”
   iii. To whom: readers of the *New York Times*, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Promises to Match Iran in Nuclear Capability”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “When President Obama began making the case for a deal with Iran that would delay its ability to assemble an atomic weapon, his first argument”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “a nuclear-armed Iran would set off a "free-for-all" of proliferation in the Arab world”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: Obama
   ii. What: “almost certain that other players in the region”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would feel it necessary to get their own nuclear weapons”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: [Obama]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
Acclaim

1. Quotes: “faced a perverse consequence: Saudi Arabia and many of the smaller Arab states are now vowing to match whatever nuclear enrichment capability Iran is permitted to retain”

Values

i. Prudence

1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

ii. Justice

1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

Who: “one of the Arab leaders preparing to meet Mr. Obama”

What: [Arab leaders]

To whom: same

How: interview

Attack

1. Quotes: “can't sit back and be nowhere as Iran is allowed to retain much of its capability and amass its research”

Values

i. Prudence

1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

ii. Justice

1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

Who: author

What: “Prince Turki bin Faisal, the 70-year-old former Saudi intelligence chief”

To whom: same

How: author language

Acclaim

1. Quotes: “touring the world with the same message”

Values

i. Prudence

1. Rationale: Appeal to wisdom

6.

Who: “Prince Turki”

What: “Whatever the Iranians have”

To whom: same

How: same

Acclaim

1. Quotes: “we will have, too”

Values

i. Justice

1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety
7. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iran deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “presented a new dilemma”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “If the agreement is sealed successfully next month -- still far from
guaranteed -- Mr. Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will be able to claim to have bought another decade,
maybe longer, before Iran can credibly threaten to have a nuclear
weapon”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “But by leaving 5,000 centrifuges and a growing research and
development program in place -- the features of the proposed deal that
Israel and the Arab states oppose virulently -- Mr. Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “essentially recognizing Iran's right to continue
enrichment of uranium, one of the two pathways to a nuclear
weapon”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “Leaders of the Sunni Arab states”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “arguing that if Iran goes down that road, Washington cannot credibly argue they should not follow down the same one, even if their technological abilities are years behind Iran's”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

11. D
   i. Who: “Gary Samore, Mr. Obama's top nuclear adviser during the first term and now the executive director of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard”
   ii. What: “With or without a deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will be pressure for nuclear proliferation in the Middle East … question is one of capabilities. How would the Saudis do this without help from the outside”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Arab states”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “may find it is not as easy as it sounds”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “members of the Nuclear Suppliers Group, a loose affiliation of nations that make the crucial components for nuclear energy and, by extension, weapons projects”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “have a long list of components they will not ship to the Middle East”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
   a. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “leaves only North Korea and Pakistan, two countries that appear to have mastered nuclear enrichment, as possible sources”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
   a. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “doubtful … although it supplied Syria with the components of a nuclear reactor that Israel destroyed in 2007”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D
   a. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “another story”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

17. D
   a. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “have a natural if unacknowledged claim on the technology: They financed much of the work done by A.Q. Khan,”
a Pakistani nuclear scientist who ended up peddling his nuclear wares abroad”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “widely presumed that Pakistan”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes; “would provide Saudi Arabia with the technology, if not a weapon itself”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

19. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “countries in the Gulf Cooperation Council”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “discussed a collective program of their own -- couched, as Iran's is, as a peaceful effort to develop nuclear energy”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “United Arab Emirates”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes; “signed a deal with the United States several years ago to build nuclear power plants, but it is prohibited under that plan from enriching its own uranium.”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

21. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Saudi government”
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “financed nuclear research projects but there is no evidence that it has ever tried to build or buy facilities of the kind Iran has assembled to master the fuel cycle, the independent production of the makings of a weapon”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

22. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Saudis”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “have given the subject of nuclear armament more than passing thought”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

23. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “bought a type of Chinese missile, called a DF-3, that could be used effectively only to deliver a nuclear weapon because the missiles were too large and inaccurate for any other purpose”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

24. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “American officials”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes; “protested”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust
25. D  
  i. Who: same  
  ii. What: Saudis  
  iii. To whom: same  
  iv. How: same  
  
  b. FTC  
  i. Acclaim  
  1. Quotes: “no evidence the Saudis ever obtained warheads to fit atop the missiles”  
  
  c. Values  
  i. Prudence  
  1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom  

26. D  
  i. Who: same  
  ii. What: “Mr. Obama”  
  iii. To whom: same  
  iv. How: same  
  
  b. FTC  
  i. Acclaim  
  1. Quotes: “met with Saudi princes in the Oval Office … who will most likely moderate their criticisms of his administration while talking directly to the president”  
  
  c. Values  
  i. Prudence  
  1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom  

27. D  
  i. Who: same  
  ii. What: “Obama”  
  iii. To whom: same  
  iv. How: same  
  
  b. FTC  
  i. Acclaim  
  1. Quotes: “expected to offer them and the other Arab states some security assurances, although not as explicit or legally binding as the kind that protect American treaty allies, from NATO to Japan to South Korea”  
  ii. Attack  
  1. Quotes: “will have a difficult time overcoming the deep suspicions that the Saudis, and other Arab leaders, harbor about the Iran deal”  
  
  c. Values  
  i. Justice  
  1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety, trust  

28. D  
  i. Who: same  
  ii. What: “Several of them”  
  iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “said that the critical problem with the tentative agreements, as described by the White House and Secretary of State John Kerry, is that they assure nothing on a permanent basis”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety, trust

29. D
   i. Who: “Prince Turki”
   ii. What: “[Obama]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “He did go behind the backs of the traditional allies of the U.S. to strike the deal … mall print of the deal is still unknown … opens the door to nuclear proliferation, not closes it, as was the initial intention”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust, safety

30. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Prince Turki”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “United States was making a "pivot to Iran" that was ill advised, and that the United States failed to learn from North Korea's violations of its nuclear deals”
   ii. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “We were America's best friend in the Arab world for 50 years," he said, using the past tense”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
ARTICLE: Sanger, David E. "Ex-Advisers Warn Obama that Iran Nuclear Deal 'may Fall Short' of Standards."Global Newsstream, Jun 24, 2015,

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Ex-advisers”
   iii. To whom: readers of the New York Times, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Warn Obama that Iran Nuclear Deal 'may Fall Short' of Standards”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Five former members of President Obama's inner circle of Iran advisers”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “have written an open letter expressing concern that a pending accord to stem Iran's nuclear program "may fall short of meeting the administration's own standard of a 'good' agreement" and laying out a series of minimum requirements that Iran must agree to in coming days for them to support a final deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Several of the senior officials said the letter”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “was prompted by concern that Mr. Obama's negotiators were headed toward concessions that would weaken international inspection of Iran's facilities, back away from forcing Tehran to
reveal its suspected past work on weapons, and allow Iranian research and development that would put it on a course to resuming intensive production of nuclear fuel as soon as the accord expires”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety, trust

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “public nature of the announcement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “adds to the challenge facing Secretary of State John Kerry”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “letter”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “was given to the White House and State Department”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: “senior administration official”
   ii. What: [letter]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “in large part tracks with the U.S. negotiating position inside the negotiating room”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
6. D
   i. Who: author
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “heightened the pressure facing negotiators by appearing
to back away from several preliminary understandings reached
between Iran and the West in early April, including in areas where
Mr. Obama's former advisers urged a hardening of the American
position”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “For the White House, the letter”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “may raise the level of political risk in seeking approval of
any final agreement”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “judgment from Mr. Obama's own former advisers that the final
accord falls short”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would provide ammunition for Republican critics who
have already said they will try to kill it when it is submitted to
Congress for review”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [letter]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “creates an opportunity for Mr. Obama as well”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “letter”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “signed by a number of prominent Republicans from President George W. Bush’s administration”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “A determination by them that the standards set out in the letter have been achieved”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would undercut the Republican critique”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
   i. Who: “the letter”
   ii. What: “Most of us”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: letter
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “preferred a stronger agreement … going on to assess the proposed accord as useful for delaying Iran's program … will however reduce that infrastructure for the next 10 to 15 years. And it will impose a transparency, inspection, and consequences regime with the goal of deterring and dissuading Iran from actually building a nuclear weapon”
   ii. Attack
      1. Quotes: “not a long-term solution to the problem of a nuclear Iran … will not prevent Iran from having a nuclear weapons capability"
... will not require the dismantling of Iran's nuclear enrichment infrastructure”

c. Values
  i. Fortitude
     1. Rationale: appeal to strength
  ii. Justice
     1. rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

13. d
  i. who: author
  ii. what: “substance of the letter”
  iii. to whom: same
  iv. how: same

b. FTC
  i. Acclaim
     1. Quotes: “less notable for what it says -- the positions were frequent talking points for the Obama administration before it faced the inevitable compromises involved in negotiations -- than for the influence of its signatories”

c. Values
  i. Prudence
     1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
  i. Who: same
  ii. What: “Among them”
  iii. To whom: same
  iv. How: same

b. FTC
  i. Acclaim
     1. Quotes: “Dennis B. Ross, a longtime Middle East negotiator who oversaw Iran policy at the White House during the first Obama term; David H. Petraeus, the former C.I.A. director who oversaw covert operations against Iran until he resigned two years ago; and Robert Einhorn, a longtime State Department proliferation expert who helped devise and enforce the sanctions against Iran … Gary Samore, Mr. Obama's former chief adviser on nuclear policy who is now the president of the advocacy group United Against Nuclear Iran, and Gen. James E. Cartwright, a former vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and an architect of Mr. Obama's effort to build up military forces in the region … Stephen J. Hadley, Mr. Bush's national security adviser in his second term, who presided over efforts to slow Iran's progress”

c. Values
  i. Prudence
     1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
  i. Who: same
ii. What: “At the core of the letter”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “"required elements that have not yet been achieved."”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “all the signatories”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “supported a negotiated settlement, and "there is no poison pill here" intended to undercut the chance of an agreement”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “All five of the Obama advisers”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “had joined in hours of Situation Room meetings during the president's first term, and some into the second, to devise both the strategy to bring Iran to the negotiating table -- a mix of sanctions, sabotage of the nuclear program and the prospect of a broader relationship with the West -- and the negotiating objectives”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “mechanics of the trade-offs to get a deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “often conflict with the negotiating objectives”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Inside the White House of late”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “there has been what one senior official called "vigorous debate" over the risks of walking away -- which would free Iran to return to full-scale production -- versus accepting a deal whose specifics still leave some officials uncomfortable”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “letter”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “gets to the heart of some of those areas, all of which are still under negotiation and, in some cases, in bitter dispute”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

21. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “negotiations that ended in April”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “resulted in vague statements about how inspections would work, beyond an understanding that Iran would sign an International Atomic Energy Agency convention giving inspectors broad rights to investigate suspicious sites”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to faith/hope

22. D
   i. Who: same
ii. What: “Ayatollah Khamenei, along with his commanders”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “immediately ruled out allowing foreigners to visit military sites”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

23. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “the letter, referring to Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps, said inspections”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “must include military (including I.R.G.C.) and other sensitive facilities”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety, trust

24. d
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “must not be able to deny or delay timely access to any site anywhere in the country”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety, trust

25. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Mr. Kerry”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “not necessary to make Iran account for evidence of past
effort to work on weapons designs, because the United States and
its allies already had "absolute knowledge" of those activities, the
former advisers view the long-sought answers to those questions as
vital”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

26. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “inspectors”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “must be able "to take samples, to interview scientists and
government officials, to inspect sites, and to review and copy
documents as required for their investigation of Iran's past and any
ongoing nuclear weaponization activities … needs to be
accomplished before any significant sanctions relief … strict limits
on advanced centrifuge R&D, testing, and deployment in the first
10 years," and for measures to prevent "rapid technical upgrade"
when those limits expire”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
      ii. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety, trust

27. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Some limits”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “negotiated in April, but the details remain to be resolved”

   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

28. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “hardest part from an Iranian perspective”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “the insistence in the letter that the United States publicly declare -- with congressional assent -- that even after the expiration of the agreement Iran will not be permitted to possess enough nuclear fuel to make a single weapon”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety, trust

29. D
   i. Who: “letter”
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How; letter

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “will be left as a nuclear threshold state (and has clearly preserved the option of becoming a nuclear weapon state),

   ii. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “the United States must go on record now that it is committed to using all means necessary, including military force, to prevent this”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

30. d
   i. Who; author
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How; author language

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “always insisted that its nuclear program is only for peaceful purposes, and has argued that after the agreement expires it should be treated like any other nuclear state, free to produce as much fuel as it desires”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

31. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “letter”
iii. To whom; same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “emerged from a study group on nuclear issues organized by the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, a policy institute”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

32. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Because only members of the group worked on the statement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “omits some former major players in the Obama administration's Iran policy, notably Hillary Rodham Clinton, who will have to decide whether to embrace any final deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

33. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “For Mrs. Clinton, a presidential candidate who has recently separated herself from some of Mr. Obama's policies”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will not be an easy decision: As secretary of state, she sent two of her most trusted aides, Jake Sullivan and William Burns, to begin the secret negotiations with Iran that set the negotiations in motion”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Obama's Chief Negotiator in Iran Nuclear Talks”
   iii. To whom: readers of the New York Times, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Plans to Depart After Deadline for Deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “President Obama’s chief negotiator with Iran, Wendy R. Sherman”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “planned to leave the administration shortly after the June 30 deadline for a final deal on limiting the country's nuclear program”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: “Ms. Sherman, the under secretary of state for policy”
   ii. what: [negotiations]
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “two long years”

c. Values
   i. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patience

3. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “all the top officials who have negotiated with Iran over those two years”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will have left the administration, leaving questions about who will coordinate the complex process of carrying out a deal if one is struck by the deadline”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Secretary of State John Kerry, who has relied on Ms. Sherman to conduct the high-stakes negotiations”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “said that her "mentoring of colleagues, her experience, her passion for diplomacy, her calm in the storm set her apart as a great under secretary of state."”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patience

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Her predecessor, William J. Burns”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “recalled that "there were many moments when our own government, and our negotiating partners, were on different paths with the Iranians, and she was the one who always made sure there were no gaps."”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patience

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Her work”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “is hardly done … left for Austria and Switzerland … task will be to see if the final differences with Tehran -- on issues like the timing of the dismantlement of much of its nuclear infrastructure and the details of inspections of military and other sites -- can be bridged”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [work]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “familiar rhythm for Ms. Sherman, 65, a wiry, intense negotiator with short-cropped white hair who stood out in photographs of the talks in a room dominated by men”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Her colleagues”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “had T-shirts printed with the words "Team Silver Fox."”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [Sherman]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “compared the negotiations to a Rubik's cube, because they involve lining up so many interrelated elements”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
   i. Who: [Sherman]
   ii. What: [negotiations]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “incredibly complex … with the Congress, with the press, our negotiating partners -- and then, when you are done with that, negotiating with the Iranians. And because we're in the world of 24/7, if there was ever a time when you could aim a message to one audience and hope it was kept from another audience -- well, that's not possible, if it ever was.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Mr. Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “had "long counted on Wendy's unique combination of intellect, toughness and persistence, which have made her one of the most effective diplomats of her generation.””

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “many Republicans in Congress”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “view her as the architect of a plan that was intended to avoid any direct congressional vote on an ultimate deal”

c. Values
   i. justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust
13. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “administration”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. quotes: “did not plan to put an accord -- which would be a political agreement, not a treaty -- to a vote until Congress had to permanently revoke sanctions against Iran, perhaps years from now”

c. values
   i. prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “under legislation that Mr. Obama signed last week, Congress”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will now vote on a final accord within a month or two of any agreement”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Even if Congress rejects it”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Mr. Obama's chances of prevailing seem high, since Republicans would not have the votes to override a veto”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Ms. Sherman, the No. 3 official at the State Department”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “did not expect to take another post in the administration, and she has not announced any plans ... close to Hillary Rodham Clinton, whose presidential campaign she supported in 2008, and who is running again for the Democratic nomination”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Mrs. Clinton”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “brought Ms. Sherman back into the government to handle Iran and other issues”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [Sherman]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “worked as a social worker in Boston, a Senate campaign aide, and a counselor to Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright during the Clinton administration, handling North Korea”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Her congressional critics”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “often cited that credential in critiquing her negotiations with Iran”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

20. D
   i. Who: “Senator Mark S. Kirk, Republican of Illinois”
ii. What: “American people”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: interview

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “need an insurance policy to prevent a rerun of North Korea”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

21. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “Iran agreement”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “far more detailed than any of the failed accords reached with North Korea, but that is no guarantee of success”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

22. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Administration officials”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “concerned that with the departures of Ms. Sherman, Mr. Burns and Jake Sullivan, one of Mrs. Clinton's top aides, much of the historical memory about the Iran deal could be lost”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

23. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Ms. Sherman said that the larger question of the Iran talks -- whether they could lead to a broader rapprochement between two countries that have been bitter adversaries for 35 years”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “would take years to play out”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

24. D
   i. Who: [Sherman]
   ii. What: [negotiators]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. acclaim
      1. quotes: “don't know the end of this story”

c. values
   i. prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

25. d
   i. who: author
   ii. what: “when she comes home in frustration over the back-and-forth of the talks, she said, her husband, Bruce Stokes, a longtime Washington journalist,”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: author

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “reminds me that this is historic”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “irate democrats”
   iii. To whom: readers of the New York Times, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “denounce G.O.P. on Iran letter”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Angry Democrats”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “excoriated the open letter sent to Iran's leadership warning about a nuclear agreement with President Obama”
   ii. Defense
      1. Quotes: “47 Republicans who signed it remained defiant and unapologetic, saying the president should have seen their opposition coming”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “reriminations from Democrats”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “threatened to unravel the bipartisan coalition that had been building to oppose a deal”
   ii. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Democrats also confronted the choice between challenging Tehran and rallying behind the president”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
3. D
   i. Who: “Senator Tim Kaine, Democrat of Virginia”
   ii. What: “Republicans”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “made it harder for us to approach this in a careful and bipartisan way”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Senator Tim Kaine, Democrat of Virginia”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “led his party's push for congressional review of the administration's policies on war and sanctions, and sponsored a bill that would allow Congress to review any removal of congressionally imposed sanctions against Iran”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “the Republicans' letter”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “undermined Mr. Obama's efforts to reach an agreement but also weakened their resolve to cross party lines and challenge their own president”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
   i. Who: “Senator Debbie Stabenow of Michigan”
   ii. What: “the war in Iraq”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “opposed … never would have sent a letter to Saddam Hussein”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: “Senator Bill Nelson, Democrat of Florida”
   ii. What: [lawmakers]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “can disagree about the specifics … have to honor the institution of the presidency … matters of war and peace, then we've got to unify”
   
   ii. Attack
      1. Quotes: “saddened that we've come to the point at which we appear to be so divided”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

8. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Mr. Obama's actions”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “unduly provocative”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: “Senator Mitch McConnell of Kentucky, the majority leader”
   ii. What: “obvious that the president” [everyone]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “does not want Congress to have any say-so over the bad deal that we are certain he seems to be inclined to make … should be suspicious of an administration that's so intent on keeping the elective representatives to the American people out of this deal”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

ii. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

10. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “Republican hardball tactics”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “could prove effective”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Democrats”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “may well support legislation to review a nuclear agreement”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Senator Michael Bennet, Democrat of Colorado”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “signed onto the oversight legislation led by Senator Bob Corker, Republican of Tennessee”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Mr. Corker”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “among seven Republicans who did not sign the letter”

c. Values  
   i. Prudence  
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D  
   i. Who: “Senator Bob Corker, Republican of Tennessee”  
   ii. What: “best”  
   iii. To whom: same  
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC  
   i. Acclaim  
      1. Quotes: “to focus on my bill”

15. D  
   i. Who: author  
   ii. What: “more conservative Republicans”  
   iii. To whom: same  
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC  
   i. Acclaim  
      1. Quotes: “bolstering their position with their pro-Israel evangelical base and appealing to Jewish voters and political donors”

16. D  
   i. Who: “Senator Benjamin L. Cardin, Democrat of Maryland”  
   ii. What: “why they did what they did”  
   iii. To whom: same  
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC  
   i. Attack  
      1. Quotes: “not helpful”  
   ii. Acclaim  
      1. [would vote for the legislation demanding congressional review of an Iran nuclear deal] “we'll support it," he said of his fellow Democrats. "I support congressional review. I think congressional review makes sense”

17. D  
   i. Who: author  
   ii. What: “The White House”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “working to head off a Democratic revolt on the deal, is seeking to capitalize on the deepening partisan rift”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Vice President Joseph R. Biden Jr.”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “served more than three decades in the Senate and was chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee”
   ii. Attack
      1. Quotes: “lengthy and harshly worded statement … could recall no other instance in which senators had written to the leaders of another country, "much less a foreign adversary," to say the president had no authority to strike an accord with them”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
i. Who: “Mr. Biden”
ii. What: “letter”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “guise of a constitutional lesson, ignores two centuries of precedent and threatens to undermine the ability of any future American president, whether Democrat or Republican, to negotiate with other nations on behalf of the United States … no way to make America safer or stronger”
   ii. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Honorable people can disagree over policy”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
      ii. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

20. D
1. Who: author
2. What: “Hillary Rodham Clinton”
3. To whom: same
4. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Defense
   1. Quotes: “defended her use of a private email account while secretary of state”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

21. D
i. Who: [Hillary Rodham Clinton]
ii. What: “recent letter from Republican senators”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “out of step with the best traditions of American leadership … what was the purpose of this letter”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
ii. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

22. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “Two bills -- one to increase economic sanctions against Iran and one to force the administration to bring any deal with Iran to Congress for review”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “co-sponsored by several Democrats”
ii. Attack
   1. Quotes: “stand a chance of drawing a veto-proof majority in the Senate, which would be a humiliating outcome for Mr. Obama”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

23. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “president”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC  
i. Attack  
   1. Quotes: “vowed to veto both bills”

c. Values  
i. Prudence  
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

24. D  
i. Who: same  
ii. What: “Republicans' aggressiveness that so angered Democrats”  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: same  
b. FTC  
i. Attack  
   1. Quotes: “could imperil reaching the two-thirds majority required to override a veto”

c. Values  
i. Prudence  
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

25. D  
i. Who: same  
ii. What: “Speaker John A. Boehner's invitation to Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu of Israel, the most outspoken opponent of an Iran deal, to address a joint meeting of Congress last week”  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: same  
b. FTC  
i. Attack  
   1. Quotes: “angered the White House and prompted many Democrats, even ardent supporters of Israel, to boycott the speech”

c. Values  
i. Prudence  
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

26. D  
i. Who: same  
ii. What: “Shortly after the address, Mr. McConnell”  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: same  
b. FTC  
i. Acclaim  
   1. Quotes: “moved to speed up consideration of the bill to review the Iran deal, which would have led to votes on it before the late-March negotiating deadline for an outline of the agreement”

c. Values  
i. Prudence  
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

27. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Democratic sponsors of that bill”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “reacted angrily and said Republicans were politicizing diplomacy, and some Democrats warned that the Republican letter to Iran may in the end backfire”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

28. D
   i. Who: “Representative Brad Sherman, a California Democrat”
   ii. What: “The whole brouhaha”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “reduced from a 40 percent chance to a 4 percent chance that Democrats will vote in sufficient numbers to override a veto”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

29. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Administration officials”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “for months made the case to restive lawmakers in their own ranks that they should wait to see the outcome of the nuclear talks before moving to impose new penalties against Tehran or airing concerns about the terms of any deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

30. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Mr. Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
1. Quotes: “doing so would allow Iran to argue plausibly that the
   United States was responsible for a breakdown of the negotiations”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

31. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “some Democrats”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. defense
      1. Quotes: “privately argued they were working to strengthen, not
         undercut, the president in taking a hard line in the talks -- playing
         "bad cop" to his "good cop"”
   ii. Attack
      1. Quotes: “White House has cautioned that the strategy could derail
         an emerging international pact”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

32. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Republicans' latest moves”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “underlined those risks, vindicating Mr. Obama's
         arguments”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

33. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “White House”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “hopeful that in the longer term, they might strengthen its
         hand in a struggle with Congress, persuading Democratic skeptics
         to side with the president over “
   ii. attack
      1. quotes: “Republicans who have injected partisanship into the
         issue”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

34. D
   i. Who: “Eric Schultz, the deputy White House press secretary”
   ii. What: “letter”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “flagrant, partisan attempt to interfere with the negotiations”
   ii. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “one president at a time in the United States”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iran accord”
   iii. To whom: readers of the New York Times, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “historic turn with its dangers”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “For the first time since 1979, the United States and the other so-called P5+1 countries”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “reached an agreement with the government of Iran of historic dimensions”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope
2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “That simple fact by itself”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “is a watershed”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “By all reckoning”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “relatively harmonious negotiation, confirming that all sides want to move beyond the tired paradigms of the past”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iranian people”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “rejoiced in this agreement because it will make it possible for their lives in Iran to get better, and they have given every indication that they urgently desire harmonious relations with the rest of the world”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “moderates in Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “tremendously strengthened by this agreement”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “other major countries”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “want to establish economic relations with Iran, and this agreement makes this very likely”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope
7. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “some, like Mr. Rubin”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “argue that President Obama should sell it to the American people on very narrow grounds, the reason we are here in the first place is because he ignored the naysayers and boldly sought a geopolitical watershed -- and time will show that this is what it is”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope/faith
8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “president”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “should both attempt to sell the agreement on the practical terms he has advanced, but also highlight that this agreement does in fact have historic dimensions … That is what leaders do … show us a vision of a future of possibilities even in a world of great imperfections”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. rationale: appeal to hope/faith
1. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “The Iran nuclear arms limitation agreement”
   iii. to whom; same
   iv. how: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “parallels the actions of the United States and Soviet Union under SALT I and SALT II in limiting the growth and expansion of both superpowers' strategic nuclear weapons and delivery systems”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Those agreements”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “did not change the actions of the Soviet Politburo nor the Soviet Union's expansionist foreign policy ventures”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. d
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “this agreement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

   b. FTC
      i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “will not change Iran's behavior”
      ii. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “is a benchmark that could lead to other nuclear program concordats as well as full rapprochement between the United States and Iran … this entente merely monitors the Iranian program with verification measures”

   c. Values
      i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope/faith

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Congressional critics and various Middle East allies”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “should at least read the agreement before excoriating President Obama and the deal's provisions”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Republicans”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. acclaim
      1. Quotes: “eviscerated their now beloved President Reagan over his
         positions on Soviet arms control mechanisms of the 1980s”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “In what way”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “is Iran reined in”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “agreement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “releases hundreds of millions of dollars in the short run,
         perhaps billions in the long run, to Iran, a portion of which will
         most certainly be used to sponsor and finance terrorist groups
         throughout the Middle East and perhaps even farther afield”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety, trust

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “fear that this agreement will, if implemented”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “produce much more pressure by terrorist groups against
         Israel, which, if fearing for its existence, might feel forced to use
         its own nuclear weapons … Then were will we be”

c. Values
   i. justice
1. rationale: appeal to fairness, trust, safety
   ii. prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom
1. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “President Obama's assertion to Thomas L. Friedman that the Soviet Union during Ronald Reagan's presidency”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “was a far greater existential threat to us than Iran will ever be” and his use of that belief to help justify the Iran nuclear accord demonstrates a profound naïveté”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Today's true existential concern”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “whether the benefits of limiting Iran's attainment of even one nuclear bomb, which Israel would likely take military steps to prevent anyway, will exceed Iran's continued and potentially increased financial support for global terrorism and destabilizing regional conflict”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom
1. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “difficult to comprehend why the United States and the other countries”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “did not precondition the deal on Iranian guarantees that it will not supply organizations like Hezbollah and Hamas and many others with the means to carry out terrorist attacks”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “how the United States and the others”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “did not make it a precondition that the Iranians refrain from inciting hatred toward the United States and Israel and that they did not require Iran to cease calling for the complete annihilation of Israel”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Roger Cohen”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “presents several good points about the Iran nuclear deal's potential, including putting distance between Iran and nuclear weapons, and opening the door to a new generation of United States diplomacy in the Middle East”
   ii. Attack
      1. Quotes: “doesn't provide a single reason that Israel should welcome such an agreement, aside from the possibility of Israel receiving "more advanced American weapons systems," the need for which is hardly a good harbinger”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “a firmer American presence in the region”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “undoubtedly good for Israel”
   ii. Attack
      1. Quotes: “regime in Iran has never wavered in its contempt for the "Zionist entity."”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “To accept the Iran deal with full knowledge of the danger it presents to Iran's enemies”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “bold diplomacy”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “to ignore those dangers”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “is foolish”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “arguments of the critics who urge a "no" vote on the agreement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “comes down to a choice between war and peace … with an Iran armed with nuclear weapons”
c. Values
   i. prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “fact that there is a deal approved by all the other major world powers”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. attack
1. Quotes: “means that it would be not only foolhardy and irresponsible, but also unimaginably destructive, for the American Congress not to approve it”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “hope that there are enough Democrats who agree with the president”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “without that we could very well sink back into the madness of the Cold War in the world's most volatile region”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
Article: (Gearan & Warrick, 2013)

I. Decontextualization: Title
   1. What: “deal”
   2. Who: “world powers” author
   3. To Whom: general public which might include regular readers of The Washington Post and those searching for such information on the internet
   4. How: author language

2. Functional theory categories:
   1. Acclaim
      1. Quote: use of the words “deal” and “world powers” gives the possible indication of an agreement which tends to denote something good, between legitimate authorities wherein both sides benefit. “World powers” could be seen as constituting an appeal to authority. The object of the Deal, freezing Iran’s nuclear capabilities, as presented in the title, might appeal to an already present fear in the minds of informed readers, Iran’s nuclear capability, in the sense that it is now allayed by said Deal.

   3. Values
      1. Prudence
         1. Rational: As stated previously in this overall study, policy is defined as the “adoption of a definite course of action.” The reasons for a course of action are based upon the balancing, maintenance, or reaching of a value-standard, even if that standard is left unspoken. Considering the language used in the title such as “deal” and “world powers,” wherein the latter is an appeal to authority and given that the title is an acclaim which proposes a course of action which is arguably better than the prior situation, the value to which the piece appeals is prudence. Prudence, in this context, means practical wisdom or knowledge and understanding of how to act given the situation. The title suggests that those involved, “world powers,” possess the needed knowledge and understanding of the situation in order to act wisely.

   3. Decontextualization: First sentence
      1. Who: “Iran and six major powers” author
      2. What: “historic deal that freezes key parts of Iran’s nuclear program in exchange for temporary relief on some economic sanctions.”
      3. To Whom: same
      4. How: same, author language

2. Functional Theory Categories
   1. Acclaim
      1. Quote: appears to strengthen words used in the title such as the addition of the word “major” to world powers and the addition of “historic agreement” to deal. These additions arguably further the goal of
presenting the policy at hand in a positive way thus making the deal, as far as functional theory’s axioms are concerned, a preferable choice.

3. Values
   1. Justice
      1. Rationale: According to the first sentence, Iran (the source of fear) receives a “temporary” relief from “some” economic sanctions while the major world powers receive a “freeze” on “key” parts of Iran’s nuclear capabilities. If Iran is perceived as the source of the fear that has led to the need for a Deal, and the sanctions in place are seen as a method of controlling Iran, then only a temporary alleviation of some of these sanctions exchanged for a complete halt of the most important parts of Iran’s program could be seen as a solution to the fear that lead to the Deal. Further, the Deal could be seen as favoring the major world powers in that they got what they wanted but Iran only got part of what they wanted. This could be seen as an appeal to justice. Justice is seen as fairness and righteousness in the sense that people receive what is due to them, whether in terms of punishment or reward. Such an appeal argues that the parties involved are acting with justice in terms of the Deal in that the major powers receive the reward of dispelling fears of Iran’s nuclear program and Iran receives punishment of having sanctions only temporarily lifted.

2. Decontextualization: Second sentence
   1. Who: same
   2. What: Same
   3. To Whom: same
   4. How: same
   1. Functional Theory Categories
      1. Acclaim
         1. Quote: “sealed at a 3 a.m. signing ceremony in Geneva’s Palace of Nations, requires Iran to halt or scale back parts of its nuclear infrastructure, the first such pause in more than a decade.”

2. Values
   1. Prudence
      1. Rationale: “3 a.m. signing” indicates hard work, not stopping till finished; location: “Geneva’s Palace of Nations” references place of world peace and accord as per WWII
   2. Justice
      1. Rationale: “requires Iran to halt or scale back parts of its nuclear infrastructure” indicates complete justice for potential aggressor; “the first such pause in more than a decade” suggests historic achievement to end hostile environment

3. Decontextualization: Third sentence
   1. Who: Iranian Foreign Minister Mohammad Javad Zarif, Secretary of State John F. Kerry and foreign ministers from Europe, Russia and China; author
2. What: “the deal”
3. To Whom: same
4. How: author language
1. Functional Theory Categories
   1. Acclaim
      1. Quote: “Iranian Foreign Minister Mohammad Javad Zarif hailed the deal, which was reached after four days of hard bargaining, including an eleventh-hour intervention”
2. Values
   1. Justice
      1. Rationale: if the Iranian minister hailed the Deal he must think it to be fair
   2. Prudence
      1. Rationale: “four days of hard bargaining” indicates long, hard work (ended with a Deal); “11th hour intervention” indicates an authoritative decision by a wise interlocutor who saved the day, so to speak; inclusion of Secretary of State, foreign ministers from Europe, Russia, and China indicates an appeal to a wise authority

4. Decontextualization: Fourth sentence
   1. Who: Iranian Foreign Minister Mohammad Javad Zarif
   2. What: Iran’s nuclear program
   3. To Whom: same
   4. How: public statement
1. Functional Theory Categories
   1. Acclaim
      1. Quote: “It is important that we all of us see the opportunity to end an unnecessary crisis and open new horizons based on respect, based on the rights of the Iranian people and removing any doubts about the exclusively peaceful nature of Iran’s nuclear program,” Zarif told reporters in English. “This is a process of attempting to restore confidence.”
   2. Values
      1. Prudence
         1. Rationale: emphasis on the importance to see opportunity to end unnecessary crisis, open new horizons, remove doubts, restore confidence, mentioning that Zarif spoke in English
      2. Justice
         1. Rationale: based on respect and rights of Iranian people, also ending unnecessary crisis, restore confidence

5. Decontextualization: Fifth sentence
   1. Who: Western officials familiar with the details; author
   2. What: “the deal”
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: author language
1. Functional Theory Categories
   1. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: reference to “more comprehensive” deal to come, “freezing” and reversing Iran’s progress, “western officials familiar with the details
   2. Values
      1. Prudence
         1. Rationale: “western officials familiar with the details,” “more comprehensive pact” to come [trust], “major” nuclear facilities
      2. Justice
         1. Rationale: freezing and reversing Iran’s progress

6. Decontextualization: sixth sentence
   1. Who: same
   2. What: same
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: author language
   1. Functional Theory Categories
      1. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: reference to halting and capping
   2. Values
      1. Justice
         1. Rationale: Halting and capping, and being “allowed to produce”

7. Decontextualization: seventh sentence
   1. Who: Iran; author
   2. What: same [agreed]
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: author language
   1. Functional Theory Categories
      1. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: halting work on “key components”
   2. Values
      1. Justice
         1. Rationale: halting work “that could someday provide Iran with a source of plutonium”
      2. Prudence
         1. Rationale: “key components”

8. Decontextualization: eighth sentence
   1. Who: “officials,” “Iran;” author
   2. What: deal [acceptance]
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: author language
   1. Functional Theory Categories
      1. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “accepted,” “dramatic increase in oversight,” “daily monitoring,” “international … inspectors”

2. Values
   1. Justice
      1. Rationale: “dramatic increase in oversight, including daily monitoring by international nuclear inspectors”
   2. Prudence
      1. Rationale: “officials” [trust]

9. Decontextualization: ninth sentence
   1. Who: “officials,” Iran; author
   2. What: deal [“concessions”]
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: author language
   1. Functional Theory Categories
      1. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: conceding, halting advances, making virtually impossible
   2. Values
      1. Justice
         1. Rationale: conceding, halting advances, making impossible, detection
   2. Prudence
      1. Rationale: “officials” [trust]

10. Decontextualization: tenth sentence
    1. Who: Iran; author
    2. What: “modest relief,” “access to some”
    3. To whom: same
    4. How: author language
    1. Functional theory categories
       1. Acclaim
          1. Quotes: “modest relief of trade sanctions,” “access to some of its frozen currency,” “valued at less than $7 billion”
    2. Values
       1. Justice
          1. Rationale: “modest relief,” “access to some,” “valued at less”

11. Decontextualization: eleventh sentence
    1. Who: Iran; author
    2. What: “sanctions,” “agreements terms”
    3. To whom: same
    4. How: author language
    1. Functional theory categories
       1. Acclaim
          1. Quotes: “reinstated if Iran violates”
    2. Values
1. Justice
   1. Rationale: sanctions reinstated if Iran violates

12. Decontextualization: twelfth sentence
   1. Who: Iran’s President Hassan Rouhani; author
   2. What: “accord” “deal”
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: author language
   1. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: accord reached, recognizing “Tehran’s right”
   2. Values
      1. Justice
         1. Rationale: “deal recognizes Tehran’s right”

13. Decontextualization: thirteenth sentence
   1. Who: Rouhani
   2. What: “right” “text of the agreement” continuance
   3. To whom: same, Iranian people
   4. How: public statement
   1. Functional theory categories
      1. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “right is clearly stated”
   2. Values
      1. Justice
         1. Rationale: “right”
      2. Prudence
         1. Rationale: “clearly stated” “activities will continue as before”

14. Decontextualization: fourteenth sentence
   1. Who: Kerry; author
   2. What: deal
   3. To whom: Same
   4. How: author language
   1. Functional theory categories
      1. Defense
         1. Quotes: “deal does not recognize a right”
   2. Values
      1. Prudence
         1. Rationale: reference to Kerry, reassurance [trust] that “deal does not recognize a right”

15. Decontextualization: fifteenth sentence
   1. Who: Kerry
   2. What: “right”
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: interview declamation
1. Functional theory categories
   1. Defense
      1. Quotes: “there is no inherent right”

2. Values
   1. Justice
      1. Rationale: Kerry, “no inherent right” [fairness]

16. Decontextualization: sixteenth sentence
   1. Who: Kerry
   2. What: “agreement”
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: interview

   1. Functional theory categories
      1. Defense
         1. Quotes: “everywhere in this … agreement” “could only do that by mutual agreement” “nothing is agreed on until everything is agreed on”

   2. Values
      1. Prudence
         1. Rationale: “everywhere” “only do that” “nothing is agreed on until everything is agreed on” [trust]

17. Decontextualization: seventeenth sentence
   1. Who: President Obama
   2. What: “negotiator’s work”
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: “address from the White House”

   1. Functional theory categories
      1. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “praised the negotiator’s work”

   2. Values
      1. Prudence
         1. Rationale: from “White House” [authority], “President” [authority]

18. Decontextualization: eighteenth sentence
   1. Who: Obama
   2. What: “diplomacy” “future” “Iran’s nuclear program”
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: public statement

   1. Functional theory categories
      1. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “diplomacy opened up a new path toward a world that is more secure” “a future in which we can verify that Iran’s nuclear program is peaceful and that it cannot build a nuclear weapon”

   2. Values
      1. Prudence
1. **Rationale:** opening up a new path, world that is more secure, future of verification, Iran’s nuclear program is peaceful, cannot build a nuclear weapon [trust]

19. Decontextualization: nineteenth sentence
   1. **Who:** Obama
   2. **What:** announcement
   3. **To whom:** same
   4. **How:** public address
   1. **Functional theory categories**
      1. Acclaim
      1. **Quotes:** “achieves a great deal”
   2. **Values**
      1. Prudence
      1. **Rationale:** “just a first step” “achieves a great deal”

20. Decontextualization: twentieth sentence
   1. **Who:** Obama, “we”
   2. **What:** “time” “Iranian nuclear program” “key parts”
   3. **To whom:** same
   4. **How:** public statement
   1. **Functional theory categories**
      1. Acclaim
      1. **Quotes:** “first time in nearly a decade” “halted the progress” “key parts” “rolled back”
   2. **Values**
      1. Justice
      1. **Rationale:** “halted the progress” “key parts” “rolled back”

21. Decontextualization: twenty-first sentence
   1. **Who:** “Obama administration;” author
   2. **What:** “agreement”, “Iranian nuclear program”
   3. **To whom:** same
   4. **How:** author language
   1. **Functional theory categories**
      1. Acclaim
      1. **Quotes:** “victory”
   2. **Values**
      1. Temperance
      1. **Rationale:** “long-sought” “earliest days”

22. Decontextualization: twenty-second sentence
   1. **Who:** “the administration” “overseas allies” “congress;” author
   2. **What:** “success”
   3. **To whom:** same
   4. **How:** author language
1. Functional theory categories
   1. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “achieved unprecedented success”

2. Values
   1. Justice
      1. Rationale: the Who appeals to authority, “imposing harsh” “sanctions” “cut Iran’s … exports in half” “decimated the country’s currency”

23. Decontextualization: twenty-third sentence
   1. Who: Obama administration; author
   2. What: “agreement”
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: author language

1. Functional theory categories
   1. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “It was hoping to quickly finalize” “in the face of threats” [success under pressure from time and threats]

2. Values
   1. Temperance
      1. Rationale: “quickly finalize”
   2. Courage
      1. Rationale: “in the face of threats by Congress”

24. Decontextualization: twenty-fourth sentence
   1. Who: “Congress members;” author
   2. What: “skepticism”
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: author language

1. Functional theory categories
   1. Attack
      1. Quotes: “expressed skepticism”

2. Values
   1. Prudence
      1. Rationale: skepticism from “influential member of president’s own party” [deal unwise]

25. Decontextualization: twenty-fifth sentence
   1. Who: Sen. Robert Menendez (D-N.J.), chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee
   2. What: “agreement”
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: public statement

1. Functional theory categories
   1. Attack
1. Quotes: “did not proportionately reduce Iran’s nuclear program for the relief it is receiving”

2. Values
   1. Justice
      1. Rationale: attack on proportionality

26. Decontextualization: twenty-sixth sentence
   1. Who: same
   2. What: Iran’s history
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: Public statement
   1. Functional theory categories
      1. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Iran’s history of duplicity”
   2. Values
      1. Justice
         1. Rationale: “history of duplicity” [lack of honesty]
      2. Prudence
         1. Rationale: “it will demand ongoing, on the ground verification” [lack of wisdom]

27. Decontextualization: twenty-seventh sentence
   1. Who: same
   2. What: “new sanctions”
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: public statement
   1. Functional theory categories
      1. Defense
      1. Quotes: “Congress would not impose new sanctions during the six-month interim agreement period” [response to Obama accusation]
   2. Values
      1. Prudence
      1. Rationale: [trust that] “Congress would not impose new sanctions during the six-month interim agreement period”

   1. Who: same
   2. What: “sanctions legislation” “talks”
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: public statement
   1. Functional theory categories
      1. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will provide for a six month window to reach a final agreement before imposing new sanctions” “will at the same time be immediately available”
   2. Values
1. Prudence
   1. Rationale: legislators will provide what is needed as it is needed

29. Decontextualization: twenty-ninth sentence
   1. Who: Kerry
   2. What: “goal”
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: public statement
   1. Functional theory categories
      1. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Speaking in the predawn hours” “require Iran to prove”
      peaceful nature” “ensure that it cannot acquire a nuclear weapon”
   2. Values
      1. Prudence
      1. Rationale: “predawn hours” suggests hard work; requiring suggests
      authority; “peaceful nature” and “ensure” suggest trust

30. Decontextualization: thirtieth sentence
   1. Who: same
   2. What: “agreement”
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: public statement
   1. Functional theory categories
      1. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “‘serious first step’ toward resolving world doubts about
      Iran’s program”
   2. Values
      1. Prudence
      1. Rationale: “serious first step” suggests solemnity and more to
      come; “resolving” suggests resolution

31. Decontextualization: thirty-first sentence
   1. Who: same
   2. What: deal
   3. To whom: same, Israel, allies in region
   4. How: public statement
   1. Functional theory categories
      1. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “addressed Israeli concerns directly;” “It will make our
      partners in the regions safer;” “It will make our ally Israel safer.”
   2. Values
      1. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeals to trust and safety

32. Decontextualization: thirty-second sentence
   1. Who: same
2. What: “agreement”
3. To whom: same
4. How: public statement

1. Functional theory categories
   1. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “can help turn the page from more than three decades of animosity and suspicion between the United States and Iran”

2. Values
   1. Prudence
      1. Rationale: “too soon” protects predictions against desperate odds yet sustains hope

33. Decontextualization: thirty-third sentence
   1. Who: same
   2. What: “moment” [deal]
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: Public statement

1. Functional theory categories
   1. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “potentially significant moment”

2. Values
   1. Prudence
      1. Rationale: suggest potentially “significant” “triumphant” moment, warns against too much significance

34. Decontextualization: thirty-fourth sentence
   1. Who: same
   2. What: it [deal]
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: public statement

1. Functional theory categories
   1. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “It is not.” [appeal to authority]

2. Values
   1. Prudence
      1. Rationale: suggests Kerry has wisdom and authority

35. Decontextualization: thirty-fifth sentence
   1. Who: Rep. Adam Smith (D-Wash.), the ranking Democrat on the House Armed Services Committee
   2. What: deal
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: public statement

2. Functional theory categories
   1. Acclaim
1. Quotes: called the deal a “positive step” “vital that we prevent Iran … in a peaceful way.”

3. Values
   1. Temperance
      1. Rationale: “positive step” in terms of a “vital” restrained peaceful solution

36. Decontextualization: thirty-sixth sentence
   1. Who: “key allies” “congressional skeptics;” author
   2. What: “agreement”
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: author language

2. Functional theory categories
   1. Attack
      1. Quotes: “heavy opposition” “demand much greater concessions”

3. Values
   1. Justice
      1. Suggests more should be demanded of Iran than what Deal demands

37. Decontextualization: thirty-seventh sentence
   1. Who: “senior administration official;” author
   2. What: “Obama plans to speak with Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu on Sunday to discuss the agreement”
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: author language

2. Functional theory categories
   1. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: Suggests Obama follow-up with ally, “senior administration official is appeal to authority

3. Values
   1. Prudence
      1. Rationale: trust in continual pursuit, appeal to authority

38. Decontextualization: thirty-eighth sentence
   1. Who: senior administration official; author
   2. What: “White House calling lawyers”
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: author language

2. Functional theory categories
   1. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “official” “White House” “calling lawyers Saturday night” [working hard] “would continue to do so in the coming days” [tenacity]

3. Values
   1. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeals to authority, hard work, tenacity

39. Decontextualization: thirty-ninth sentence
   1. Who: “republican lawmakers;” author
   2. What: “agreement”
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: author language
2. Functional theory categories
   1. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Republican lawmakers characterized the agreement as not going far enough.”
3. Values
   1. Justice
      1. Rationale: not enough asked of Iran to be fair

40. Decontextualization: fortieth sentence
   2. What: “agreement”
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: public statement
2. Functional theory categories
   1. Attack
      1. Quotes: “I have serious concerns that this agreement does not meet the standards necessary to protect the United States and our allies,”
3. Values
   1. Justice
      1. Rationale: “does not meet the standards necessary to protect”

41. Decontextualization: forty-first sentence
   1. Who: same
   2. What: “Tehran”
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: public statement
2. Functional theory categories
   1. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Instead of rolling back Iran’s program, Tehran would be able to keep the key elements of its nuclear weapons-making capability.”
3. Values
   1. Justice
      1. Fair goal not reached

42. Decontextualization: forty-second sentence
   1. Who: same
   2. What: “we” [US]
3. To whom: same
4. Public statement
2. Functional theory categories
   1. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Yet we are the ones doing the dismantling — relieving Iran of the sanctions pressure built up over years.”
3. Values
   1. Justice
      1. Rationale: Deal unfair to US

43. Decontextualization: forty-third sentence
   1. Who: “others;” author
   2. What: “deal”
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: author language
2. Functional theory categories
   1. Defense
      1. Quotes: “Others, however, hailed the successful conclusion of a deal that eased a crisis that brought the Middle East to the brink of armed conflict.”
3. Values
   1. Prudence
      1. Rationale: “hailed” “successful conclusion” “eased a crisis” [trust]

44. Decontextualization: forty-fourth sentence
   1. Who: “Clifford Kupchan, a former State Department official and Iran expert”
   2. What: “deal”
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: public statement
2. Functional theory categories
   1. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “a huge win for Obama.”
3. Values
   1. Prudence
      1. Rationale: “former State Department official and Iran expert” [trust the Deal]

45. Decontextualization: forty-fifth sentence
   1. Who: same
   2. What: “these guys” [Obama administration]
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: public statement
2. Functional theory categories
   1. Acclaim
Quotes: “You have to give it to these guys: They put in place the most effective sanctions regime in memory and leveraged it into a deal,”

Values
1. Prudence
   1. Rationale: “give it to these guys” “most effective sanctions … in memory” [trust]

46. Decontextualization: forty-sixth sentence
1. Who: “Trita Parsi, president of the National Iranian American Council”
2. What: “diplomacy”
3. To whom: same
4. How: author language, public statement

2. Functional theory categories
1. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “delivered the U.S. and Iran from the brink of a disastrous war and placed the two countries at the beginning of a brighter, more sustainable path forward.”

3. Values
1. Prudence
   1. Rationale: “president of the National Iranian American Council” “delivered” “brighter … sustainable path forward”

47. Decontextualization: forty-seventh sentence
1. Who: author
2. What: “Iran” “purity level”
3. To whom: same
4. How: author language

2. Functional theory language
1. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “Iran agreed to halt enriching uranium to a level above 5 percent purity, a level used for nuclear reactor fuel but not approaching the 90-percent purity needed for nuclear weapons.”

3. Values
1. Prudence
   1. Rationale: “agreed” “for … fuel but not … weapons” [trust]

48. Decontextualization: forty-eighth sentence
1. Who: author
2. What: “Iran” “enrichment”
3. To whom: same
4. How: author language

2. Functional theory categories
1. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “While Iran would be allowed to continue some uranium enrichment, it could not install new centrifuges or use thousands of others that it has manufactured but not placed into service.”

3. Values
   1. Justice
      1. Rationale: “allowed” “some” “could not install … or use” [fair]

49. Decontextualization: forty-ninth sentence
   1. Who: same
   2. What: “Iran’s stockpile”
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: author language
2. Functional theory language
   1. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Iran’s total stockpile of enriched uranium would not be allowed to grow during the six-month period.”

3. Values
   1. Justice
      1. Rationale: “would not be allowed” [fairness]

50. Decontextualization: fiftieth sentence
   1. Who: author
   2. What: “Iran … agreed”
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: author language
2. Functional theory categories
   1. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “agreed to stop producing … and committed itself to eliminate its stockpile”
3. Values
   1. Justice
      1. Rationale: “stop producing” “eliminate” [fairness]
   2. Prudence
      1. Rationale: “committed itself” [trust as part of Deal?]

51. Decontextualization: fifty-first sentence
   1. Who: author
   2. What: “Iran’s … heavy-water reactor”
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: author language
2. Functional theory language
   1. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Iran agreed to halt production of fuel for the reactor and refrain from installing further reactor components.”
3. Values
   1. Justice
1. Rationale: “agreed to halt … and refrain from installing” [fairness]

52. Decontextualization: fifty-second sentence
1. Who: author
2. What: “compliance” “UN inspectors”
3. To whom: same
4. How: author language
2. Functional theory categories
1. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “Assuring compliance with the agreement” “daily access” “remote cameras and sensing equipment”
3. Values
1. Prudence
   1. Rationale: “assuring compliance” “daily access” “remote cameras and sensing equipment” [trust]

53. Decontextualization: fifty-third sentence
1. Who: author
2. What: “discussions”
3. To whom: same
4. How: author language
2. Functional theory categories
1. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “According to a senior Obama administration official” “U.S. officials held a series of bilateral discussions with Iranian officials”
3. Values
1. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeals to authority

54. Decontextualization: fifty-fourth sentence
1. Who: author
2. What: “discussions”
3. To whom: same
4. How: author language
2. Functional theory categories
1. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “marathon discussions” [hard work] “described by Western officials as “very difficult” “intense””
3. Values
1. Prudence
   1. Rationale: allusion to hard work

55. Decontextualization: fifty-fifth sentence
1. Who: author
2. What: “expectations”
3. To whom: same
4. How: author language
2. Functional theory categories
   1. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Several officials had sought to lower expectations”
3. Values
   1. Justice
      1. Rationale: might not get what we should/wanted

56. Decontextualization: fifty-sixth sentence
   1. Who: author
   2. What: “negotiations”
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: author language
2. Functional theory categories
   1. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Negotiations over the deal had remained snarled”
3. Values
   1. Prudence
      1. Rationale: “foreign ministers of Britain, France, Germany, China, Russia, the European Union and the United States huddled in a hotel conference room.” [appeals to authority]

57. Decontextualization: fifty-seventh sentence
   1. Who: author
   2. What: “divided on key details”
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: author language
2. Functional theory categories
   1. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Several of the diplomats met earlier in the day with Iran’s Zarif, who told reporters that the parties remained divided on key details of the six-month deal.”
3. Values
   1. Justice
      1. Rationale: division on “key details” [fairness]

58. Decontextualization: fifty-eighth sentence
   1. Who: author
   2. What: “session”
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: author language
2. Functional theory categories
   1. Attack
      1. Quotes: “…session ended with no announcement of progress.”
3. Values
1. Justice
   1. Rationale: Appeal to authorities “Kerry, Zarif and European Union foreign policy chief Catherine Ashton” yet no progress [fairness]

59. Decontextualization: fifty-ninth sentence
   1. Who: author
   2. What: “position on Iran’s right to enrich”
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: author language
   2. Functional theory categories
      1. Attack
         1. Quotes: “Instead, Iran’s deputy foreign minister hardened his position on Iran’s right to enrich uranium, a matter of deep national pride.”
   3. Values
      1. Justice
         1. Rationale: “right to enrich” “matter of deep national pride” [fairness]

60. Decontextualization: sixtieth sentence
   1. Who: author
   2. What: “deal”
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: author language
   2. Functional theory categories
      1. Attack
         1. Quotes: “…Iran said it could not accept any agreement that does not recognize enrichment rights …”
   3. Values
      1. Justice
         1. Rationale: no deal without recognition of right to enrich [fairness]
            appeal to authority (Iranian Deputy Foreign Minister Abbas Araghchi)

61. Decontextualization: sixty-first sentence
   1. Who: Araghchi
   2. What: “agreement”
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: public statement
   2. Functional theory categories
      1. Attack
         1. Quotes: “Any agreement without recognizing Iran’s right to enrich, practically and verbally, will be unacceptable for Tehran,”
   3. Values
      1. Justice
         1. Rationale: no deal with right recognition [fairness]
62. Decontextualization: sixty-second sentence
   1. Who: author
   2. What: “legal right”
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: author language
   2. Functional theory categories
      1. Attack
         1. Quotes: “Western officials balked at recognizing a legal right to uranium enrichment…”
   3. Values
      1. Justice
         1. Rationale: “…hoping instead to craft language that acknowledges the right of all countries to pursue nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.” Appeal to authorities [fairness]

63. Decontextualization: sixty-third sentence
   1. Who: author
   2. What: “endorse”
   3. To whom: same
   4. How: author language
   2. Functional theory categories
      1. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “Zarif appeared to endorse that approach publicly this month.”
   3. Values
      1. Justice
         1. Appeal to authority, endorsement [fairness]

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Kerry”
   iii. To whom: readers of the Washington Post, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “lobbies Netanyahu to give Iran deal a chance.”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom, trust

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama administration”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “set up a choice for Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu … allow the United States and other world powers some breathing room to achieve a satisfactory final deal with Iran, or he can dig in his heels against it”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Secretary of State John F. Kerry”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “lobbied Netanyahu … Netanyahu has called a dangerous blunder”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Kerry”
iii. To whom: Same  
iv. How: same  
b. FTC  
i. Defense  
1. Quotes: “delicate task of swaying the Israeli public … likely without meeting Israel's demand”  
c. Values  
i. Prudence  
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom  

4. D  
i. Who: same  
ii. What: same  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: same  
b. FTC  
i. Defense  
1. Quotes: “assured Israel”  
c. Values  
i. Justice  
1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust  

5. D  
i. Who: “Kerry”  
ii. What: “fundamental sanctions regime”  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: public statement  
b. FTC  
i. Defense  
1. Quotes: “remains absolutely in place … stepping up our effort of enforcement”  
c. Values  
i. Justice  
1. Rationale: Appeal to fairness, trust  

6. D  
i. Who: author  
ii. What: “Kerry”  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: author language  
b. FTC  
i. Defense  
1. Quotes: “wants Netanyahu to back off … give the United States and five other world powers time”  
c. Values  
i. Justice
1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Defense
         1. Quotes: “insists that its program is for peaceful purposes and that it neither wants nor needs nuclear weapons, which the country’s supreme leader has declared are prohibited by Islam”
   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

8. D
   i. Who: “a State Department official”
   ii. What: “Israelis”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “had supported an effort to have a comprehensive agreement”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “United States”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “wants Netanyahu to signal to pro-Israel lawmakers in Congress that he is willing to give talks a chance”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: [Netanyahu to signal to pro-Israel lawmakers in Congress that he is willing to give talks a chance]
    iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “may be unrealistic”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Netanyahu”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “does not have control”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Kerry and other U.S. officials”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “made direct appeals to Congress”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “signed a six-month agreement to begin curtailing its disputed program in exchange for limited relief”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

14. D
   i. Who: same
ii. What: “Kerry”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “pushed Netanyahu and Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Abbas deserves credit”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “claimed "some progress””

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to prudence

17. D
   i. Who: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “tasked by the Obama administration with sketching possible security arrangements for Israel”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Netanyahu”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “has come under criticism”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Former prime minister Ehud Olmert”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Netanyahu "lost his head" by "declaring war on the United States."”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Olmert”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “accused Netanyahu of antagonizing the White House and trying to do an end run around the Obama administration”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

21. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Israeli military and intelligence establishment”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
1. Quotes: “appears to be of two minds these days - warning of dangers in allowing Iran to continue its nuclear program while also urging Israel's leaders to work effectively to strengthen the final deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: Appeal to wisdom

22. D

   i. Who: “Amos Yadlin, director of the Institute for National Security Studies”
   ii. What: “initial agreement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “not a final one. The fact that Iran is on the threshold of nuclear capabilities is not the result of this agreement, but because the Iranians were hard at work on these capabilities for many years and no one has been able to stop them”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

23. D

   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Netanyahu”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “continued to criticize the Iran deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

24. D

   i. Who: “Netanyahu”
   ii. What: “easy”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “easy to be silent … easy to receive a pat on the shoulder from the international community, to bow one's head, but I am committed to the security of my people”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

25. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Israel”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “warning that Israel would act alone, if necessary”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

26. D
   i. Who: “Efraim Inbar, director of the Begin-Sadat Center for Strategic Studies at Bar Ilan University”
   ii. What: “Netanyahu”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “made quite clear what he thinks” about the deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

27. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Kerry”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “will try to convince him it's only temporary and there is a possibility to change the final agreement.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

28. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Netanyahu”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “don't think Netanyahu will buy that”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

29. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “monthly poll”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “77 percent of Israelis do not think the agreement will lead to the end of what Israel suspects is an Iranian nuclear weapons program”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

30. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “response to a question on who is Israel's greatest ally”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “71 percent said they think the United States is Israel's most loyal and important ally”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: readers of the Washington Post, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “defends Iran deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “defended it as the best option”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: “Obama”
   ii. What: “We”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “have to be vigilant about maintaining our security postures, not be naive about the dangers that an Iranian regime poses, fight them wherever they're engaging in terrorism or actions that are hostile to us or our allies”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “have to not constantly assume that it's not possible for Iran, like any country, to change over time … we have to try”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “described the recent deal with Iran - which the administration says halts development of Iran's nuclear program in exchange for modest relief from sanctions - as a necessary test to see whether a more comprehensive agreement could be secured”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [Obama]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “doubts about the regime's credibility augurs for a more realistic approach”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
   i. Who: “Obama”
   ii. What: “we”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “have to be more realistic”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: author
ii. What: “international community”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “will have an even-greater ability to put new pressure on Iran”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

8. D
i. Who: “Obama”
ii. What: “we”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “we're no worse off, and in fact we have greater leverage with the international community to continue to apply sanctions and even strengthen them”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “sanctions themselves “
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “would have led Iran to abandon its nuclear program.”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
i. Who: “Obama”
ii. What: “choice”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “not the choice between this deal and the ideal, but the choice between this deal and other alternatives”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
11. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Secretary of State John Kerry”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “more optimistic about the chances for a lasting deal with Iran that makes Israel safer”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Kerry”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “tried to sell the deal”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “criticism from Netanyahu and many pro-Israel lawmakers”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “that the United States is being duped, Kerry stressed that Iran's compliance will be tested and monitored at every step”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
14. D
   i. Who: “Kerry”
   ii. What: [deal]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement
b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “not about trust”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
15. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Lasting peace with the Palestinians”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “will make Israel safer … efforts toward a peace deal are
            focused on Israel's specific security needs”
   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Israeli prime minister”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Defense
         1. Quotes: “could sell a peace deal at home if it did not contain
            carefully considered measures to defend Israel against new threats”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Kerry”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “returned Friday night from his eighth trip to Israel in 10
            months as the top U.S. diplomat”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom, hard work

18. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “This visit”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “centered on the presentation of secret proposals for
            security measures in the West Bank's Jordan Valley that were
            developed by retired Marine Gen. John Allen”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [retired Marine Gen. John Allen’ work]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “marks the most extensive U.S. study of Israeli security needs”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Israel”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “holds military control of the territory”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

21. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Many Israelis”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “fear that withdrawal would expose Israel to terrorist rockets and other potential threats”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “unthinkable”
   iii. To whom: readers of the Washington Post, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “unthinkable now in motion”

   c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “big turn in foreign policy is possible”

   c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: Obama wise

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “People”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “can debate whether it's the equivalent of the opening to China or the end of the Cold War, but there's no doubt that this is a time of opportunity”

   c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “what was unthinkable”
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “now appears to be in motion”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Obama”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “talked directly with President Hassan Rouhani about quickly negotiating a deal to limit the Iranian nuclear program”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “United States and Russia”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “agreed on a U.N. plan to destroy President Bashar al-Assad's stockpile of chemical weapons”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “some observers”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “see signs of American weakness or even capitulation”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
i. Who: author
   ii. What: [some observers]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Defense
      1. Quotes: “They’re mistaken.”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “United States”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “stronger if it can create a new framework for security in the Middle East that involves Iran and defuses the Sunni-Shiite sectarian conflict threatening the region”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “change”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “frightens people, especially when it's being pushed by a president who is perceived as weak at home and abroad”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “tactical finesse”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “matters in big strategic moments like this”
Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “lesson”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “the way President Richard Nixon (with Henry Kissinger) shaped the opening to China … and Presidents Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush (with Brent Scowcroft and James Baker) managed the end of the Cold War”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
   i. Who: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “They made it look easy”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
   i. Who: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “did well was manage communications … regular dialogue with the Soviet Union …”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “endgame”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “required frequent contact with U.S. allies”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “U.S. diplomats”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “on airplanes nearly every week to reassure allies”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to faith

16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “will need a deal that verifies Iranian supreme leader Ali
      Khamenei's pledge not to build a bomb - and prevents any quick
      breakout capability”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: wise stipulations

17. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “Iran will have to”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: wise stipulations
18. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “numbers”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “must be low enough that Iran would need months to dash for a bomb - long enough that the United States and Israel would have strategic warning”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: wise stipulation

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “West”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “accept Iran's right, in principle, to enrich.”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “elements of a workable Iran deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “obvious to all”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: apple polishing

21. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “crucial”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “the United States communicate frequently”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

22. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “invite regional leaders”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

23. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Regional coordination”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “may be even more important with Syria”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

24. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Saudis and Qataris”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “pumping money into a Syrian opposition that's dominated by jihadists”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

25. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [situation]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “like filling a balloon with poison: Foreign fighters are rushing to Syria to join the well-financed jihad … truly dangerous”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

26. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “path toward a more stable Syria”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “passes through Geneva, with the negotiations”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

27. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “all parties (including Iran)”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “Syrian nightmare could begin to end”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

28. d
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “moderate Syrian opposition”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “could help maintain state institutions”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

29. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “A U.S. official”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “needs to coordinate … and drive it toward Geneva”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
30. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “delicate process”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “to Saudi Arabia and Qatar and their checkbook jihad
         would be nuts”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
31. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama and Secretary of State John Kerry”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “must communicate … Iran must temper its revolutionary
         dreams … Saudi Arabia must stop hyperventilating about the
         "Shiite crescent."”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
32. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “What's around the corner”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “a new regional framework that accommodates the
         security needs”
c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

33. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “great strategic opportunity”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will require constant, skillful diplomatic guidance”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
Title: Final Iran deal needs to balance out the concessions

I. Decontextualization: title
   1. Who: authors (editorial board)
   2. What: “Deal”
   3. To whom: Washington Post Readers and internet searchers
   4. How: author language
   1. Functional theory categories
      a. Attack
         i. Quotes: title references need to balance deal better
   2. Values
      a. Justice
         i. Rationale: suggests that deal is unfair

1. Decontextualization: sentence one
   i. Who: authors
   ii. What: “fact sheet”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: authors’ language
   b. Functional theory categories
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “notable for its omissions.”
   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Suggests Obama is misleading

2. Decontextualization: sentence two
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “2,000 word document”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
   b. Functional theory categories
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “2,000 word document”, suggests stress on only positives
   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: builds on last sentence, wordy yet omits potential negatives

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “war with Iran”
   iii. To whom: readers of the Washington Post, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “pre-authorizing”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Eric Edelman, Dennis Ross and Ray Takeyh”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “outlined a series of steps to secure congressional support for a possible deal with Iran regarding its nuclear program”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “authors”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “asserted that "any deal is likely to be far more credible on the Hill if the administration has a clear plan to deal with cheating" and proposed that such a plan could "include congressional authorization for the use of force to respond to violations of the agreement."
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
      ii. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

3. D
   i. Who: same
ii. What: “notion of Congress pre-authorizing the use of force to respond to violations of an agreement with Iran - in effect, giving this or any future president a green light to use force against Iran”

iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would and should be met with severe skepticism by representatives intent on preserving congressional prerogatives and not writing the White House another blank check”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “one would expect that President Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would see the irony of any such plan”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “many ways consistent with our Constitution”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “that the administration and Congress can show resolve to Iran”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Pre-authorization”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
1. Quotes: “not a plan that an elected U.S. politician in any branch of government could or should embrace”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: readers of the Washington Post, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “common cause”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Arab proverb”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “advises, "A problem is solved when it gets tougher”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “advance in Iraq and Syria of the Islamic State”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “poses a threat to the United States while clarifying choices for U.S. policymakers”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “question confronting the United States and Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “no longer whether to work together but how to do so”
c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “communications between the two countries”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “can be greatly facilitated by reaching a comprehensive nuclear agreement in talks”
c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Failure”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “would leave only bad options”
c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “If the Islamic State is to be contained”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “United States and other nations will have to reconsider past policies and manage enmities”
c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “For Iran, the breakup of Iraq and the creation of a radical Islamist Sunni state next door”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “catastrophic”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to safety

8. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Iranian leaders”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “must decide whether to join Iraqi Shiites in a bloody sectarian war or, along with the use of force, work with others to build a federalized Iraq in which ethnic groups share in the responsibilities and benefits of statehood”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “after years of clandestinely supporting radical Sunni Islamists throughout the Middle East, the Persian Gulf monarchies”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “face a choice between denouncing the Islamic State, which poses a significant threat to them as well, or continuing to emphasize the sectarian struggle with the Shiites”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “the choice for Bashar Assad's government”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “either to turn its military power against the Islamic State or to continue to kill fellow Syrians”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “for the West to support a war against Assad as well as a war against the Islamic State”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “makes no sense … Assad is evil, but in this case he is certainly the lesser evil”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Turkish leadership”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “decided already to support Kurdish military action against the Islamic State, choosing to risk enabling more independence for the Kurds given that the alternative is a radical Islamist regime on its border”

c. Values
   i. prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Israel”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “must see that this violent Islamist turbulence requires it to reconsider which foreign power represents its most serious threat”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran and the United States”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “share interests in Iraq and Afghanistan … Iran’s intelligence network, religious identity, political influence, history and geography give it a pre-eminent role in both countries. At the same time, U.S. air power, special forces, military advisers, recent history and a commitment not to waste the lives and money the United States invested in both places likewise assure that it has a major part to play. While some direct, low-key talks on Iraq have already taken place, the nuclear negotiations must be resolved before the United States and Iran will agree to have regular talks on the issue. Any such discussions must also be sensitive to the reactions of Sunnis, particularly those in Iraq who loathe Iran.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Both sides”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “clearly committed to making a maximum effort to get a nuclear agreement by July 20, and a good accord is within reach”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Despite the expectations of many observers, remarkable headway”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. defense
      1. Quotes: “has been made … Iran has already met most of the demands of the six nations involved in the talks, and the sides are working to establish a practical time frame for Iran to comply with limits on its nuclear program under extraordinary monitoring and safeguards. The negotiations have been more civil than anyone imagined a year ago.”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope
   ii. justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

17. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “important - perhaps deal-breaking - details regarding the ultimate size and scope of Iran's peaceful nuclear program”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “remain unresolved”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. rationale: appeal to hope

18. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “A breakdown of the talks”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “still a possibility - would revive the specter of military conflict and result in the collapse of the worldwide alliance that helped bring Iran to the table. It would make bilateral communications impossible, with both sides blaming the other. As the U.S.-built coalition crumbled, Iran might succeed in establishing its own trade and political relationships with Russia, China and Western Europe … undermine the hopes for Iranian President Hassan Rouhani's government and could lead to the removal from office of those Iranian leaders who have sought to put the confrontational Ahmadinejad era behind them”

c. Values
i. Fortitude
   1. Rationale: appeal to hope

ii. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “A new strategic relationship between the United States and Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “may seem impossible and risky, yet it is also necessary and in the interests of both … mutually informed parallel action is essential”
   ii. Attack
      1. Quotes: “an alliance is out of the question”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Arab proverb”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “At the narrow passage there is no brother or friend. Indeed, as we enter a new era of Middle East conflict, the path is narrow and fraught, and the United States will have to work with many strange bedfellows.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

21. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “with the right nuclear agreement and pragmatic strategic decisions by Tehran and Washington”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “there is a way forward”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
ii. Fortitude
    1. Rationale: appeal to hope

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iran and Western nations”
   iii. To whom: readers of the Washington Post, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “open final round of nuclear talks”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope
1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “day in Tehran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “sunny … soothing piano music … Persian mosaics, past a burbling fountain and into a courtyard … unique opportunity to make history”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope
2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iranian Foreign Minister Mohammad Javad Zarif's four-minute video”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “signaled his government's intention to claim credit if negotiations over its nuclear program have succeeded when they reach their scheduled end July 20, or to direct blame elsewhere if they have failed”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Secretary of State John F. Kerry”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “already made a similar case for the international coalition on the other side”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4.  D
i. Who: “Kerry”
ii. What: “The United States and our partners”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “demonstrated to Iran how serious we are … Iran must choose”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5.  D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “final round”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “expected to continue for the next three weeks without pause”

c. Values
i. Temperance
   1. Rationale: appeal to patience

6.  D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “U.S. officials and nuclear experts”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “specifics remain secret … expressed little optimism about a deal … remain far apart on key elements”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7.  D
i. Who: “George Perkovich, a nonproliferation expert and vice president for studies at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace”

ii. What: “From the U.S. perspective, the key thing”

iii. To whom: same

iv. How: interview

b. FTC

i. Acclaim

1. Quotes: “this isn't a negotiation among parties with equal standing, trying to find a middle ground. This is more about compliance, so there are some absolute minimal conditions that aren't negotiable”

ii. Values

1. Justice

1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

2. Prudence

1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D

i. Who: same

ii. What: “To the Iranians”

iii. To whom: same

iv. How: same

b. FTC

i. Acclaim

1. Quotes: “more a negotiation between equals”

ii. Values

1. Justice

1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

2. Prudence

1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D

i. Who: author

ii. What: “Burns's presence, along with that of Jake Sullivan, national security adviser to Vice President Biden”

iii. To whom: same

iv. How: author language

b. FTC

i. Acclaim

1. Quotes: “designed to convey U.S. seriousness of purpose … participated in secret talks with Iran early last year that led to the current negotiations, and they are seen as trusted by Tehran”

ii. Values

1. Prudence

1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. Fortitude

1. Rationale: appeal to trust

10. D

i. Who: same
ii. What: “Expectations”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “ran high after an interim agreement was signed in November … froze Iran's nuclear expansion - which the West says is designed to build a weapon and Iran says is for peaceful energy purposes - and eased harsh international economic sanctions … set a six-month timeline for a permanent, comprehensive agreement”

c. Values
i. Fortitude
   1. Rationale: appeal to hope
ii. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety, trust

11. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “interim accord”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “hard for the administration to convince a skeptical Congress without agreement by Iran on at least one of the most substantive issues”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Senate majority”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: Same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “signed on to new legislation to ready new, harsher economic sanctions for Iran if the deadline is missed”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

13. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “President Obama”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
1. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “dissuaded supporters of the measure by promising that he would introduce such legislation himself if it was clear Iran was not negotiating seriously”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to faith

14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Israel”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “likely to push for using force to destroy Iran's nuclear facilities if progress is not made”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Among the thorniest issues”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “number of centrifuges Iran is allowed to retain … how much enriched uranium it is allowed to produce and to what level of enrichment”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Many in Congress and in Israel”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “argued that the Iranians should be allowed no uranium enrichment capability”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

17. d
   i. Who: same
ii. what: “The United States and its partners”
iii. to whom: same
iv. how: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “indicated a willingness to agree to a 4,000-centrifuge ceiling with a cap of 3 to 5 percent enrichment, for research and development purposes … argued that Iran has no need to produce large quantities of enriched uranium to operate its Russian-supplied power reactor”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

18. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Russians”
   iii. To whom: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “obligated under the reactor contract to provide fuel until 2021”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “feels it has a moral and domestic political imperative to have more”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

20. D
   i. Who: “one nuclear expert”
   ii. What: “our people”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “will never accept dismantling things and curtailing [enrichment], because we've paid such a price through all the
sanctions … through the still-unsolved assassinations of Iranian nuclear scientists - killings that are generally blamed on Israel”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

21. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “second item of contention”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “the Arak heavy-water reactor, capable of producing plutonium that can be used to make nuclear weapons, as can a sufficient quantity of very highly enriched uranium”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

22. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “U.S. position”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “the reactor must close, or at least be redesigned to produce substantially less plutonium, which the Iranians have argued they need for medical and research purposes”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety, fairness

23. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “timing and phases of restrictions”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “are other issues, as are the insistence by the United States and others that inspections must be extended to military as well as civilian sites”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety

24. D
   i. Who: “nuclear expert”
ii. What: “inspections issue”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: interview

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “a real problem … How do you reassure them you would only call for inspections” when there were real indications of prohibited activity, "and you wouldn't abuse or use it for intelligence purposes, when in fact we do all those things? And they know it”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

25. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “Zarif”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “blamed the West for Iran's expanding nuclear program, saying that "crippling" sanctions and "the murder of our nuclear scientists" had compelled them to increase their production of enriched uranium … compelled to warn again that pursuing a game of chicken in an attempt to extract last-minute concessions cannot achieve anything better … Try mutual respect … It works”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. rationale: appeal to fairness
ii. Prudence
   1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iran deal”
   iii. To whom: readers of the Washington Post, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “bringing in congress”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Arms control”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “often been a bone of contention between the White House and Congress”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Presidents and their diplomats”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “prefer to reach agreements in secret and then shield the accord from congressional scrutiny, much less consent”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “tempting for the Obama administration”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “to follow this script as it negotiates with Iran”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [bypassing congress]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “that would be a mistake”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “seeking congressional endorsement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “essential lest any agreement rest on a shaky foundation and be difficult to implement”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Two of President Obama's predecessors”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “offer a path worthy of emulation”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Harry Truman”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “did much to anchor the institutions of the Cold War in a durable domestic consensus”
C. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Richard Nixon”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “created the modern arms-control architecture and managed to persuade both parties on the importance of nuclear restraint”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Truman”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “appreciated that, for the United States to awaken fully from its isolationist torpor, he had to bring along a Republican Party skeptical of international engagement … cultivated influential Republican lawmakers such as Sen. Arthur Vandenberg (Mich.) and paid close attention to their advice and suggestions … John Foster Dulles was included in the Truman administration’s inner circle on issues such as the peace treaty with Japan and the establishment of NATO. As a result of these efforts, key initiatives such as the creation of the United Nations and the Marshall Plan enjoyed widespread support from across the aisle - even though bipartisan support could not be assumed at that time”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “for the Republican Party”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “membership in global organizations and offering aid to foreign countries had once been anathema”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “the Obama administration's Iran policy”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “rests on no such national consensus”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “president”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “can do much to alter this reality by offering detailed briefings on the Hill and even including Republican staffers in U.S. delegations to the P5+1 talks”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Nixon is remembered today mostly for the opening to China and ending the Vietnam War”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “he did much to temper the nuclear arms race at the height of the Cold War”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Nixon”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “could have sought to protect his signature achievement, SALT I, from congressional scrutiny by claiming presidential authority … SALT I was an executive agreement, and if he wanted to, Nixon could have made a murky case for not seeking Congress's sanction … He thought better of it and submitted the agreement for approval.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [not bypassing congress]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “meant negotiating with the formidable Sen. Henry "Scoop" Jackson (D-Wash.)”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to courage

16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “process”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “may have been tortuous, but the result was a public law that enshrined the agreement in statute”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “One point that may enhance the Obama administration's ability to bring Congress along”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “to offer an explanation about the consequence of cheating by Iran if there is an agreement … likely to be far more credible on
the Hill if the administration has a clear plan to deal with cheating … could go beyond the imposition of harsh sanctions and include congressional authorization for the use of force to respond to violations of the agreement. In this way, the administration would demonstrate resolve while also having Congress show its support for use of force - a message that the Iranians would be unlikely to miss”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust, safety

18. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Congress”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “must bear a burden of a measure of responsibility and appreciate that it cannot just criticize”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Constitution”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “privileges the president in the realm of foreign affairs”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Congress”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “not without prerogatives of its own”

c. Values
21. **D**
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Congress”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. **FTC**
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “embraced an assertive role when it came to proliferation”
   c. **Values**
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

22. **D**
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “proponents of such legislative activism”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. **FTC**
      i. Acclaim
   c. **Values**
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

23. **D**
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “looming shadow of an Iranian bomb”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. **FTC**
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “no less important”
   c. **Values**
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

24. **D**
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Congress”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. **FTC**
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “needs to press its claims on this issue with no less force”
   c. **Values**
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
25. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Washington”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “needs to develop a bipartisan consensus about parameters of an acceptable agreement”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

26. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “without the two branches of government and the two political parties working together”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “No such consensus can come about”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

27. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: [consensus]
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will require the White House to take into account Congress's perspective and heed its warnings”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

28. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “failure to do so”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “could mean that any agreement negotiated by Obama will not survive his presidency”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Kerry”
   iii. To whom: readers of the Washington Post, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “commits to current sanctions”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to faith
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “United States”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will continue to enforce existing sanctions on Iran while bargaining over a deal to rein in Iran's disputed nuclear program”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “top U.S. and Iranian diplomats”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “held a rare face-to-face meeting”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
ii. What: “private meeting”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “furthers a tentative warming between the two nations”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
ii. Fortitude
   1. Rationale: appeal to hope

4. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Kerry’s discussion with Iranian Foreign Minister Mohammad Javad Zarif”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “first since the United States and Iran struck a temporary agreement that caps the most worrisome elements of Iran's nuclear program in exchange for limited easing of global financial restrictions on Iran's oil business … also met in September at the United Nations to begin talks that Iran has sought as a way to end crushing economic sanctions”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
ii. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety
iii. Fortitude
   1. Rationale: appeal to hope

5. D
i. Who: “a senior State Department official”
ii. What: “Secretary Kerry”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: interview

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “reiterated the importance of both sides negotiating in good faith and Iran abiding by its commitments”

c. Values
i. Justice
1. Rationale: appeal to trust, fairness

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “United States”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will continue to enforce existing sanctions”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

7. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “official”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “to describe the closed-door meeting on the sidelines of an international security conference”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “meeting”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “lasted slightly longer than an hour”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “nuclear negotiations with Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “politically sensitive at home, where many in Congress oppose the Obama administration's strategy of limited easing of sanctions imposed in protest of a secretive nuclear program that Iran says has no military purpose”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust, fairness, safety

d. Who: same
   ii. What: “Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      ii. Quotes: “also opposed the interim, six-month deal as a giveaway to Iran”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

d. Who: same
   ii. What: “United States and Israel”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “called the one-on-one meeting "incredibly important" to build confidence for the larger negotiations”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
1. Rationale: appeal to faith

13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “goal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “comprehensive agreement that ends a 10-year diplomatic impasse and ensures that Iran cannot quickly redirect its advanced nuclear development work to build a bomb”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust

14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “negotiations”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will be difficult”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Kerry and Zarif”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “portrayed the interim deal reached in November very differently for their respective publics”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Kerry”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “stresses that the deal forces Iran to stop uranium enrichment work considered the most likely to lead to a bomb and degrade its existing stocks of the most potent uranium”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

17. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Zarif”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “stresses the economic benefit to Iran and what he calls a recognition of Iran's right to a continued homegrown uranium enrichment program”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

18. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “not prepared to give up research on centrifuges used to purify uranium as part of a final nuclear deal”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

19. D
   i. Who: “Zarif”
   ii. What: [Iran]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “it is in our interests and we have no other intention”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

ii. Fortitude
   1. Rationale: appeal to trust

20. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “Mehdi Karroubi, the 76-year-old former speaker of Iran's parliament”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “released from custody”

c. Values
i. Fortitude
   1. Rationale: appeal to hope

21. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “move”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “first sign that Karroubi and former prime minister Mir Hossein Mousavi may be exonerated for leading the 2009 "Green Movement."”

c. Values
i. Fortitude
   1. Rationale: appeal to hope

22. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Both men”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. attack
   1. Quotes: “accused of inciting massive street protests after the disputed reelection of President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad in 2009”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

23. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Since the election of Rouhani as Iran's president in June”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “growing calls from reformists for the release of Mousavi and Karroubi”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

24. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Karroubi”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “held under arrest in a heavily guarded state-controlled residence … fate is still unclear”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

25. D
i. Who: “Hossein Karroubi”
ii. What: “groundwork for this transfer”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “done 10 days ago, and now he is living on the second floor and the security team are in a separate suite on the first floor. The security situation has not changed, just the location”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “U.S., Iranian negotiators”
   iii. To whom: readers of the Washington Post, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. acclaim
      1. quotes: “fail to break impasse; nuclear deal looks unlikely”

c. values
   i. prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. d: sentence one
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “Iranian and American negotiators”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. quotes: “far apart on crucial issues and digging in their heels”

c. values
   i. prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “sense of pessimism”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “hangs over landmark negotiations that are among the Obama administration's highest priorities”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “unusually high-level U.S. delegation”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “met with Iranian negotiators this week in Switzerland, hoping to break an impasse over Iranian nuclear capability that makes a deal look unlikely”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iranian Foreign Minister Mohammad Javad Zarif”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “used his English-language Twitter feed Wednesday to warn that the talks were deadlocked over restrictions that international negotiators want to apply to Iran's centrifuges”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “The more sophisticated centrifuges left in Iran's control -- and the fewer curbs placed to make them difficult to misuse”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “the quicker Iran could convert its nuclear energy program into one that produces enough highly enriched uranium for a weapon”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Zarif”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “tweeted a link to an Iranian report that estimates Iran would need 36 months to amass enough material for a nuclear weapon”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Secretary of State John F. Kerry”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “has said Iran might be able to do that in as little as two months”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “The seven-nation consortium negotiating over the boundaries of Iran's nuclear program”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “meets again next week, for the first time since talks that had been described as productive and swift-moving hit a wall”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
9. D
   i. Who: “State Department spokeswoman Jen Psaki”
   ii. What: “focus”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “on the core issues being negotiated behind the scenes. All the issues are on the table”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
10. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: [negotiators]
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “never said this would be easy. We continue to believe that.”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “centrifuge machinery used to enrich uranium”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “always at the crux of the dispute over whether Iran's nuclear program was truly peaceful, as Iran claims”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “negotiators”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “not confronted with the stark question of how many machines Iran would retain and in what condition”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “seeking a reduction in sanctions that have stunted its oil-based economy. But the government does not want to destroy or disable centrifuges and insists that any deal leaves it with the ability to continue to enrich uranium and develop plans for nuclear power reactors”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “International negotiators, and in particular the United States and France”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “want fewer centrifuges and verifiable ways to ensure those left in Iran cannot be quickly converted to weapons use”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety, trust

15. D
   i. Who: “French Foreign Minister Laurent Fabius”
   ii. What: [negotiators]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “still hitting a wall on one absolutely fundamental point, which is the number of centrifuges which allow enrichment … "We say that there can be a few hundred centrifuges, but the Iranians want thousands. We're not in the same framework.””
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

16. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iranian President Hassan Rouhani”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “saying his country would do its best to reach a permanent deal”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

17. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “goal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “a pact that would set boundaries for Iran's nuclear program and mandate inspections and disclosures about nuclear
development work that has long made Western nations and Israel deeply suspicious”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

18. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would win a loosening and eventual lifting of economic sanctions on its oil exports and other areas of the economy. Those international sanctions were applied over several years with heavy pressure by the United States”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Critics in Congress and Israel of the Obama administration's diplomatic outreach to Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “claim it is a gambit that risks removing the effective lever of sanctions with no guarantee that Iran cannot still develop a weapon”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran and the six powers”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “reached a breakthrough last year, drafting a temporary deal that eased sanctions while expanding international scrutiny of the Iranian program. Talks to resolve a permanent deal could be extended past July if all sides agree”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

21. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “goal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “to reach a deal next month, but many outside analysts have predicted that the deadline will slip

22. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iranian diplomats”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “in a round of meetings with some of the six individual nations in the international bargaining body … met with French officials Wednesday, one day after the rare direct talks with U.S. officials … plans meetings in the coming days with Russian and German envoys”

23. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “American delegation”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “included some of the senior figures who conducted secret talks with Iran last year that preceded the breakthrough … two-day session, announced unexpectedly, suggested to many that the talks were in serious trouble”

24. D
   i. Who: same
ii. What: “both sides”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “appeared sobered by the difficult discussion at the last
         group session, in May … unable to begin drafting a final
         document, as had been hoped”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

25. D
   i. Who: “Kelsey Davenport, an Arms Control Association analyst”
   ii. What: [negotiators]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “very serious … under a lot of pressure, including
         domestic political pressure, to complete a deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “U.S. and Iran”
   iii. To whom: readers of the Washington Post, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “made little progress on key issues”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “a historic phone conversation between President Obama and Iranian President Hassan Rouhani”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “electrified the foreign policy and diplomatic universe”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Rouhani”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “publicly committed to improving relations with the United States”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “agreed to direct negotiating teams to seek a deal on Iran's nuclear program”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “the two nations”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “have not closed a nuclear deal”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “the rise of the Islamic State”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “opposed by both the United States and Iran”
   ii. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “raised awkward questions about how two countries estranged for 35 years might unite against a common foe”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. d
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “This year's General Assembly”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “presents yet another opportunity for the United States and Iran to test each other's willingness to engage on a host of issues”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama and Rouhani”
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “will circle each other once again with no plans to meet --
         a metaphor, perhaps, for the eddy and stall of what seemed a year
         ago to be bright prospects for change”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Talks on Iran's nuclear program”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “have been at an impasse for months over what American
         and other Western officials call Iranian intransigence”

c. Values
   i. prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Secretary of State John F. Kerry”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “emerged from talks Sunday with Iranian Foreign Minister
         Mohammad Javad Zarif to say that the United States will keep
         working on the deal to roll back Iran's nuclear program in
         exchange for the lifting of international sanctions on Tehran”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

10. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “Iran”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “has expressed its own frustrations with the American
         approach to the talks”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “United States”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “‘obsessed’ with sanctions”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
   i. Who: Zarif
   ii. What: “Sanctions”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “become an end in themselves … do not serve any purpose”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “spread of the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “might otherwise be an opportunity for cooperation between the United States and Iran”
   ii. Attack
      1. Quotes: “instead made both nations nervous about how to maneuver around one another”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “United States”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “ensured that Iran was excluded from an international conference on strategies to counter the militants last week”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iranian diplomats”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “said that the United States and other nations are only cleaning up a mess of their own making in Iraq”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Kerry”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “invited Iran to play a constructive role when he convened a U.N. Security Council meeting on the militants last week, but he avoided asking for any specific commitment to work side by side”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Some reports”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “indicated that the Iranian government is interested in working with the United States against the Islamic State in exchange for flexibility on its nuclear program”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Obama administration”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “would not entertain any effort by Iran to link the two issues”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
   i. Who: “White House press secretary Josh Earnest”
   ii. What: “United States”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “will not be in the position of trading aspects of Iran's nuclear program to secure commitments to take on ISIL”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

20. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “nuclear negotiations”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “entirely separate" from the new challenge”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

21. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “United States”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “will not coordinate military action or share intelligence on the militants with Iran”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
22. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Kerry and Zarif”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “expected to meet again this week, even if Obama and Rouhani do not”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

23. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “On the agenda”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “any number of issues that have complicated U.S.-Iranian relations lately, including the arrest of Washington Post reporter Jason Rezaian”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

24. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “troubled nuclear talks”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “likely to dominate the discussions”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

25. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “A senior State Department official”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “did not sound optimistic about the nuclear talks”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
1. Rationale: appeal to hope

26. D
   i. Who: [A senior State Department official]
   ii. What: [Kerry and Zarif]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “discussed both the progress that has been made and the work that still needs to be done”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

27. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Secretary Kerry”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “noted that this week is an opportunity to make additional progress and stressed that it is our intention to do so”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

28. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “another State Department official”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “was more direct”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

29. D
   i. Who: [another State Department official]
   ii. What: “status quo”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “not doable for any of us. It is not doable for either side”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

30. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “the official”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “spoke on the condition of anonymity because she was not authorized to discuss the status of the negotiations on the record”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

31. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “goal of the talks, from the Western perspective”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “greatly roll back the scope of a program seen as a potential cover for the development of nuclear weapons … left with a small uranium-enrichment capability that would allow the government to say that it did not give up what it calls a right to the same scientific technology other nations employ”
   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety, trust

32. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “insisted on keeping about three times as many uranium-enriching centrifuges as U.S. and other negotiators propose”
   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

33. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Diplomats”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “best outcome at this point may be a second extension of the deadline for a deal, which was supposed to be concluded by July, or a much smaller and temporary agreement than the comprehensive settlement envisioned a year ago”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

34. D
   i. Who: “Zarif”
   ii. What: “on both sides”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “mutual lack of confidence”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to faith

35. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iranian people and the Iranian government representing them”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “totally distrustful of the intentions of the United States … won't be surprised if you tell me that you don't trust our intentions. So, fine. We're even”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to faith

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: readers of the Washington Post, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will not stop uranium enrichment”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Negotiations over Iran's nuclear program”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “moving much too slowly”
   ii. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “country will not "surrender" on the key sticking point of uranium enrichment”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Talks between Iran and world powers”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “stalled over the question of what limitations Iran will accept on its uranium-enrichment program in exchange for the lifting of international sanctions”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Negotiators”
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: same  
b. FTC  
i. Attack  
1. Quotes: “met nearly daily over the past two weeks but apparently made no headway”  
c. Values  
i. Justice  
1. Rationale: appeal to fairness  

4. D  
i. Who: same  
ii. What: “deadline for a deal”  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: same  
b. FTC  
i. Acclaim  
1. Quotes: “extended”  
c. Values  
i. Fortitude  
1. Rationale: appeal to hope  

5. D  
i. Who: “Rouhani”  
ii. What: “remaining time for reaching an agreement”  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: public statement  
b. FTC  
i. Attack  
1. Quotes: “extremely short … progress that has been witnessed in the last two days has been extremely slow”  
ii. Acclaim  
1. Quotes: “must have a more-fast pace to move forward”  
c. Values  
i. Fortitude  
1. Rationale: appeal to hope  
ii. Prudence  
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom  

6. D  
i. Who: author  
ii. What: “Expectations”  
iii. To whom: same  
iv. How: author language  
b. FTC  
i. Acclaim  
1. Quotes: “had been high that foreign ministers of the six powers negotiating with Iran would join the talks on the sidelines of the United Nations General Assembly”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “French Foreign Minister Laurent Fabius”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “would not do so because "there are no significant advances at the moment."”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Rouhani”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “acknowledged division at the talks, saying that "not all our opinions match," and some political hard-liners in Iran are opposed to his efforts to pursue a deal”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “there is solid popular and high-level political support in Iran for the talks after more than a decade of impasse”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

10. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “The Iranian leader”
    iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “no plan for him to talk to President Obama, as he did by telephone during last year's U.N. gathering, or for the two presidents to meet”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Obama”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “would be open to such a meeting under the right circumstances”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “The two nations”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “estranged for 35 years”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Rouhani”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “a nuclear deal can be "a solid foundation for mutual trust-building" and improved relations”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
i. Who: “Rouhani”
ii. What: [negotiators]
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: public statement
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “must bring more effort to bear”
c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “Rouhani”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “would not give details of the chief sticking point, which is the scope of the uranium-enrichment program that Iran would retain.”
c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “United States and its partners”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “want deep cuts to Iran's estimated 10,000 centrifuges, the machines used to make nuclear fuel, leaving Iran with a small, face-saving program that could not be quickly redirected toward building a nuclear bomb”
c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

17. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Iran”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. defense
   1. Quotes: “insists that its nuclear program is entirely peaceful and aimed at energy production”
c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety, trust

18. D
   i. Who: “Rouhani”
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will never surrender its legal right to peaceful nuclear activities … Uranium enrichment will continue”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: readers of the Washington Post, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “holds out”

c. Values
   i. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patience

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “agreed to the offer the West put on the table in Vienna last month in negotiations over the country's nuclear activities … If he were simply motivated by economics, he certainly should have”

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran's fully accessible hard-currency reserves”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “are low …Tehran has received around $4.2 billion in cash relief from unfrozen hard-currency accounts … Another $2.8 billion is forthcoming … Billions more have been gained indirectly since the United States and Europe ceased escalating sanctions; one can see the effects through the halving of Iran's inflation rate, the stabilization of its exchange rate and an increase in gross national product. If the Iranians moved toward the West, tens of billions of dollars would likely start flowing into Iranian banks”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iranian regime”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “well aware that the European Union oil embargo was a
         rare act of consensus, brought on in part by the combative style of
         former president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Many European states”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “feel they have little at stake in the Middle East, and
         others, such as Germany, Italy and Great Britain, have had
         substantial trade with the Islamic Republic”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Nuclear concessions by Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “could easily lead rapidly to the lifting of the embargo”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Tehran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “might still have to navigate Washington's financial sanctions, an end to the embargo would probably mean that Europe would never again be a major player in sanctions - even if the mullahs were later caught cheating on a nuclear deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “President Hassan Rouhani”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “often stressed the need to use Europe against the United States; it's a good bet that a primary political objective for Tehran is to shatter Western unity on the nuclear issue”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Khamenei's obstinacy”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “puts that at risk”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “West”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Nor is the West even trying arduously to deny Tehran the capacity to build nuclear weapons … Negotiators have recognized the regime's "right" to uranium enrichment; they appear ready to accept several thousand operational centrifuges and Iran's "right" to advanced centrifuge research and development at the buried-in-the-mountain Fordow site. President Obama has also accepted the idea of a "sunset clause" on any agreement (Tehran has suggested three to seven years; Washington wants more than 10), which
means that eventually the regime could legally develop an industrial-size enrichment program, reducing its bomb breakout time to days and increasing the risk of uranium diversion to covert sites. The White House has also largely ignored concerns of the International Atomic Energy Agency about weaponization research, leaving those troublesome questions to separate talks between the IAEA and Tehran.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

10. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Questions about Iran's intercontinental ballistic missile program”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “being redefined … administration no longer seeks to stop the development of long-range missiles, just nuclear warheads, even though warhead production is nearly impossible to detect, especially without an intrusive inspections regime. And Obama appears content to keep inspections limited to known nuclear sites; Iran won't have to agree to give IAEA inspectors unchallenged access to any suspicious location. The White House also seems to have dropped the demand that the heavy-water facility at the Arak plant be converted to a light-water reactor, which produces hard-to-extract plutonium. The emphasis at Arak is now on frequent inspections and a reduction in reactor fuel”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “United States has”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “offered a very good deal … Khamenei hasn't bitten … possible that the cleric just expects to win more concessions from a U.S. president allergic to conflict in the Middle East. Much has been made of the salutary effect of sanctions on the regime's
embrace of diplomacy; too little has been made of Tehran's longtime strategy to get the West to accept its continuing nuclear progress. Diplomacy for the regime has always been a path to the bomb, and this is especially true for Rouhani, who believes he used diplomacy between 2003 and 2005 to protect his country's atomic quest from a war-mongering George W. Bush. Rouhani has surely told Khamenei that the more the West extends diplomacy, the more concessions it makes and, thus, the smoother Iran's transition to a nuclear-armed state.”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
ii. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “such diplomatic maneuvering”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “difficult for Khamenei … loathes America and doesn't appear to share Rouhani's fondness for using Europe against the United States. In his view, bowing to Westerners is a sin. The same is true for the Islamic Revolutionary Guards, who aren't clever but are powerful. Rouhani has a long-standing, friendly relationship with Khamenei, but he may not be able to persuade his boss to let Obama surrender with some face”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “No one”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “should be surprised if the supreme leader doesn't allow negotiations to drag on beyond November, the new deadline, even if the West offers more economic relief. If talks end, the White House could try to bolster its diplomacy with more sanctions and a congressional authorization to use military force.”

c. Values
i. prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “odds of such an approach working”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “aren’t good”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “White House's palpable fear of conventional conflict … West's track record of giving ground in talks”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Khamenei regularly mocks … proves in Khamenei's eyes the strategic wisdom of his nuclear aspirations”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “the line”
   iii. To whom: readers of the *Washington Post*, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “hold”
   c. Values
      i. Fortitude
         1. Rationale: appeal to strength, courage

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “DEADLINE for completing a nuclear agreement with Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “now less than eight weeks away”
   ii. Attack
      1. Quotes: “omens are not good”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “U.S. officials”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “hoped that an intensive week of negotiations at the United Nations last month would open the way to a deal”
   ii. Attack
      1. Quotes: “little headway was made”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

3. D
   i. Who: “a U.S. official”
   ii. What: “gaps”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “still serious”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

4. D
   i. Who: “Iranian President Hassan Rouhani”
   ii. What: “progress realized thus far”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “even blunter”
   ii. Attack
      1. Quotes: “not been significant”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “impasse”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “does not reflect a lack of initiative by the Obama administration”

   c. Values
      i. temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patience

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “U.S. negotiators”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “responded to Iranian intransigence on key issues with creative but sometimes disturbing counterproposals”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iranian Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “declared that the regime will not dismantle any of the 19,000 centrifuges it has constructed to enrich uranium”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

8. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “United States and its allies”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “floated a proposal to leave the centrifuges in place but take away the plumbing that connects them”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

9. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “If Iran has made similar efforts to bridge the gaps between the two sides”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “no report of them”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

10. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Tehran”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “appears to be sticking to its insistence on maintaining and eventually vastly expanding its nuclear infrastructure while offering only a temporary slowdown in uranium enrichment and "increased transparency."”

c. Values
i. Justice
1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [Iran]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “refusing to discuss its ballistic missile program and still isn't cooperating with international inspectors' probe into its past nuclear weapons design work”
   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama administration”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “has a history of responding to Iran's stonewalling by peeling away its own demands … gave up an attempt to impose a permanent ban on Iranian enrichment and seems to have dropped a requirement that an underground uranium enrichment plant be closed … contemplating scenarios under which Iran would not have to dismantle centrifuges that would be the center of any bomb-making effort”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “a nuclear deal including this concession”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “could still achieve the goal publicly set by Secretary of State John F. Kerry, which is to increase the time Iran would need to produce a bomb”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
   i. Who: same
ii. What: “by leaving the nuclear infrastructure intact,”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “it would cede Iran the option of racing to build a nuclear arsenal at a time of its choosing, while removing the sanctions that are pressing the regime”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “a concession already made by the United States and its allies - setting a date after which all restrictions on Iran's nuclear work would lapse”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “would create a time bomb for the Middle East”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Neighbors such as Saudi Arabia”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “would likely take such a date, whether it is five or 15 years away, as a deadline for creating their own capacity for building nuclear weapons”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: [Editorial Board]
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “supported negotiations with Iran, and the interim deal struck last year, as preferable to what had previously looked like a slide toward war”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “President Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “should resist the temptation to make further concessions in order to complete a long-term deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “should be offered, at best, an extension of the existing arrangement, with the current sanctions left in place - and threatened with tougher measures if it does not accept”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
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I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: readers of the Washington Post, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “new dealmaker”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “intriguing figure”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “gaining prominence in the Iranian government”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Ali Shamkhani”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “newly prominent official … head of Iran's national security council … played a key role last summer in the ouster of Nouri al-Maliki as Iraq’s prime minister … described Shamkhani as a rising political player”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: “Hossein Mousavian, a former Iranian official”
   ii. What: [Ali Shamkhani]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “person in the middle … with close links to both President Hassan Rouhani and Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei … can play an influential role in managing the crisis in the Arab world … because he is from an Arabic-speaking region of southern Iran”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “political balance in Tehran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “important as the nuclear talks come to a head”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iranian and U.S. officials”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “dickering with different formulas that would limit Iran's nuclear stockpile and centrifuges”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “United States”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “wants to sharply limit the enrichment program and thereby extend the time it would take Iran to "break out" and build a bomb”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Shamkhani's rise”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
  i. Acclaim
    1. Quotes: “noteworthy because he appears to bridge the radical and moderate camps at a time when opinion in Iran is divided about a nuclear deal”

c. Values
  i. Fortitude
    1. Rationale: appeal to hope

8. D
  i. Who: same
  ii. What: “Khamenei”
  iii. To whom: same
  iv. How: same

b. FTC
  i. Acclaim
    1. Quotes: “will have to bless any agreement made by Rouhani and Foreign Minister Mohammad Javad Zarif”

c. Values
  i. Prudence
    1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
  ii. Justice
    1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

9. D
  i. Who: “Karim Sadjadpour, a leading Iran expert at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace”
  ii. What: “Shamkhani”
  iii. To whom: same
  iv. How: interview

b. FTC
  i. Acclaim
    1. Quotes: “a former Revolutionary Guard [IRGC] commander who has the clout to challenge his former comrades … may be "an honest broker” between Rouhani and Khamenei”

c. Values
  i. Prudence
    1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
  ii. Justice
    1. Rationale: appeal to trust

10. D
  i. Who: “a U.S. official”
  ii. What: “Shamkhani”
  iii. To whom: same
  iv. How: interview

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “taken on a more prominent role in Iranian regional policy, especially in Iraq, which previously was the exclusive purview of the IRGC Quds Force commander, Qassem Suleimani … star continues to rise”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “that Shamkhani's new ascendancy means any diminution for Suleimani”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “cautions against assuming … who "remains firmly in charge of Quds Force activities" and whose "overall standing in Tehran does not seem to have tapered off."”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Shamkhani's role in Maliki's ouster”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “described by two Iraqi officials … visited Najaf in July to meet with Ayatollah Ali Sistani, the Shiite religious leader, and carried back his message that it was time for the polarizing Maliki to go … Iranians appeared to be holding out for Maliki or another pliant Iraqi politician, but they acceded in the eventual, U.S.-backed choice of Haider al-Abadi”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Shamkhani's regional stature”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “evident in September in a visit to Beirut, where he floated the idea of Iranian support for the Lebanese military”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “such aid”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “won't be accepted, but it's an interesting sign of how Iranian policy is working in parallel with that of the United States, which is the Lebanese army's main supplier of weapons”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Shamkhani”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “as defense minister under the moderate President Mohammad Khatami a decade ago; he then worked for Khamenei during the presidency of the fiery Mahmoud Ahmadinejad”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “U.S. and Iranian officials”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “holding back-channel talks to explore possible formulas for agreement … classic bargaining process”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran … United States”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “reportedly began by demanding 22,000 centrifuges”
   ii. acclaim
      1. Quotes: “insisted on a limit of 2,000”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

18. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “gap”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “narrowed considerably”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “United States”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “might compromise on the number of centrifuges if the Iranians agree to sharply cut their stockpile of enriched uranium … requirement for any deal is close monitoring of Iranian activities”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Mousavian, the former Iranian official”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “suggests that if the two sides can't agree by the deadline, they should ask the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna to limit Iran's capabilities at what the IAEA determines is its "practical need" for civilian power”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

21. D
   i. Who: “Mousavian”
   ii. What: “to decide”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “need a judge”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Kerry”
   iii. To whom: readers of the Washington Post, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “predicts Iran deal is imminent”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope
1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Secretary of State John Kerry”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “predicted yesterday that a deal to limit Iran's nuclear capacity could be reached in three or four months, or even sooner”
   ii. Defense
      1. Quotes: “defended the decision two weeks ago to extend nuclear negotiations with Iran”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “extension”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “came after the parties could not agree on a comprehensive pact in last-minute talks leading up to a Nov. 24 deadline”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
3. D
   i. Who: same
ii. What: “whether an agreement is feasible”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “it will become apparent, long before the new June 30 deadline”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
i. Who: “Kerry”
ii. What: [negotiators]
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “not looking at seven months … target is three, four months, and hopefully even sooner if that is possible”

c. Values
i. Fortitude
   1. Rationale: appeal to hope

5. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “Kerry’s hourlong speech at the forum - called "Stormy Seas: The United States and Israel in a Tumultuous Middle East"”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “preceded by a heavy dose of skepticism from Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, who spoke for 10 minutes on a video link from Jerusalem, which he called "the united capital of Israel."”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Netanyahu”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “suggested Israeli opposition to a deal with Iran was a factor in the negotiations' failure”
ii. Attack
   1. Quotes: “lobbied hard against a deal, personally calling every foreign minister from the countries negotiating with Iran, known as the P5+1, to outline his objections . . . words seemed to rebuke Kerry's efforts to find a compromise with Iran”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: “Netanyahu”
   ii. What: “deadline”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “fortunate . . . deal was not signed that would have left Iran as a threshold nuclear power. Though Israel isn't part of the P5+1, our voice and our concerns played a critical role in preventing a bad deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

8. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Netanyahu”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “seemed to signal his approval of a tactic urged by some members of Congress who want to add new U.S. sanctions on Iran, saying that painful economic measures would force Iran to abandon its nuclear ambitions”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Defense
   1. Quotes: “denies it wants to enrich uranium for anything but peaceful measures”
ii. Attack
   1. Quotes: “many critics do not believe those assurances”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust, safety

10. d
i. Who: “Netanyahu”
ii. What: [world]
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: public statement
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “must use the time available to increase the pressure on Iran to dismantle its nuclear capability”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
i. Who: author
   ii. What: “preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “center of President Obama's foreign policy”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
i. Who: [Kerry]
   ii. What: “best way to prevent Iran from having a nuclear weapon”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “through a verified, negotiated agreement”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Kerry”
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “spoke at the same forum last year, right after the signing of an interim agreement that allowed formal negotiations to begin … seemed to relish recalling the premonitions of critics who proclaimed that Iran was bound to cheat and that the administration was jeopardizing national security … argued, the world is a safer place. International inspectors have daily access to Iran's enrichment facilities. Its stockpile of highly enriched uranium has been diluted or converted. And a plutonium reactor is effectively frozen”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
   i. Who: “Kerry”
   ii. What: “why are we doing this”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “I believe, President Obama believes, the administration believes that it would be the height of irresponsibility, it would be against our own interests and those of our closest partners, to walk away from a table when and if a peaceful resolution might really be within reach”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “If negotiations succeed”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “the entire world - including Israel - will be safer for it”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iranian President”
   iii. To whom: readers of the Washington Post, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “Calls Sanctions Imposed by U.S. An 'Invasion’”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iranian President Hassan Rouhani”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “called Western sanctions an "invasion" Saturday after Washington imposed new penalties over the country's contested nuclear program”
   ii. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “promised that negotiations with world powers would go on”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “United States”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “imposed sanctions Friday on more than 25 businesses, banks and individuals it said it suspected of working to expand Iran's nuclear program, supporting terrorism and helping the Islamic republic evade U.S. and international sanctions”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety, trust

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “sanctions”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “bar Americans from engaging in transactions with any of the designated parties, freeze those parties' assets and block their property under U.S. jurisdiction”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Rouhani”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “criticized the sanctions”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: “Rouhani”
   ii. What: “Sanctions”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “an invasion of the Iranian nation”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

6. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: [Iran]
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “resist the invasion and put the invaders in their place … not allow the continuation and repetition of the invasion”

c. Values
i. Fortitude
   1. Rationale: appeal to strength
ii. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

7. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “Friday's action”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “did not constitute an expansion of the sanctions regime but rather the enforcement of existing sanctions”

c. Values
i. prudence
   1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. d
i. who: same
ii. what: “Rouhani”
iii. to whom: same
iv. how: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “sanctions would not thwart the nuclear talks with world powers”

ii. Attack
   1. Quotes: “called the measures affecting the country's pharmaceutical companies a 'crime against humanity.'”

c. Values
i. Fortitude
   1. Rationale: appeal to hope
ii. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

9. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: same
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “didn't know whether he would attend next month's U.N. General Assembly in New York and said he had "no plan" to meet President Obama there”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “the two leaders”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “spoke by telephone, the first direct conversation between leaders of the two countries since the 1979 Islamic Revolution”

c. Values
i. Fortitude
   1. Rationale: appeal to hope

11. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “West”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “suspected Iran of trying to build an atomic weapon through its nuclear program”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

12. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Iran”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Defense
1. Quotes: “said its program is for peaceful purposes, such as medical research and the generation of electricity”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “world powers and Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “reached an interim deal over the nuclear program, which called for Iran to limit its uranium enrichment in exchange for an easing of some economic sanctions. Both sides are negotiating a final deal”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “announced that work was underway to redesign its nearly completed Arak heavy water reactor so it produces less plutonium, a key sticking point in negotiations … also recently inaugurated a plant to convert a type of uranium into a material that cannot be used to make nuclear weapons, another point in talks”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “voters”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “elected Rouhani last year after he promised to engage the West diplomatically in order to get the sanctions lifted”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to faith, hope

16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [Rouhani]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “faced criticism from hard-liners who say he has conceded too much in the nuclear talks”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

17. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “touched obliquely on the advance of the Islamic State group in Iraq, saying that Iran had "no plan to cooperate" with the United States in the fight against terrorism”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. D
   i. Who: “Rouhani”
   ii. What: “our viewpoint”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “crime is crime”
   ii. Attack
      1. Quotes: “If some say we only fight terrorism if an American is killed, it only indicates they are not serious in fighting”
c. values
   i. prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iran deal”
   iii. To whom: readers of the Washington Post, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “day after”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Advocates of the effort to reach a negotiated settlement with Iran over its illicit nuclear activities”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “emphasized the benefits an agreement could bring by peacefully and verifiably barring Tehran from developing nuclear weapons”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to peace, safety

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Skeptics”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “warned of the risks of a "bad deal," under which Iran's capabilities are not sufficiently rolled back”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Largely absent from the debate”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “a fuller consideration of the strategic implications a nuclear agreement could have on the U.S. position in the Middle East”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Such an assessment”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “must begin by considering the consequences of lifting the majority of sanctions on Iran - and of Iran resuming normal trade with the world's major economies”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “This prospect”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “provides our strongest leverage to persuade the Iranian government to abandon key elements of its nuclear program”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “lifting sanctions”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “would also lead to the economic empowerment of a government that is the leading state sponsor of terrorism”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “managed to provide robust support to extremist proxies as part of its broader geopolitical agenda across the Middle East and beyond - activities antithetical to U.S. interests and to those of our closest allies”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety, trust

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “possible”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “a nuclear deal would pave the way to a broader detente in Iran's relations with the United States and its neighbors”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “more plausible”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “removing sanctions would strengthen Tehran's ability to project malign influence in its near-abroad”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “a successful nuclear deal”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “could result in the United States and our partners in the Middle East facing a better-resourced and, in some respects, more dangerous adversary”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “does not mean”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “we should abandon diplomacy with Tehran”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “ought to be our foremost priority, and a diplomatic agreement that truly bolts the door against that danger is worth potential downsides”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “the alternative to successful diplomacy - military action”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “carries its own set of costs and risks to regional stability and the global economy”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
   i. Who: same
ii. What: “military action”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “holds less promise for decisively ending the nuclear threat than does a good negotiated accord”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “we need to recognize”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “genuine trade-offs involved in even the best possible nuclear deal - and start laying the groundwork for mitigating them”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “five actions”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “should be considered”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “no true reconciliation between Iran and the United States”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “without a comprehensive change in Iran's destabilizing regional behavior”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Such a message - delivered publicly, unambiguously and consistently”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would help eliminate the corrosive, and inaccurate, perception that Washington is so eager to disengage from the Middle East that it would accept Iranian hegemony there”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “United States should intensify dialogue with our Arab and Israeli allies”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “to develop a common understanding about how to contend with an economically strengthened Iran in the wake of a nuclear deal”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “sanctions relief would bolster Tehran's capability to train, finance and equip its terrorist proxies”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “we and our partners in the region must start preparing to intensify our efforts to identify, disrupt and dismantle these networks”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

21. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “the United States”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “needs to look hard at its position on Syria”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

22. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “reports that the Obama administration has been considering
       various forms of increased support to the Syrian opposition”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “are encouraging”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

23. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “reports”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “reflect recognition that a much more robust, focused and
         well-resourced effort is required to reverse the Assad regime's
         current battlefield momentum, which it has achieved in large part
         due to Iranian help”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

24. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Rather than freeing Washington to reduce the U.S. footprint in the
       Middle East and focus elsewhere”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “a nuclear agreement with Tehran is likely to compel us to
         deepen our military, diplomatic and intelligence presence in the
         region in order to help partners there balance against increasing
         Iranian power”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

25. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “variety of steps”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “should be pursued to this end”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength

26. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “in the wake of a deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “we need to start planning for what a new sanctions regime would look like”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

27. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “surge of money to Tehran is inevitable as nuclear-linked sanctions are lifted”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “sanctions related to terrorism should remain in place and new ones considered to keep Iranian companies, banks and individuals tied to destabilizing regional activities from reaping a windfall”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

28. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Planning for such sanctions”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “must be undertaken in advance of a nuclear agreement”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

29. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “in the event of inadequate Iranian implementation of an agreement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “should also be a clear plan for immediate reimposition of crippling sanctions”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

30. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “too often in U.S. foreign policy, we set a strategic objective and pursue it doggedly”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “only to be insufficiently prepared for the consequences when we achieve our goal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

31. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “the time for thinking through and preparing for its implications”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “is now”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iran’s president”
   iii. To whom: readers of the Washington Post, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “calls for unity”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: “Iran's Hassan Rouhani”
   ii. What: [Iran]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “must move forward”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “reformist president”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “resolute on its nuclear program”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iranian President Hassan Rouhani”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “marked the anniversary of the founding of the Islamic republic on Tuesday with a mix of defiance and moderation, telling a huge crowd of Iranians that "no single political faction can rule the country, and all political groups must have a share in running the country”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

4. D
   i. Who: “Rouhani”
   ii. What: [Iran]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “want to increase national unity and clear our hearts from some past events”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Rouhani”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “resolute about the country's right to develop its own energy sources and, separately, to protect itself”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

6. D
   i. Who: “Rouhani”
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will maintain a permanent nuclear program”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to faith, hope, strength
7. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “nuclear program”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “peaceful and permitted under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty”
   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “the West, Israel and some Arab nations”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “fear that Iran is trying to start a clandestine weapons program”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
      ii. Fortitude
         1. Rationale: appeal to trust

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “upcoming talks”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “will provide an opportunity to end the standoff … warned of calamity if the two sides cannot come to a comprehensive agreement”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
    i. Who: [Rouhani]
    ii. What: “talks”
    iii. To whom: same
iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “historical test for Europe and the United States”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “if they respect the interests of our nation and cooperate in a lawful way”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will hear a positive response from our nation”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “if they repeat the mistaken approaches of the past”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “will be harmful for themselves, the region and world stability”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

13. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “anniversary celebration”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “felt in some ways like a carnival”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “festive atmosphere”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “punctuated with revolutionary fervor”

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Volunteers”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “handed out posters and fliers that repeated the old slogan "Death to the U.S.A.,” as well as newer ones such as "We are eager for the options on the table" - an apparent reference to statements by U.S. officials that Washington reserves the right to use military force if Iran and world powers cannot finalize a deal”

16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “One booth”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “held what it called an "Effigy of Arrogance' building competition," offering a gold coin for the most realistic likeness of one of Iran's adversaries - President Obama and Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu chief among them”

17. D
   i. Who: same
ii. What: “An organizer of the competition”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “not hopeful that his country and the West would reach a compromise over Iran's nuclear program”

c. Values
i. Fortitude
   1. Rationale: appeal to hope

18. D
i. Who: “Mohammad Nouri”
ii. What: “Everything our leaders do to try and improve the situation, like entering the nuclear negotiations in good faith”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: interview

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “rejected by the other side”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

19. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “Others in the crowd”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “more optimistic”

c. Values
i. Fortitude
   1. Rationale: appeal to hope

20. D
i. Who: “hotel worker Esmail Heydarpour”
ii. What: “realities of our day-to-day politics”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: interview

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “participated in the revolution and then in the war with Iraq. I did it for my dignity and that of my country … tell us that if
we have relations with the U.S., the situation will be much better for us”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

21. d
   i. who: author
   ii. what: “Tehran”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
       1. Quotes: “uses the anniversary of the 1979 revolution to announce important technical and military achievements, and this year was no exception”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
ii. Fortitude
       1. rationale: appeal to strength, hope, faith

22. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “country”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
       1. Quotes: “successfully tested a new generation of long-range ballistic missiles”

c. Values
i. Fortitude
   1. Rationale: appeal to strength

23. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “tests”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
       1. Quotes: “should have no bearing on the upcoming Vienna talks”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
24. D
   i. Who: [Deputy Foreign Minister Abbas Araghchi]
   ii. what: “talks with the six world powers”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: public statement
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “only about the nuclear issue”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

25. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [Iran]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “We will never engage in talks about other matters … made it clear to them in the past, and we also made it clear for the upcoming talks”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength

26. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Rouhani”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “sked Iranians to try to come together to move beyond the scars and deep divisions generated by the contested 2009 reelection of Mahmoud Ahmadinejad as president and the months of protests that followed”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

27. D
   i. Who: “Rouhani”
   ii. What: [Iran]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “need to move forward”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “world powers”
   iii. To whom: readers of the *Washington Post*, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. quotes: “lift some sanctions in response to action by Iran”

c. values
   i. justice
      1. rationale: appeal to fairness, trust
   ii. fortitude
      1. rationale: appeal to hope

1. d: sentence one
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “Iran … world powers”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “suspended its most sensitive nuclear development work … immediately responded by lifting some of the sanctions … first cautious step toward making good on a deal”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “reciprocal steps”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “honor a plan to gradually ease restrictions on Iran as it adheres to new commitments to curb the program and allow greatly expanded international inspection and monitoring of the program which it insists is not intended to produce nuclear weapons”

c. Values
   i. Justice
1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “United States”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “reacted with both praise and suspicion … "important step forward … warning that the restrictions would be quickly reinstated if Iran reneges on its efforts”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
      ii. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “announcement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “met a Jan. 20 deadline for the move, which is intended to lay the groundwork for a broader accord on Iran's nuclear activities”

   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “European Union”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “responding with an easing of some sanctions”

   c. Values
      i. Justice
         1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “decision”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
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i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “expected to allow Iran to resume critical exports of oil and gas”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

7. D
   i. Who: “E.U. foreign policy chief Catherine Ashton”
   ii. What: “that Iran has an exclusively peaceful nuclear program”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “important day”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

8. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “White House”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “issued a more reserved statement”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: “White House press secretary Jay Carney”
   ii. What: “world powers”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “follow through on our commitment to begin to provide the modest relief agreed to with Iran … continue our aggressive enforcement of the sanctions measures that will remain in place throughout this six-month period”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

10. D
    i. Who: author
    ii. What: “Obama administration”
    iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “trying to address a chorus of critics at home and in Israel who say the deal is too generous as it combats efforts in Congress to impose new sanctions”
c. Values
   i. justice
      1. rationale: appeal to trust
11. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “Senior Obama administration officials”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “called the relief a "drop in the bucket" compared with the billions in oil revenue that the global sanctions on Iran have left tied up in international banks”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
12. D
   i. Who: “one U.S. official”
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “not truly open for business”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. what: “most of Iran's legitimate oil trade”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “suspended over the past two years”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
14. D
   i. Who: same
ii. What: “European and other corporations”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “reported to be seeking ways to resume business with Iran soon, leaving U.S. officials trying to stand in the breach”

c. Values
i. Fortitude
   1. Rationale: appeal to hope
ii. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

15. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “U.S. officials”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “addressed the fraught politics of the Iran deal in the United States, where a bipartisan and nearly veto-proof majority of senators is on record supporting new sanctions on Iran”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “administration”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. quotes: “opposes new sanctions as a violation of its careful agreement with Iran and other world powers and warns that Iran may walk away if Congress doesn't back down”

c. values
i. prudence
   1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. d
i. who: “one official”
ii. what: “steps that we are taking today”
iii. to whom: same
iv. how: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “show that we are on track toward implementing this arrangement which gives us what we need … should test the proposition that moving forward with this will give us in the end what we need”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “nuclear talks”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “separate from other U.S. and world political disputes with Iran”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “United Nations”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “rescinded an invitation to Iran to attend the talks because Iran would not endorse a transition from the regime of Syrian President Bashar al-Assad”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “mixed reaction to the halting of the uranium enrichment at nuclear plants”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

21. D
   i. Who: same
ii. What: “Iranian opponents of the deal”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “stepped up their denunciations of what they are calling their country's capitulation to Western demands”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Vatan-e Emrooz, a newspaper closely associated with conservatives”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “printed Monday's edition in all-black type and dedicated it to coverage of what it called Iran's "nuclear holocaust."”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

D
i. Who: “Hossein Shariatmadari, the editor in chief of Kayhan, a newspaper often referred to as the mouthpiece for the most conservative members of Iran's political establishment”
ii. What: “What we have given up”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: editorial
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “not only incomparable with what we have received, but much less significant than can be called a win-win situation”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “Criticism of the deal”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “not unexpected, but opponents of Iran’s new president, Hassan Rouhani, and his administration’s nuclear outreach had been uncharacteristically quiet until now”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

25. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Ahmad Tavakoli, a prominent conservative member of parliament”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “told fellow lawmakers Monday that there were two main problems with the nuclear deal”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

26. D
i. Who: “Ahmad Tavakoli”
ii. What: “many discrepancies in the text of the agreement”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “we can hardly be hopeful that our national interests will ever materialize. Second, as officials, we must not reveal our weak points in a way that our enemies can exploit them”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

27. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “agreement”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “supported by many key Iranian political figures, as well as many ordinary Iranians who hope that an easing of sanctions will relieve economic woes”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

28. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “Iran's financial markets”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “responding well to the deal's implementation”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iran deal”
   iii. To whom: readers of the Washington Post, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “fool’s errand”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Only the delusional”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “could believe that a nuclear deal with Iran is possible”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iranians”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “making fools of the negotiators, playing us for suckers while the centrifuges spin”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “a matter of months”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “before the world detects an underground nuclear explosion”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [underground explosion]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will end this negotiating charade once and for all”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will become another North Korea”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iran deal”
   iii. To whom: readers of the Washington Post, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “could encourage rather than limit nuclear activity”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “A final deal that allows Iran to retain centrifuges for uranium enrichment”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “ultimately would allow the development of nuclear weapons in Iran, encourage a Sunni-Shiite arms race in the Middle East and weaken counterproliferation efforts worldwide”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “already possesses ballistic missiles suited to carry nuclear warheads and advanced knowledge of weaponization”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “the production of fissile material … is the principal stage in the process of making a nuclear weapon”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
  i. Attack
    1. Quotes: “acquiescing to Iranian enrichment is tantamount to legitimizing Iran's status on the nuclear threshold”

c. Values
  i. Prudence
    1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
  i. Who: same
  ii. What: “Proposals for the final agreement to restrict the number of centrifuges”
  iii. To whom: same
  iv. How: same

b. FTC
  i. Attack
    1. Quotes: “almost irrelevant”

c. Values
  i. Prudence
    1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
  i. Who: same
  ii. What: “if Iran were forced to reduce its number of centrifuges to only 3,000”
  iii. To whom: same
  iv. How: same

b. FTC
  i. Acclaim
    1. Quotes: “its stockpile of uranium enriched to 3.5 percent would allow the production of enough fissile material for a nuclear bomb within six months”

c. Values
  i. Prudence
    1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
  i. Who: same
  ii. What: “If forced to start from scratch with 3,000 centrifuges”
  iii. To whom: same
  iv. How: same

b. FTC
  i. Acclaim
    1. Quotes: “Iran could still produce enough fissile material to make a nuclear weapon within one year”

c. Values
  i. Prudence
    1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “chances of Iran developing the bomb as a "threshold country""
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “considerable … North Korea did so after signing a similar deal in 2007”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Becoming a nuclear power”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “the ayatollahs' initial objective and the reason Tehran invested around $50 billion in this project”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “other countries on the nuclear threshold”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “unlike Germany and Japan, Iran is unlikely to maintain its threshold status”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “ayatollahs' regime”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “poses a threat to its Sunni neighbors”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Tehran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. quotes: “calls for the annihilation of the Jewish state and sponsors terrorist groups such as Hezbollah and Islamic Jihad, all of which sparks fear in other countries”
c. values
   i. prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom
12. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “Tehran's anxiety over potential retaliatory actions against its regime, including its nuclear project”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would increase pressures within Iran to dash toward a fait accompli nuclear weapon”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “critical reaction to an international agreement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. quotes: “would be not in Washington but in Cairo, Ankara and Riyadh”
c. values
   i. prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom
14. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “if the Western powers express confidence in Iran's commitment and pledge a vigorous economic and military response to any Iranian violation”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “regional players will render their own judgments”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iranian President Hassan Rouhani's "charm offensive"”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “dramatic effect in the West”
      ii. Attack
         1. Quotes: “no one in the Middle East buys Iran's projection of pacifism”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Tehran's direct involvement in Sunni-Shiite carnage in Syria, Lebanon and Iraq”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “sharpened its image”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran's breakout capability”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “pivotal in regional assessments, … most governments likely to conclude that if the deal leaves Iran only a year or two away from the bomb Tehran ultimately will go nuclear”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. D
   i. Who: same
ii. What: “Any deal that legitimizes Iran as an unpunished, sanctions-free country on the nuclear threshold”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. attack
   1. Quotes: “might spark a nuclear arms race in the region, as Saudi Arabia has hinted”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
i. Who: same
ii. what: “Some Sunni states”
iii. to whom: same
iv. how: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “might seek to develop the bomb in a bid to achieve parity with Iran or to ensure their ability to join the nuclear club if Tehran does”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

20. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “such an arms race”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “might provide Tehran the ultimate excuse to produce the bomb: to keep pace with the rivals its own actions drove to go nuclear”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

21. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “if Iran kept its commitment to avoid the bomb”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “allowing it to retain centrifuges could have grave global implications”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

22. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Should the final compromise include de facto recognition of Iran's "right to enrich,‴”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “the international community would find it difficult to insist later that other problematic regimes concede that "right.‴”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Appeal to fairness

23. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “the interim agreement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “already linked Iran's hypothetical future enrichment to its civilian "practical needs."‴”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

24. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Practical needs”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “is interpreted mainly as enrichment needed to fuel nuclear power stations”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
25. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Such a civilian purpose”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “demands more centrifuges than are in Iran's inventory”
   ii. Attack
      1. Quotes: “seems to allow for even more centrifuges than are militarily needed for the annual production of several nuclear bombs”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
26. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “countries produce electricity in nuclear reactors”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “More than 20 … dozens more are planning to do so”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
27. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “If Iran were ultimately allowed to enrich”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “how would the United States justify its demand that, say, Egypt, Jordan or South Korea eschew uranium enrichment for peaceful civilian purposes? How would U.S. officials argue that what the deal concedes to the ayatollahs' regime, after a decade of flagrant violations of six U.N. Security Council resolutions and their commitments under the Non-Proliferation Treaty, is forbidden for more responsible countries? How could the United States cast greater legitimacy on the previously clandestine centrifuge facilities in Qom and Natanz than on those that would be aboveboard from the outset?”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
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ii. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

28.  D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “multiple countries, including some rogue states”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would insist on their own enrichment facilities”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

29.  D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “such a deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “might generate many new threshold states”

c. Values
   i. prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

30.  D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Under such circumstances, local disputes or changes in
government”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would push some countries across the threshold”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

31.  D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “a deal intended to prevent the nuclear armament of one dangerous
country, Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
1. Quotes: “could plant the seeds for the wholesale sprouting of many nuclear powers”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
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I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “pathway to an Iran deal”
   iii. To whom: readers of The Washington Post, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “perilous”

c. Values
   i. justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “expectations”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “high”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope/faith

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “fallen sharply”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope/faith

3. d
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “wide divide and how to get around the main obstacle they will face”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “does not mean a final deal with Tehran is impossible, but it does mean that both sides, Tehran and the West, need to start thinking creatively about how to bridge … not abroad but at home”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iranian statements that have attracted so much attention”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “came from both the foreign minister and president”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “did not agree to dismantle anything … would not destroy any of its existing centrifuges … would not shut down its heavy-water reactor at Arak”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran and America”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “have fundamentally different views about an acceptable final deal”

c. Values
  i. Prudence
     1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
  i. Who: same
  ii. what: “Iran”
  iii. to whom: same
  iv. how: same

b. FTC
  i. Acclaim
     1. Quotes: “will provide the world with assurances and evidence that its nuclear program is civilian, not military”

c. Values
  i. Justice
     1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety, trust

8. D
  i. Who: same
  ii. What: same
  iii. To whom: same
  iv. How: same

b. FTC
  i. Acclaim
     1. Quotes: “would allow unprecedented levels of intrusive inspections at all facilities”

c. Values
  i. Justice
     1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust, safety

9. D
  i. Who: same
  ii. What: “process”
  iii. To whom: same
  iv. How: same

b. FTC
  i. Acclaim
     1. Quotes: “has already begun”

c. Values
  i. Prudence
     1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
  i. Who: same
  ii. What: “interim agreement”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “calls for international inspections at Iran's centrifuge production factories, mines and mills”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

11. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “inspectors”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “entered Iranian mines”

c. Values
i. Fortitude
   1. Rationale; appeal to hope

12. D
i. Who: same
ii. what: “Iran's officials”
iii. to whom: same
iv. how: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “determined not to accept any constraints on their program … They speak often about the importance of being treated like any other country that has signed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, which to them means having the unfettered right to enrich uranium to produce electricity”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

13. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “treaty”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “says nothing about enrichment activities specifically”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “enrichment”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “has so far been a permitted activity”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “The only criterion the treaty lays out”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “is that all nuclear production must be "for peaceful purposes."”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety

16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “American vision of the final deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “quite different and stems from the notion that Iran must take special steps to provide confidence that its program is peaceful”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
ii. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to trust, safety

17. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Both sides”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will have to think hard about their core concerns”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran's officials”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will have to come to terms with the fact that their country is being treated differently and for good reasons”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “has a program that is suspicious … has deceived the world about its program in the past”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust

20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Washington”
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “it will get more concessions than it thought possible on inspections, it will get fewer on the rollback of Iran's existing program”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

21. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “If it can ensure that it has a real lead time”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “significant achievement”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

22. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “if Tehran throws the inspectors out”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would change the situation instantly - and Washington would not need six months to react”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

23. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “creative compromises”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “bridge many of the gaps”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
24. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Georgetown University's Colin Kahl and The Ploughshares Fund's Joseph Cirincione”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “one could shut down centrifuges without destroying them”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

25. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “compromises”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “already been found”
   c. Values
      i. Fortitude
         1. Rationale: appeal to hope

26. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “moderates”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “who seek greater integration of Iran with the world”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
      ii. Fortitude
         1. Rationale: appeal to hope

27. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “hinted”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “leaders of the Green Movement would be released”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

28. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [Iranian leaders]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “operating under constraints, with many domestic opponents”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

29. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “same”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “could be said of the Obama administration”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

30. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “both sides start preparing the ground domestically for a final deal - and the compromises it would involve - rather than hoping that somehow if it works out in Geneva, it will work out at home as well”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “better”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: [U.S.]
   iii. To whom: readers of the Washington Post, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “can make a deal”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “nuclear talks between Iran and the P5+1 powers”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “have reached a critical stage”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “confident”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “we can reach a comprehensive agreement that will assure the world that Iran's nuclear program will remain exclusively peaceful”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to faith
   iii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to peace

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “All that is required”
   iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same 
b. FTC 
i. Acclaim 
   1. Quotes: “a sober appreciation of the realities faced and a serious calculation of alternatives”
c. Values 
i. Prudence 
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
4. D 
i. Who: same 
ii. What: “Illusions” 
iii. To whom: same 
iv. How: same 
b. FTC 
i. attack 
   1. Quotes: “have in the past led to missed opportunities and should not be allowed to ruin the real prospect of the historic deal before us”
c. Values 
i. Prudence 
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
5. D 
i. Who: same 
ii. What: “When current President Hassan Rouhani and I were leading the Iranian nuclear negotiating team” 
iii. To whom: same 
iv. How: same 
b. FTC 
i. Acclaim 
   1. Quotes: “I presented a proposal to our Western counterparts that contained an array of measures designed by independent, non-Iranian scientists to provide assurances that our nuclear program would remain forever peaceful”
c. Values 
i. Prudence 
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
6. D 
i. Who: same 
ii. What: “our counterparts” 
iii. To whom: same 
iv. How: same 
b. FTC 
i. attack 
   1. Quotes: “demanded that we abstain from enrichment until at least 2015, effectively killing the chances of a deal”
c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Their mistaking our constructive engagement for weakness, and opting for pressure and sanctions to gain concessions”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “led to a change in Iran's position, both by the ballot box in the 2005 presidential election and the subsequent expansion of Iran's peaceful nuclear activities”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “outcome of past maximalism and obsession with sanctions”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “clearly evident”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “nobody”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “can rewind the clock”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “Sacrifices”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same
b. FTC
    i. Acclaim
       1. Quotes: “have been made”
c. values
   i. prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom
11. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “Capabilities”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. quotes: “are vastly different”
c. values
   i. prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom
12. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “Knowledge and expertise”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “have been attained”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “None of this”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. quotes: “can be wished or negotiated away”
c. values
   i. prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom
14. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “President Rouhani and I”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “back at the negotiating table, and our commitment to constructive engagement has not changed … willing to provide
assurances of the exclusively peaceful nature of our nuclear program”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Our proposed measures”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “serious and would make a real difference”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: [Iran]
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “will not abandon or make a mockery of our technological advances or our scientists, nor would it be prudent or serve the interest of nuclear nonproliferation to expect us to do so”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “already delivered”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. D
   i. Who: same
ii. What: “first nuclear agreement in a decade”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “was concluded”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “International Atomic Energy Agency”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “verified that we have kept up our end of the bargain …
   the cooperation we now extend to the IAEA has been recognized
   as the best in years … prepared to maintain this trajectory”

c. Values
i. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to trust
ii. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

20. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “if illusions were to again derail progress toward a historic
   achievement”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “tragically shortsighted”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

21. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “when all sides have much to gain and before the window of
   cooperation and pragmatic reason closes”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “no better time to put an end to the unnecessary nuclear
   crisis than now”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

22. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Excuses for once again torpedoing a deal, which can change the shape of our region”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “can certainly be found”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

23. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Prominent among them”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “myth of "breakout."

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

24. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “small but powerful constituencies”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “have irrationally advanced the idea that Iran can produce enough fissile material for a bomb in months”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

25. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “While reaching a realistic deal is the best available option for the West to prevent such a remote possibility”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “it may be instructive to take that phobia at face value”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

26. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: [“breakout”]
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “put it to a logical test”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

27. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “If Iran ever wanted to break out”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “all IAEA inspectors would have to be expelled from the country”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

28. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “Iran's program”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would then have to be reconfigured to make weapons-grade fissile material, which would have to be converted to metal, be molded into the shape required for a bomb and undergo countless other complex weaponization processes”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

29. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “None of these capabilities”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “exist in Iran and would have to be developed from scratch. This would take several years - not a few months”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
30. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “when Iran had the time for this”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “it did not opt for a bomb”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
31. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “already paid the price of massive, unjust sanctions that far exceeded those imposed on countries that have developed a bomb”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
32. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [Iran]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “did not take a single step toward a nuclear weapon … 16 security organs behind two consecutive U.S. National Intelligence Estimates, in 2007 and 2012, agreed”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust
33. D
   i. Who: same
ii. What: [breakout]
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “ironic that some in the West ignore all of this in favor of projecting the dangerous double myth that Iran needs the bomb to protect itself and is only months away from getting one. It will be even more ironic if this hype torpedoes a deal that is the surest and safest way to preclude proliferation”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

34. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “unique opportunity in our negotiations with the P5+1 to put in place long-term confidence-building measures, as well as extensive monitoring and verification arrangements, to provide the greatest assurance”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “that Iran's nuclear program will forever remain exclusively peaceful. To overcome the obstacles to realizing this historic achievement, we must look ahead, but we also cannot ignore the lessons provided by the past. Comprehension of how the cycle of lost chances has been propelled by illusions is important. Taking action to exit this cycle is crucial.”

   c. Values
      i. prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

35. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [deal]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “As we enter the crossroads of turning the interim nuclear deal into a comprehensive solution, I urge my counterparts to reciprocate our willingness to address concerns about our capabilities with appreciation of our demand for our rights, dignity and respect.”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

36. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “illusions”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “refrain from allowing illusions to derail the march toward ending an unnecessary crisis and opening new horizons.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: readers of the Washington Post. Internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory language
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “third way”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “His support of the administration's concessions in the nuclear talks with Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “ignored the most obvious practical alternative”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “if the current talks collapsed”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “not true … only option for the United States and Israel would be "a stark choice over whether to attack Iranian facilities."”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
3. d
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “option that has proved effective in the past”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “the imposition and enforcement of additional and stronger sanctions, such as those provided for in the Kirk-Menendez bill pending in the Senate”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “that the sanctions previously adopted by Congress brought Iran to the negotiating table”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “no doubt … regime's goal is to escape their bite on its economy”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Sanctions”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “helped drive Libya to back off from nuclear development years ago”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. what: “Ignoring the option of squeezing the Iranian regime with tighter sanctions”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “major flaw in the administration's argument”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Schumer's opposition to Iran deal”
   iii. To whom: readers of the Washington Post, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “may bring other Democrats with him”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Sen. Charles E. Schumer's announcement that he will oppose the Iran deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “was surprising only in its timing, unfolding as it did during the Republican presidential debate on Thursday night”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
2. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “Many thought the likely "no" voter”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “might stay silent for awhile in deference to the White House's aggressive push for congressional support”
c. Values
   i. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patience
3. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “now that the New York Democrat's opposition is out in the open, the question”
iii. To whom; same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will it ultimately hurt President Obama or Schumer more, the
         former in his quest to sell the deal and the latter in his bid to become the
         highest-ranking Senate Democrat”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom
4. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “Schumer”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “wasn’t the only lawmaker to come out against the deal Thursday
         night - so did Rep. Eliot Engel, D-N.Y., another skeptic and the House's
         ranking member on its Foreign Affairs Committee”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength
5. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “Schumer”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “carries a much larger megaphone”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength
6. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “His opposition”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “could spell trouble for a deal that is already challenging to sell to
         a skeptical Congress, even among members of Obama's own party”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to faith

7. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “If the Iran deal falls apart”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How; same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “would spark a period of uncertainty, as the world observes how an Iran freed of international sanctions but unfettered by the confines of a broken nuclear deal behaves on the world stage”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

8. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “Another unknown”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “how, in such circumstances, the United States might respond to perceptions that Iran is nearing nuclear weapons' readiness”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “Schumer's colleagues”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How; same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes; “readily admitted over the last several weeks that the senator's opinion on the deal was influential”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength

10. D
    i. Who; same
    ii. What: “in the end”
iii. To whom; same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
  i. Acclaim
    1. Quotes: “comes down to a hard game of numbers”

c. Values
  i. Prudence
    1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
  i. Who: same
  ii. What: “Obama”
  iii. To whom: same
  iv. How: same

b. FTC
  i. Acclaim
    1. Quotes: “needs to keep either the House or the Senate from forming a two-thirds majority against the deal to keep the agreement alive, as the Republican-led Congress is expected to deliver the president a "no" vote he will then veto”

c. Values
  i. Prudence
    1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
  i. Who: same
  ii. What: “trend in the Senate”
  iii. To whom: same
  iv. How: same

b. FTC
  i. Acclaim
    1. Quotes: “has been Democrats declaring their support for the deal”

c. Values
  i. Fortitude
    1. Rationale: appeal to strength

13. D
  i. Who: same
  ii. What: “a pair of Senate Democrats”
  iii. To whom: same
  iv. How: same

b. FTC
  i. Acclaim
    1. Quotes: “said they would support the Iran agreement”

c. Values
  i. Fortitude
1. Rationale: appeal to strength

14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “needs 34 senators on his side, but right now, only 13 are absolute "yes" votes - though another 14 are expected to ultimately vote in favor as well”
      ii. Attack
         1. Quotes: “still seven shy of what the president needs to override a veto”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
      ii. Fortitude
         1. Rationale: appeal to hope

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “15 senators”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “still either undecided or playing their cards extremely close to the chest”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “In the House, the math”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “is less clear”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. D
   i. Who: same
ii. What: “Obama”
iii. To whom; same
iv. How; same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes; “would need 146 votes to maintain his veto there - and at first glance, his chances seem good: Only 8 of the 188 House Democrats have come out against the deal, and he has Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi, D-Calif., working hard to come up with the needed support. Already, 34 House Democrats have come out for it”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

18. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “not enough members”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How; same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes; “declared themselves to get a full read on the House state of play - and a bunch of newer Democrats may be getting the tough sell on a trip to Israel right now sponsored by AIPAC’s charitable arm”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

19. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “Only one lawmaker known to be on the trip”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How; same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “previously declared his support for the deal”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

20. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “senators”
   iii. To whom; same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “shuttled through a series of high-level briefings, both in public and behind closed doors, to examine the deal, from security concerns to inspections regimes, and collect information on everything from the nuclear fuel cycle to the negotiating process”
c. Values
i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

21. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “the true undecideds”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “have yet to break one way or another”
c. Values
i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

22. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Many”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. attack
1. Quotes: “claim that the longer the briefing process, the more questions arise”
c. Values
i. Fortitude
1. Rationale: appeal to hope

23. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “majority of undecided senators”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “are rank-and-file members who seem determined to either keep their own counsel or stick to their own review process before making a personal decision on the matter”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

24. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “some leading figures”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “are also on the fence”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

25. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: [Sen. Ben Cardin, D-Md]
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “could arguably sway an even greater flock than Schumer once he makes a decision … not said when he will declare himself. But he has been pushing for the administration to provide the text of side agreements between the International Atomic Energy Agency and Iran to Congress. But those agreements do not appear to be in the offing”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength
   ii. Prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

26. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “Schumer”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How; same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “explained his opposition to the deal in a very long post for Medium, as most of the political world was focused on the first 2016 debate between the top 10 Republican candidates”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

27. D
   i. who; same
   ii. what: “Politico”
   iii. to whom; same
   iv. how; same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “cited an anonymous source saying that Schumer intended to announce the news on Friday, but the White House leaked the news to the Huffington Post”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

28. d
   i. who; same
   ii. what: “White House allies”
   iii. to whom; same
   iv. how; same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “pounced on Schumer immediately, questioning his fitness for leading the Democrats if he was so willing to blatantly cross Obama on a topic of such import”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Senate”
   iii. To whom: readers of the Washington Post, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “rejects attempt to derail Iran deal in victory for Obama”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength
1. D: sentence one
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “Senate Democrats”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How; same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes; “blocked a Republican effort to scuttle the Iran nuclear deal, delivering the Obama administration a long-awaited, major foreign policy victory”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength
2. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “Republicans in both chambers dead set on taking further shots to eviscerate the agreement, and potentially even drag it to court to block its implementation, debate over the deal with Iran”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How; same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “may not be over”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
3. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “vote on a procedural motion”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How; same
b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “was 58 to 42, two votes short of the 60 votes needed to consider the resolution rejecting the agreement”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength

4. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “House”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How; same

b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “passed, 245 to 186, a resolution stating that President Obama didn't fulfill his obligations under the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act because Congress has yet to see two confidential side agreements pertaining to the deal -- documents the administration says it doesn't have”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “resolution”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “stated that the 60-day clock for Congress to approve the deal hasn't started”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “despite the House vote (and two more to come Friday), the Senate action”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes; “virtually assures that the deal will be implemented, at least in the short term”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
1. Rationale: appeal to strength, hope

7. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “deal’s backers”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “secured the votes to sustain Obama's promised veto”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength

8. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “successful filibuster of the resolution of disapproval”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “ensures Obama won't have to rely on his veto pen to preserve a major piece of his foreign policy agenda”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) said the Senate”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will vote on the resolution of disapproval one more time before the Sept. 17 deadline to see "if any folks want to change their minds." … seemed to accept that there was no way for Congress to block the agreement's implementation”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength

10. D
    i. Who; “McConnell”
    ii. What: “If we want to do anything further about this Iranian regime”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: public statement
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “bring me a bill with enough co-sponsors to override a presidential veto … Otherwise, the American people will give us their judgment about the appropriateness of this measure a year from November”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
   i. Who; author
   ii. What: “House, Republicans who don't want to wait until the election”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “prepared to take aim at the pact from another angle”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Speaker John A. Boehner (R-Ohio) on Thursday said House Republicans”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will "use every tool at our disposal to stop, slow and delay this agreement from being fully implemented," including suing Obama to keep him from carrying out the deal”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength

13. D
   i. Who: “Boehner”
   ii. What: “option”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How; public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “very possible”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “lawsuit”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “dramatic postscript to a long fight over green-lighting the deal to curb Iran’s nuclear ambitions in exchange for easing economic sanctions on Tehran -- a fight that, in its final hours, has been ensnared in procedural jockeying in both chambers of Congress”

c. Values
i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “House, leaders”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “abruptly shifted course to quell a nascent uprising this week … may not consider a disapproval resolution at all”

c. Values
i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Republican lawmakers, and some Democrats”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “asking to see two confidential side agreements, struck between Iran and the International Atomic Energy Agency”

c. Values
i. Justice
1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

17. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “administration”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Defense
1. Quotes: “argues it can't produce them because it has never had the confidential documents.”

c. Values
  i. Prudence
     1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “House”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will take up a measure to prevent Obama from lifting sanctions on Iran … will likely reject an approval resolution for the entire deal, a move that "is about holding every member accountable for their vote”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale; appeal to strength
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Now that efforts to block the agreement through a disapproval resolution have faltered, many House conservatives”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How; same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “agitating for their Senate counterparts to follow their lead”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

20. D
   i. Who; “Rep. Raúl R. Labrador (R-Idaho)”
   ii. What: “like to see the Senate”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “actually go nuclear on this … Take up our resolution and also turn down the deal. There's a lot of different things that we could do”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

21. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “A few senators”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “might be receptive to the idea”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

22. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Tex.)”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “sent House Republican leaders a letter making the same argument as House conservatives about Congress not having to abide by the deal because of lawmakers not being privy to side agreements”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength

23. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Sen. Bob Corker (R-Tenn.)”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “indicated there isn't much interest among Senate Republicans in taking steps to formally assert that Obama is in violation of his obligations under the law”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

24. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Democrats”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. attack
1. Quotes: “frustrated and impatiently waiting to declare victory”

c. Values
   i. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patience

25. D
   i. Who: “Senate Minority Leader Harry M. Reid (D-Nev.)”
   ii. What: “time”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “we move on to something else … matter is over”
   ii. Attack
      1. Quotes: “can continue re-litigating, but it's going to have the same result”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Lobbyists, Obama administration officials”
   iii. To whom: readers of the *Washington Post*, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “appeal to Jewish Democrats on Iran”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Jewish Democrats on Capitol Hill”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “at the center of a fierce tug of war over the Iran deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “On one side”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “lobbyists for the American-Israel Public Affairs Committee and Israeli diplomats, who have been active on in an effort to kill the deal's chances”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “on the other”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “the Obama administration, as Cabinet secretaries tour Hill to sell it”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “fate of the deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes; “will likely come down to how Democratic lawmakers choose to vote”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “though some Jewish Democratic lawmakers - like California Sens. Dianne Feinstein and Barbara Boxer - have indicated their inclination to support the agreement, many more”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes; “have stayed mum”

c. Values
   i. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Secretary of State John Kerry”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes; “leaped on an opening from Rep. Sander Levin, D-Mich., the longest-serving Jewish member of Congress”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
7. D
   i. Who; “Levin”
   ii. What; “support for the deal”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How; same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “I believe that Israel, the region, and the world are far more secure if Iran does not move toward possession of a nuclear weapon. I believe the Agreement is the best way to achieve that”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale; appeal to safety
   ii. Prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom
8. d
   i. who: author
   ii. what: “Kerry”
   iii. to whom; same
   iv. how; same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes; “insisted on reading that section of Levin's statement to the lawmakers present in the Foreign Affairs committee room, though they assured him they were already aware of it and probably didn't need to hear it again”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
9. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What; “Kerry's zeal to reiterate Levin's words”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How; same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes; “part of a greater push to prove his sensitivity to Israel and his pro-Israel bona fides … seemed to want to convince lawmakers being
pressured by pro-Israel lobbyists that there is nothing anti-Israel in supporting the deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. rationale: appeal to faith

10. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “Levin's early backing of the Iran deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How; same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “lays down a marker for other Jewish members of Congress and Democratic representatives of heavily Jewish House districts, who are struggling under competing pressures from pro-Israel lobbyists and the head of their party in the White House”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “to be sure”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How; same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “dozens of other lawmakers who have also voiced serious concerns about Israel's security”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety

12. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “only a handful of them”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How; same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes; “would arguably speak with more personal authority about Israel's interests”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. d
   i. who; same
   ii. what: “many Democratic lawmakers”
   iii. to whom; same
   iv. how; same
b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. quotes; “still had serious concerns about how well the deal would protect Israel”

c. values
   i. fortitude
      1. rationale: appeal to faith, safety

14. d
   i. who; “Rep. Eliot Engel, D-N.Y.”
   ii. what: “would like to know how”
   iii. to whom; same
   iv. how: interview
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes; “will we work with our allies to minimize the potential windfall to terrorist organizations, and protect our allies like Israel”
   ii. Attack
      1. Quotes: “friends in Israel rightfully are concerned that Iranian funding of terrorism would continue to affect them in an existential way”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to faith, safety

15. D
   i. Who; author
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How; same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “raised concerns about Iran's ability to continue or even increase funding for militant groups wreaking havoc in the Middle East and posing a serious threat to Israel and the United States”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
1. Rationale: appeal to faith, safety

16. D
   i. Who; “Sherman”
   ii. What: [Iran]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “holding four American hostages. Assad is killing 5,000 people a month and the blood is on the hands of men in Tehran … supporting Hamas, Hezbollah and the Houthi, and those are just the organizations that begin with the letter H”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to faith

17. D
   i. Who; author
   ii. what: “Kerry”
   iii. to whom; same
   iv. how; author language

b. FTC
   i. defense
      1. Quotes; “tried to establish his credibility on Israel by citing his voting record on pertinent matters as a senator”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to faith

18. D
   i. Who: “Kerry”
   ii. What: “In the 28 years, a little more, that I was privileged to represent Massachusetts”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How; same

b. FTC
   i. defense
      1. Quotes: “had a 100 percent voting record on every issue for Israel … I understand the fear, I understand the concerns that our friends in Israel have. But we believe that what we have laid out here is a way of making Israel and the region, in fact, safer.”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to faith
   ii. Prudence
1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. d
   i. who; author
   ii. what: [Kerry]
   iii. to whom; same
   iv. how; author language
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes; “backed up by Energy Secretary Ernest Moniz, who often gets a kinder reception than Kerry from lawmakers”
   c. Values
      i. Fortitude
         1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

20. d
   i. who; “Moniz”
   ii. what: “landmark agreement”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: public statement
   b. FTC
      i. Defense
         1. Quotes: “confident this is a good deal for America, for our allies and for our global security … removes the threat that a nuclear armed Iran would pose to the regions and to Israel specifically”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   
21. D
   i. Who; author
   ii. What: [deal being good]
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How; author language
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes; “not the line that Israel's leaders, chief among them Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, have taken on the deal”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

22. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Netanyahu”
iii. To whom; same
iv. How; same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes; “remains vehemently opposed to it, and has argued it only gives Iran a more legitimate pathway to making a bomb and will embolden terrorists in the region”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to safety

23. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “Some lawmakers”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How; same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “tried to create openings Tuesday for Kerry to argue why Netanyahu's take was wrong.”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

24. D
   ii. What: “agreement”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How; public statement
b. FTC
   i. defense
      1. Quotes: “makes the world, our allies, including Israel, and the region safe … provide for us kind of some thinking of why it is that the current Israeli leadership does not see it that way”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to faith
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

25. D
   i. Who; author
   ii. What: “chorus of anti-deal voices”
   iii. To whom; same
iv. How: author language
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “remains far louder.”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

26. D
   i. Who: “Kerry”
   ii. what: “concerns”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: public statement
b. FTC
i. Defense
   1. Quotes: “fully understand every Israeli has concerns, has fears. There are concerns about the region they live in, about the nature, the rhetoric that's used. Death to Israel, death to America - everybody is concerned”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale; appeal to faith

27. D
   ii. What: [Kerry]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement
b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “You're going to name a couple of people … prime minister is against it”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “lobbyists”
   iii. To whom: readers of the Washington Post, internet searchers
   iv. How: same

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Hit High Gear as an Iran Deal Nears”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Steven Fulop, mayor of Jersey City”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “surprised the congregation by devoting much of his remarks to ongoing negotiations over a nuclear deal with Iran”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “Democratic mayor”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “laid out five very specific conditions to make any deal with Tehran acceptable”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: [deal speech]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “an unusual step for a Jersey mayor … marked the first time that Fulop had "ventured into the foreign policy arena”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “Fulop's "five key points”"
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How; same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “appeared to have been taken verbatim from a one-page briefing document - "5 Requirements for a Good Deal" - recently distributed by the Washington-based American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC)”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: [5 key points]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How; same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “unimpeded access to Iran's nuclear sites; a full explanation of Iran's prior efforts to develop a nuclear weapon; sanctions relief only after Iranian compliance; long-term prevention of Iran's nuclear ambition; and complete dismantlement of all Iranian nuclear infrastructure”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale; appeal to safety

6. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “all those demands”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How; same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes; “potentially exceed the parameters currently being negotiated with Iran by the Obama administration”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
1. rationale; appeal to wisdom

7. d
   i. who; same
   ii. what: “deadline for completing the deal”
   iii. to whom; same
   iv. how; same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “June 30”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “opponents and proponents”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes; “gearing up to sway public and congressional reaction to the final agreement, which lawmakers will have at least 30 days to review”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “AIPAC”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “undertaking a major mobilization … joined in opposition to the anticipated agreement by the American Jewish Committee and Republican-leaning think tanks and political groups”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength

10. D
   i. Who: same
    ii. What: “J Street, the liberal pro-Israel lobby”
    iii. To whom; same
    iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “leading the charge on the other side … enlisted high-profile former government officials and produced a blizzard of printed and online material to argue that the deal is good for America”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “White House”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “immersed in its own lobbying effort, particularly in Congress, where a senior administration official tallied more than 200 calls, meetings and hearings since April 2, when the United States and Iran announced a framework for the final agreement”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

12. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “President Obama”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would not sign an agreement that allowed Iran to develop a nuclear weapon … pledged that "our strategic partnership with Israel will remain, no matter what happens in the days and years ahead”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to faith

13. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “Both sides”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “claim the support of American Jews”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale; appeal to strength
     14. D
        i. Who; same
        ii. What: “J Street”
        iii. To whom; same
        iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. "released a poll this week indicating that 59 percent would
         support the agreement Obama is trying to hammer out with
         Tehran, a higher percentage than overall U.S. public support for
         the deal"

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale; appeal to strength
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
15. D
   i. Who; “J Street President Jeremy Ben-Ami”
   ii. What: “numbers”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. "show - once again - that pundits and presumed communal
         representatives are flat-out wrong in assuming American Jews are
         hawkish on Iran or U.S. policy in the Middle East in general"

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom
16. D
   i. Who; author
   ii. What: “Opponents noted that Treasury Secretary Jack Lew”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How; author language
b. FTC
   i. acclaim
      1. "was loudly and repeatedly booed Sunday when he spoke
         about the Iran negotiations at a New York conference organized
         by the Jerusalem Post"

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom
17. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “June 30 deadline”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
  i. Acclaim
     1. Quotes: “remains the administration's immediate goal”

c. Values
  i. Prudence
     1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. D
  
    i. Who: “senior official”
  
    ii. What: [negotiations]
  
    iii. To whom: same
  
    iv. How: interview

b. FTC
  i. Acclaim
     1. Quotes: “going to be tough, we know there's a lot of work to do, and we know that the Iranians . . . like to bring things down to the wire”

c. Values
  i. Prudence
     1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
  
    i. Who: author
  
    ii. What: “official”
  
    iii. To whom: same
  
    iv. How: author language

b. FTC
  i. Acclaim
     1. Quotes: “spoke on the condition of anonymity under ground rules set by the White House”

c. Values
  i. Prudence
     1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

20. D
  
    i. Who: [official]
  
    ii. What: [administration]
  
    iii. To whom: same
  
    iv. How: interview

b. FTC
  i. Acclaim
     1. Quotes: “under no illusions . . . that post-June 30, we're not going to get some potential pushback from the Hill . . . spending so much time and effort on the front end" to build public and congressional support”
c. Values  
   i. Prudence  
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
21. D  
   i. Who; author  
   ii. What: “Many believe the deadline”  
   iii. To whom: same  
   iv. How: author language  

b. FTC  
   i. Acclaim  
      1. Quotes: “will not be met”

c. Values  
   i. Prudence  
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom
22. D  
   i. Who: “Thomas R. Pickering, a former top U.S. diplomat who has met with numerous members of Congress to build support for the agreement”  
   ii. What: “My own view”  
   iii. To whom; same  
   iv. How: same  

b. FTC  
   i. Acclaim  
      1. Quotes: “highly unlikely”

c. Values  
   i. Prudence  
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom
23. D  
   i. Who; author  
   ii. What: “Seyed Hossein Mousavian, a former Iranian nuclear negotiator close to President Hassan Rouhani, told the Tehran Times this week that talks”  
   iii. To whom: same  
   iv. How; author language  

b. FTC  
   i. Acclaim  
      1. Quotes: “might be extended an additional one to two months and that it was "more constructive in the long run for negotiators to take the necessary time" to complete complicated annexes that will lay out the specifics of the deal”

c. Values  
   i. Prudence  
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom
24. D  
   i. Who; same  
   ii. What: “Congress”  
   iii. To whom; same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “agreed not to interfere with the negotiations before the
deadline”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale; appeal to fairness
25. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “Obama agreed that Congress”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How; same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes; “could have a month to review the final agreement, during
which he would not lift long-standing, congressionally imposed
sanctions against Iran, regardless of what the negotiated
agreement might specify”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
26. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “If lawmakers do not receive a copy of the agreement and all
technical annexes by July 10, their review period”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “increases to 60 days, taking them beyond their summer
recess and into the fall session”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
27. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “extended review”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would also give those opposed to the deal in this country
more time to build support for a disapproval vote”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

28. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “Congress”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How; same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “has the option, by a simple majority vote, to "disapprove" the agreement and bar the president permanently from lifting statutory sanctions”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

29. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would veto any such measure”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

30. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “White House”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How; same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “accepted the compromise confident that a subsequent vote to override a veto would never garner enough Democratic votes to reach the required two-thirds majority in both Republican-controlled chambers”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

31. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “opponents”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “counting on extra time to make their case”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

32. D
   i. Who; “Mark Dubowitz, executive director of the Foundation for Defense of Democracies”
   ii. What: “potent argument out there that for Democrats facing a deal like this”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes; “may grow increasingly skeptical the more they know . . . the more they understand the scale of U.S. concessions to Iran”
   ii. Attack
      1. Quotes: “his organization "supports a deal, it just doesn't support this emerging deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

33. D
   i. Who; author
   ii. What: “Dylan Williams, J Street vice president of government affairs, said an initial resolution of disapproval”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How; author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would probably pass, at least in the House”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

34. D
   i. Who; “Dylan Williams”
   ii. What: “crucial vote”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “override of a presidential veto”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

35. D
   i. Who; same
ii. What: “if a deal is reached that tracks the terms set forth in the framework”

iii. To whom: same

iv. How: same

b. FTC

i. Acclaim

1. Quotes: “going to be very difficult for those opposed to kill that deal in Congress”

c. Values

i. Prudence

1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

36. D

i. Who: author

ii. What: “William Luers, director of the Iran Project, a high-level group that has long supported negotiations with Iran”

iii. To whom: same

iv. How; author language

b. FTC

i. Acclaim

1. Quotes: “less certain”

c. Values

i. Prudence

1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

37. D

i. Who: same

ii. What: “A delay of a week or so in completing the deal”

iii. To whom: same

iv. How; same

b. FTC

i. Acclaim

1. quotes: “probably doable and I don't think the Democrats will escape”

c. values

i. prudence

1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

38. d

i. who; “Luers”

ii. what: “If it goes on for another month, or two months”

iii. to whom; same

iv. how; interview

b. FTC

i. Acclaim

1. Quotes: “that’s a different order of problem. . . . Then I think the Democrats will not hold the line, and the naysayers . . . will try to start a stampede against it”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Administration”
   iii. To whom: readers of the Washington Post, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “prepares to implement Iran nuclear deal as republicans again fail to stop it”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Following a final failed attempt by Senate Republicans to kill the Iran nuclear agreement Thursday, the administration”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “moved aggressively toward putting it into effect, naming a new czar to oversee implementation and announcing that President Obama would issue waivers suspending all U.S. nuclear-related sanctions on Oct. 18”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “waivers”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will not go into effect until what the agreement itself calls "Implementation Day," when the International Atomic Energy Agency certifies that Iran has complied with all of its obligations -- including removal of 98 percent of its enriched uranium stockpile, shutting down its underground enrichment facility and rendering inoperative the core of a plutonium-capable reactor”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

3. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “Senior administration officials said those processes”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How; same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “could take well into 2016 once they begin next month, under the terms of the deal completed in July”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to patience

4. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “Secretary of State John F. Kerry”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How; same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “appointed a career foreign service officer, Stephen D. Mull, as implementation coordinator among U.S. agencies and negotiating partners, reporting directly to the secretary's office”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Before his most recent job as U.S. ambassador to Poland, Mull”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “played a key role in early negotiations with Iran”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
   i. Who; “Kerry”
   ii. What: “as important as it was to negotiate the nuclear deal with Iran”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: interview
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “implementing it was going to be even more crucial in meeting our national security objectives”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. rationale; appeal to faith

7. d
   i. who; author
   ii. what: “Thursday”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “was the deadline, under legislation negotiated between Obama and Congress, for lawmakers to vote a resolution of disapproval of the deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “If such a vote could be sustained with an override of Obama’s promised veto”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would have prevented the president from exercising provisions allowing him to waive sanctions provisions”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Senate Democrats”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How; same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “blocked a resolution vote, preventing the Republican-backed measure from getting the 60 votes it needed to advance”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
10. **D**
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “Thursday's failed proposal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. **FTC**
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would have also barred any waivers unless Iran recognized Israel and released four American prisoners it is holding”
c. **Values**
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
11. **D**
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Several Democrats who had voted for the previous two measures”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How; same
b. **FTC**
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “joined in rejecting Thursday's attempt”
   ii. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “saying that the Israel and prisoner provisions were outside the scope of what Congress originally agreed to review”
c. **Values**
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
12. **D**
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) said that the Democrats”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How; same
b. **FTC**
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “had "made their choice" and would be as responsible as Obama for a deal that would allow billions of dollars to "flow into Iranian coffers to use for terrorism."”
c. **Values**
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom
13. **D**
   i. Who: same
ii. What: “Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.)”
iii. To whom; same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “called the Republican effort "nothing more than an attempt to extract a political price" from those who have supported the deal all along”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Under provisions of the agreement”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “must be formally adopted by all parties -- including the United States, the five other world powers who participated in the negotiations, and Iran -- 90 days after the U.N. Security Council approved it in July. That day is Oct. 18”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “From then on, said one of several senior administration officials who briefed reporters on implementation steps”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “"the ball is in Iran's court."”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D
i. Who; same
ii. What: “officials”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How; same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “spoke on the condition of anonymity under rules set by the State Department”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “IAEA”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “must verify all compliance steps in the deal have been taken, along with verification that Iran has satisfied the agency’s questions about previous nuclear activities at military installations, "before sanctions relief is offered," an administration official said”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

18. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Implementation day”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “unknown at this point”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Signing of the waivers in advance”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “were included in the deal as a demonstration of good faith as Iran begins its dismantlement”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to faith

20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “the day sanctions are removed, Iranian oil sales and financial transactions with much of the world”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “are free to resume and frozen Iranian assets will be released, although prohibitions against arms sales and the transfer of missile technology will remain in effect for five and eight years, respectively”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

21. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “U.S. interaction with Iran”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How; same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will be limited as sanctions related to Iranian support for terrorism will remain in effect”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, safety

22. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “U.S. waivers”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How; same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “can be reversed if Iran fails to comply with the agreement”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

23. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “administration”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How; same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “must also now turn its attention to preventing the Republican-led Congress from voting new sanctions against Iran or otherwise trying to scotch the deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

24. FTC
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. defense
      1. Quotes: “promised to assuage Israeli opposition to it with new measures to buttress Israeli defenses”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale; appeal to faith

25. FTC
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “One step in that direction”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Obama's invitation to Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu to the White House in November”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “republicans”
   iii. To whom: readers of the Washington Post, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “fumble their chance to focus attention on an Iran deal”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “CONGRESSIONAL REPUBLICANS”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “trying to obstruct President Obama from concluding a nuclear agreement with Iran”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “only tangible result of their efforts”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “to impede serious debate about the legitimate issues arising from the potential deal”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “latest GOP gambit, an open letter to Iran's leaders disparaging any accord not approved by Congress”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
1. Quotes: “prompted predictable blasts of rhetoric from the White House, the Senate caucuses and even the Iranian foreign minister, Mohammad Javad Zarif, but not a word of discussion about what the Republicans say worries them: whether the terms being offered to Iran by the Obama administration are in the United States' interest”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “the Republican maneuver”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “served to focus debate on a perceived breach of diplomatic protocol”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Vice President Biden”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “thundered that "in 36 years in the U.S. Senate, I cannot recall another instance in which Senators wrote directly to advise another country" that the president lacks the authority to sustain an agreement”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “attempts by Congress to undermine a president's controversial foreign policy”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “hardly new”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “2007, then-House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.)”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “responded to a Bush administration policy of isolating Syria by traveling to Damascus to meet with President Bashar al-Assad”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Members of Congress, from both parties”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “frustrated by the administration’s announced intention to implement any deal with Iran without votes in either chamber by using waiver authority to suspend sanctions that were imposed by legislation”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Mr. Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “has the legal authority to proceed in this way, in so doing he risks -- as the letter pointed out -- leaving a tenuous legacy that the next president or Congress could seek to undo”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. d
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “worth recalling that a controversial nuclear accord struck by President Bill Clinton with North Korea”
    iii. To whom: same
iv. how: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “was scrapped by the administration of George W. Bush after it concluded the regime was cheating”
c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness
11. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “not clear how the letter”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes; “advances the opposition's cause”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
12. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “Sen. Bob Corker (R-Tenn.) the Foreign Relations Committee chairman”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “did not sign the letter”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “whether to endorse a deal”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Nor is the document likely to affect the decision of Iran's supreme leader, Ali Khamenei”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
14. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “if the Iranian leader rejects the accord, Tehran”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “will surely pin blame on U.S. Republicans and Mr. Netanyahu, which wouldn't help any effort to sustain international sanctions”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
i. Who; same
ii. What: “Republicans”
iii. To whom; same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “had an opportunity to focus attention on weaknesses in the emerging accord with Iran and mobilize bipartisan pressure on the administration to demand better terms”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. d
i. who: same
ii. what: “Instead”
iii. to whom; same
iv. how; same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “engaged in grandstanding tactics that have alienated potential supporters while obscuring critical issues”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Their antics”
iii. To whom; same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “making it easier rather than harder for Mr. Obama to proceed unilaterally”

c. Values
i. Prudence
1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Bahrain's rulers”
   iii. To whom: readers of the Washington Post, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “flout the U.S. openly”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “GOVERNMENTS ACROSS the Middle East perceive that President Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “has subordinated much of U.S. policy in the region to the goal of completing a nuclear bargain with Iran”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “Policies that might disturb Tehran”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “have been put on hold”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “traditional U.S. allies that are skeptical of the deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “have been promised stepped-up U.S. military assistance”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale; appeal to faith

4. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “One U.S. client that has sized up the situation with particular
cynicism”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Bahrain”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “regime”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “has been harshly repressing opponents calling for greater
political representation for the country's Shiite minority”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale; appeal to fairness

6. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “Regular demonstrations in Shiite areas”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “put down by force; activists are arrested and often
tortured; and opposition politicians and human rights monitors are
prosecuted on trumped-up charges”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

7. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “regime”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “occasionally promised reforms or dialogue with the
         opposition but invariably has failed to follow through”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

8. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “the ruling al-Khalifa family”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How; same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “appears to have concluded that it can afford to flout the
         Obama administration openly”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: [al-Khalifa family]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “expelled the visiting State Department assistant secretary
         for human rights after he met with opposition members, including
         from the al-Wefaq party … arrested the head of the party, Sheikh
         Ali Salman. On Tuesday, a court sentenced Mr. Salman to four
         years in prison on flimsy charges of "inciting hatred" and
         "insulting public institutions."”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale; appeal to fairness

10. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “King Hamad bin Isa al-Khalifa”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “attended a horse show in England rather than the summit
         Mr. Obama held to sell the Iran deal to Persian Gulf leaders … still
         counting on a handsome payoff: U.S. tolerance for the
imprisonment of the country's foremost opposition leader, and more military aid to boot”

c. Values
   i. justice
      1. rationale: appeal to fairness

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “has been encouraged: According to Bloomberg View, Secretary of State John F. Kerry promised Bahrain's foreign minister last month that the administration would work to lift a partial ban on arms sales to the island state, imposed four years ago in reaction to the repression”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “have been held up”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “came before the case of Mr. Salman -- whose arrest the State Department had protested -- had been disposed of, and, according to the Bloomberg View report, before a U.S. inter-agency decision to end the ban had been made”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
i. Who; same
ii. What: “State Department issued a statement on Tuesday saying the administration”
iii. To whom; same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “was "deeply concerned" about Mr. Salman's imprisonment … should be”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “Brian Dooley of Human Rights First observed, the verdict”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “drives Bahrain deeper into political crisis and sweeps any chance of a negotiated settlement off the table" while encouraging "those seeking violent change”

   c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

16. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “That's a problem Mr. Obama”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes; “seems to understand … observed that "the biggest threats that" Persian Gulf states face "may not be coming from Iran invading" but "from dissatisfaction inside their own countries … surely right”

   c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “in its zeal to complete the Iran deal, the administration”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
1. Quotes: “seems to be setting aside the president's wisdom”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Jewish leaders”
   iii. To whom: readers of the *Washington Post*, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “who don't speak for American Jews”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “conflict over the Iran deal”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How; same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “exposed a substantial rift between American Jews and the groups generally known as "the Jewish leadership," "major Jewish organizations" and "influential Jewish organizations."”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “These leaders and groups”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How; same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “not, in fact, leading American Jewish opinion on the Iran deal … defying it … doubtless represent the views of their board members, but those views are at odds with the majority of rank-and-file American Jews, who, in fact, support the deal more than Americans generally”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Many major Jewish organizations”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “oppose the Iran deal … the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), the American Jewish Committee, the Anti-Defamation League and the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
4. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Conference of Presidents”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “explicitly states that it “advances the interests of the American Jewish community”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
5. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Those who support the claims of AIPAC and its allies that dominate the Conference of Presidents”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “often do not pause to note that the largest American Jewish organization to support the Iran deal, J Street, was denied membership in the otherwise inclusive umbrella body last year”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom
6. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “One of us (Cohen)”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “conducted a poll last month for the Jewish Journal on the Iran accord … only poll of American Jews on the subject to
explicitly include Jews with no religion - those who said that, "aside from religion," they "consider themselves Jewish. … asked their opinion of "an agreement . . . in which the United States and other countries would lift major economic sanctions against Iran, in exchange for Iran restricting its nuclear program in a way that makes it harder for it to produce nuclear weapons … Of the three-quarters who said they knew enough to offer an opinion on the deal, 63 percent supported it”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale; appeal to strength

7. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “same polling agency”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How; same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “asked the same questions of a sample of all Americans”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Of those who said they knew enough, 54 percent”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “supported the deal, while 46 percent opposed it. (Only 52 percent of this total sample said they knew enough.”

c. Values
   i. prudence
      1. rationale; appeal to wisdom

9. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “poll”
   iii. to whom; same
   iv. how; same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “asked whether Congress should "vote to approve or oppose the deal.”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
    i. Who; same
    ii. What: “Jews”
    iii. To whom; same
    iv. How; same
    b. FTC
       i. Acclaim
          1. Quotes: “leaned heavily toward approval, 54 percent to 35 percent, with 12 percent undecided”
    c. Values
       i. Fortitude
          1. Rationale: appeal to strength

11. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “national sample”
    iii. To whom; same
    iv. How: same
    b. FTC
       i. Acclaim
          1. Quotes: “divided 41 percent for vs. 38 percent against, with 21 percent undecided”
    c. Values
       i. Prudence
          1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

12. D
    i. Who; same
    ii. What: “Jews”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same
    b. FTC
       i. Acclaim
          1. Quotes: “support the agreement despite their mixed - even skeptical - views of its outcomes”
    c. Values
       i. Fortitude
          1. Rationale: appeal to strength

13. D
    i. Who; same
    ii. What: “whether "this agreement would prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons over the next 10 years or so," just 43 percent”
    iii. To whom; same
    iv. How; same
    b. FTC
       i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “were "somewhat" or "very" confident”
   
ii. Attack
   1. Quotes: “while 54 percent were "not so confident" or "not confident at all."

   c. Values
      i. Fortitude
         1. Rationale: appeal to faith

14. D

   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “more than three-fifths of American Jews who express an opinion”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. quotes: “support the deal, compared with a bit more than half of Americans overall”

c. Values
   i. prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. d

   i. who: same
   ii. what: “Jews”
   iii. to whom; same
   iv. how; same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “far more sharply divided over the deal than non-Jews”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. d

   i. who: same
   ii. what: “The old saw "two Jews, three opinions"”
   iii. to whom; same
   iv. how: same

b. FTC
   i. acclaim
      1. Quotes: “understates the matter”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. D

   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “among the official "Jewish leaders”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How; same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. quotes: “hardly the case”

c. Values
   i. prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “AIPAC says that the deal”
   iii. to whom; same
   iv. how: same

b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “would facilitate rather than prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon and would further entrench and empower the leading state sponsor of terror”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to faith

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “American Jewish Committee says the deal”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “creates only "a temporary freeze" on Iranian nuclear weapons”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. rationale: appeal to faith

20. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “ADL”
   iii. to whom; same
   iv. how: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “agrees that it "represents a pause, not a stop to Iran's nuclear weapons quest.””

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to faith

21. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “None of them”
iii. To whom; same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “offer any plausible alternative means to close the door on that quest”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

22. d
i. who: same
ii. what: “Jewish leadership”
iii. to whom: same
iv. how: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “so unrepresentative of the population it claims to speak for on one of the most consequential and controversial American foreign policy decisions of our time … announce plans to spend more than $20 million on advertising against the deal, while J Street raised $2 million to spend in favor”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

23. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “dominant leadership”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “somewhat older and more conservative than Jews on the whole … disproportionately represents wealthy Jews”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

24. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “wealthy”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “small minority of all Jews, but among all Americans, this is a plutocratic age”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

25. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Those who pay pipers”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “call the tunes”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

26. d
   i. who; same
   ii. what: “Some Democratic members of Congress”
   iii. to whom; same
   iv. how; same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “ignore the fact that among self-described Jewish Democrats polled, about five times as many support the deal as oppose it”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

27. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Of the 10 Jewish senators”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “Schumer is … only one to have formally voiced opposition to the deal … Five support it … remaining four … have yet to declare”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

28. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “that accounts for the disparity between the views of American Jews overall and the views of the Jewish establishment”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same
   b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “those who belong to Jewish organizations (18 percent of all Jews) differ in many ways from those who do not. The affiliated are more affluent (31 percent have incomes of at least $150,000, as opposed to 24 percent among the unaffiliated), more Republican (18 percent vs. 12 percent) and less likely to identify as liberal (46 percent vs. 53 percent). Even in 2013, the organizationally affiliated were more likely to disapprove of President Obama's handing of the Iran issue … affiliated include hardly any of the large minority of Jews who profess no religion. These "Jews with no religion" (JNRs, in Pew's lexicon) did not answer "Jewish" when asked their faith but did say they were Jewish when asked, "Aside from religion, do you consider yourself Jewish or partially Jewish, or not?" These JNRs account for 5 percent of Jewish organization members but more than five times as many (27 percent) nonmembers. In the Jewish Journal survey, while 39 percent of Jews-by-religion want Congress to reject the deal, only half as many (19 percent) of the JNRs are opposed”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

29. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “our survey technique”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How; same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “explicitly included JNRs, other recent surveys on the views of American Jews - such as a July poll commissioned by the Israel Project, which opposes the nuclear deal - rely solely on the religion question to qualify respondents and fail to ask the follow-up: "Aside from religion, do you consider yourself Jewish or partially Jewish?"”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

30. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “Jewish organizations”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “understandably populated by Jews who are more engaged in conventional Jewish life”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

31. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “surveys that purport to delineate American Jewish opinion”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How; same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “frequently ignore what is perhaps the fastest growing "denomination" in American Judaism: Jewish with no religion”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

32. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “the idea that American Jews speak as a monolithic bloc”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “needs very early retirement”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

33. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “their commitment to Israel or the views of its prime minister”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “overwhelms their support for Obama and the Iran deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

34. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “leads, or represents, the world's Jews”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

35. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “unrepresentative "leaders"”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “speak for American Jews generally on the urgent matter of nuclear arms in the Middle East”
   ii. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “may speak for their donors, leaders and members”
   iii. Attack
      1. Quotes: “but they certainly do not speak for the American Jewish public at large and, in particular, the large population of American Jewish liberals who overwhelmingly support the deal and want their senators and representatives to approve it next month”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “GOP 2016 contenders”
   iii. To whom: readers of the Washington Post, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “denounce Iranian nuclear framework deal”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Disgust with the Iranian nuclear framework agreement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “dominated this weekend's meeting of the Republican Jewish Coalition”
   ii. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “as a crop of White House aspirants sought to outdo each other in opposition to the deal before a record crowd”
c. Values
   i. Temperance
      1. Rationale: appeal to tolerance
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Sen. Ted Cruz of Texas”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “declared that he intends "to do everything humanly possible to stop a bad Iran deal."”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

3. D
   i. Who: same
ii. What: “Former Texas governor Rick Perry”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “warned that "tyrants don't abide by agreements."”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Indiana Gov. Mike Pence, another possible 2016 contender”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “pledged that "Israel's enemies are our enemies; Israel's cause is our cause."”

c. Values
i. Fortitude
   1. Rationale: appeal to courage

5. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Their impassioned declarations”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: underscored the political clout of the organization, which includes some of the GOP's largest donors -- particularly casino mogul Sheldon Adelson, the 81-year-old chief executive of the Las Vegas Sands, who Forbes estimates is worth $29.2 billion”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “RJC officials said that the organization”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “has seen a flood of new contributors in recent months as President Obama has clashed with Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu over a proposed deal to curtail Iran's nuclear program”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Nearly 800 people”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “gathered in Las Vegas for the group’s three-day spring leadership meeting, almost double the number who attended last year”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “surge in donations”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “will allow the RJC to mount its biggest voter outreach effort in 2016, the group's executives said”
   c. Values
      i. Fortitude
         1. Rationale: appeal to hope/strength

9. D
   i. Who: “Chairman David Flaum”
   ii. What: [RJC]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “building up our war chest”
   c. Values
      i. Fortitude
         1. Rationale: appeal to strength

10. D
    i. Who: author
    ii. What: “organization”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: author’s language
    b. FTC
       i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “will not take sides in the GOP primary, but 2016 contenders are hoping to win the support of the wealthy individuals who make up the group's leadership”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

11. D
   i. Who: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “have strong supporters on the RJC's heavyweight board, but many on the panel remain neutral, according to people familiar with the dynamics”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “driving concern throughout the group”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “the proposed Iranian deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Many”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “they worry the deal will allow Iran to continue to develop its nuclear capabilities”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
   i. Who: “board member Ari Fleischer”
   ii. What: “fear for Israel's future”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

   b. FTC
      i. attack
      1. Quotes: “sharp … People are scared”

   c. Values
      i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to courage

15. D
   i. Who; author
   ii. What: “Cruz”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

   b. FTC
      i. Attack
      1. quotes: “warned that Israel faces an existential threat from a nuclear Iran”

   c. values
      i. fortitude
      1. rationale: appeal to courage

16. d
   i. who; [Cruz]
   ii. what: “subsequent maps of the world”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: public statement

   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “show a nation of Israel … what the stakes are”

   c. Values
      i. prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. d
   i. who: author
   ii. what: “Perry”
   iii. to whom; same
   iv. how: author language

   b. FTC
      i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “denounced Obama for having "delusional thinking" when it comes to his assessment of global threats adding that "he places naive trust in the ayatollah of Iran."”

   c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Top 2016 contenders who were not in attendance”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “sent emissaries to work the crowd”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
   i. Who: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “handed out "Jeb!" buttons in Hebrew, while Walker
            strategist Rick Wiley mingled with major donors”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Adelson”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “not said whom he will support”
   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

21. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Associates”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “expect him to hold off picking a favorite until the fall,
            after the first few debates”
   c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

22. D
i. Who; same
ii. What: “casino tycoon and his wife, Miriam”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “plowed more than $92 million into efforts to elect Republicans, including a costly effort to boost the long-shot presidential bid of former House speaker Newt Gingrich”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

23. d
i. who; same
ii. what: “This time, advisers say, the bar for support”
iii. to whom; same
iv. how: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will be higher as Adelson weighs who has the best shot of winning the White House”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

24. d
i. who; same
ii. what: “Rubio”
iii. to whom; same
iv. how: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “believed to be one of the leading contenders for his backing”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “odds of an Iran deal”
   iii. To whom: readers of the Washington Post, internet searchers
   iv. How; same
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “rise”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “151 House Democrats”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “signed a letter expressing strong support for President Obama's negotiations with Iran over its nuclear program, improving the chances that an eventual deal could survive the congressional oversight process … significant”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom
2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “If a deal is reached that looks like the recently announced framework, and the GOP-controlled Congress votes to disapprove of it”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How; same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “more likely that there will be enough House Democrats to sustain Obama's veto, allowing the deal to move forward”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. what: “Congress”
   iii. to whom: same
iv. how: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “would vote to approve or disapprove of a final deal, determining whether Obama has the authority to temporarily lift sanctions on Iran to implement it”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “If Congress fails to pass a disapproval measure or if Congress does pass one but fails to override Obama’s veto of it the deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “moves forward”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Of the House Dems who signed the letter, 146”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “are voting members just enough to sustain a veto”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “letter”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “does not commit its signatories to ultimately supporting a final deal … suggests that the members will likely support a deal that looks like the framework the parties already agreed upon (obviously far from a certain outcome)”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
7. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “goal of the letter”
   iii. to whom; same
   iv. how: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “isn't just to signal that a veto would likely be sustained …
         meant to help the talks along”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. d
   i. who; same
   ii. what: “Daryl Kimball, the executive director of the Arms Control
         Association”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “thinks the letter could give U.S. negotiators leverage”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: “Daryl Kimball”
   ii. What: [letter]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will strengthen the hand of U.S. and P5+1 negotiators in
         the final rounds of difficult negotiations with Iran, because it
         reinforces the fact that the Obama administration will likely have
         sufficient political support from Congress to follow through on the
         U.S.’s commitments in the framework agreement … expression of
         congressional support for the framework should make it more
         likely that the negotiators can finalize the remaining details before
         June 30”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

10. D
   i. Who; author
ii. What: “way to go”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “long”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “deal”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “might not be reached at all … might be a bad one that causes some Democrats to defect”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Democratic aides say that a handful of House members”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “signaled support for the negotiations without signing the letter, which could provide a bit of breathing room”

c. Values
i. fortitude
   1. rationale: appeal to hope
I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who; author
   ii. What: “credibility”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “gap”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to faith
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I. Decontextualization: title  
   i. Who; author  
   ii. What: “Iran deal”  
   iii. To whom: readers of the *Washington Post*, internet searchers  
   iv. How: author language  

b. Functional theory categories  
   i. Acclaim  
      1. Quotes: “solid case”  

c. Values  
   i. Prudence  
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom  

1. D: sentence one  
   i. Who: same  
   ii. What: “Prussian King Frederick the Great”  
   iii. To whom: same  
   iv. How: same  

b. FTC  
   i. Acclaim  
      1. Quotes: “offered this rebuke to those who refused to allow any concessions: "If you try to hold everything, you hold nothing."”  

c. Values  
   i. Prudence  
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom  

2. D  
   i. Who: same  
   ii. What: “President Obama”  
   iii. To whom: same  
   iv. How: same  

b. FTC  
   i. Acclaim  
      1. Quotes: “might make a similar retort to Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's attack on the alleged "bad deal" the United States is contemplating with Iran”  

c. Values  
   i. Prudence  
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom  

3. D  
   i. Who: same  
   ii. What: “Netanyahu”  
   iii. To whom: same  
   iv. How: same  

b. FTC  
   i. Attack
1. Quotes: “rejects any concessions that allow Iran to enrich uranium … thinks the U.S. goal of a one-year "breakout" period before Iran could build a bomb isn't enough”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “several leading administration officials”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “respond: Okay, then, what's a better practical idea for controlling Iran's nuclear program? … They grant that their solution isn't perfect. But they argue that it's far better for Israel and the West than any other plausible scenario”
   ii. attack
      1. They see in Netanyahu's maximalist goals an air of unreality - of fantasy, even.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran nuclear talks”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “arguably the most important diplomatic negotiations of the last several decades, will come to a head next month”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Netanyahu”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes: “will take his case against the agreement to Congress on March 3 in an unusual speech organized by the Republican House speaker … leadership will be tested in Israeli elections on March 17”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran negotiations”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will reach a March 24 deadline for the framework of a final comprehensive accord”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Israel's Minister of Intelligence Yuval Steinitz”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “made the case against the Iran agreement in an interview with me last week”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
   i. Who: [Steinitz]
   ii. What: “we made it clear”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “we had reservations about the goal of the negotiations”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Obama's effort to limit the Iranian nuclear program for a decade or so, in the expectation that a future generation of leaders wouldn't seek a bomb”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “too speculative”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “administration's response”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “agreement is better than any realistic alternative … argue it would put the Iranian program in a box, with constraints on all the pathways to making a bomb … would provide strict monitoring and allow intrusive inspection of Iranian facilities”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “If Iran seeks a covert path to building a bomb, the deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “offers the best hope of detecting it”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “If the current talks collapsed, all these safeguards”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would disappear”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iranians”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “could resume enrichment and other currently prohibited activities”

   c. Values
      i. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “In such a situation, the United States and Israel”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would face a stark choice over whether to attack Iranian facilities - with no guarantee that such an attack would set Tehran back more than a few years”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “How these research limits would be monitored and enforced”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “key bargaining issue”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Another critical variable”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “size of the stockpile Iran could maintain; U.S. officials want a very low number, with additional enriched material shipped out of Iran”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
         1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Netanyahu”
iii. To whom; same
iv. How; same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “probably won't address this issue in his speech to Congress, since he insists the only acceptable number of centrifuges is zero”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “length of the agreement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “crucial variable”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “U.S. officials”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “have always spoken of a "double-digit" duration period, somewhere between 10 and 15 years”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

21. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Negotiators”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “exploring the possibility of different phases of the timeline, with inspection provisions having a longer life span than, say, limits on the number of centrifuges”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
22.  
D
   i.  Who: same
   ii. What: “deal-breaker for the administration”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv.  How: same
b. FTC
   i.  Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “if Iran balks at U.S. insistence that sanctions will only be removed step by step, as Iran demonstrates that it's serious about abiding by the agreement”
c. Values
   i.  Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

23.  
d
   i.  who: same
   ii. what: “In the U.S. view, Iran”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv.  how: same
b. FTC
   i.  Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “has to earn its way back to global acceptance”
c. Values
   i.  Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

24.  
D
   i.  Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv.  How: same
b. FTC
   i.  Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “imperfect”
c. Values
   i.  Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

25.  
D
   i.  Who: same
   ii. What: “Peace”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv.  How: same
b. FTC
   i.  Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “does not exist with a revolutionary system”
c. Values
   i.  Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
26. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “U.S. officials”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “make a compelling case that this agreement is a start toward a safer Middle East.”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “House”
   iii. To whom: readers of the Washington Post, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “approves bill to let it review Iran deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “House”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “gave overwhelming approval Thursday to create a congressional review of the potential nuclear power deal with Iran, sending the bill to the White House for President Obama's signature”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “House's 400-to-25 vote”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “concluded months of tense talks between congressional leaders and administration officials over what degree of oversight Congress would have if Obama finalizes a deal with Iranian leaders to ensure their nuclear program won't shift into military use”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: same
ii. What: “Obama”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “agreed to the slightly modified version drafted by Sen. Bob Corker (R-Tenn.), chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, after three months of negotiations led a large number of Democrats to support the plan”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
i. Who: [Sen. Bob Corker (R-Tenn.)]
ii. What: “Republicans and Democrats in both the House and the Senate”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: interview

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “sent a strong message that the American people - through their elected representatives - must have a voice on any final nuclear deal with Iran”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “legislation”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “grants Congress 30 days to review the nuclear deal”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Obama”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “could waive sanctions against Tehran that were imposed by the executive branch but must leave in place sanctions that Congress previously drafted”
values
i. prudence
   1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. d
i. who: same
ii. what: “If the House and the Senate disapprove of the Iran deal, including overcoming a possible presidential veto, then Obama”
iii. to whom: same
iv. how: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “must leave in place those congressionally mandated sanctions”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Any other outcome in Congress”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would allow Obama to go ahead with implementing all aspects of any nuclear deal”

    c. Values
       i. Prudence
          1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “A bloc of House conservatives”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “grew angry when GOP leaders placed the legislation on the fast-track calendar that prohibited any amendments leading 19 Republicans to vote against the Corker bill”

    c. Values
       i. Justice
          1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

10. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Six Democrats who want Obama to have a free hand in his deal-making”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same 

b. FTC 
   i. Attack 
      1. Quotes: “opposed the bill”

c. Values 
   i. Prudence 
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

11. D 
   i. Who: same 
   ii. What: “Senate conservatives” 
   iii. To whom; same 
   iv. How: same

b. FTC 
   i. Acclaim 
      1. Quotes: “nearly derailed the legislation with similar efforts to 
         amend the bill, which Corker maneuvered against because that 
         would have lost most Democratic support and drawn a presidential 
         veto”

c. Values 
   i. Prudence 
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D 
   i. Who; same 
   ii. What: “those supporting Obama's effort to reach a deal and those opposing 
       it”
   iii. To whom; same 
   iv. How: same

b. FTC 
   i. Acclaim 
      1. Quotes: “largely approved of some congressional review”

c. Values 
   i. Prudence 
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D 
   i. Who: “Washington Rep. Adam Smith, the ranking Democrat on the House 
       Armed Services Committee”
   ii. What: “true bipartisan compromise”
   iii. To whom; same 
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC 
   i. Acclaim 
      1. Quotes: “will give Congress the opportunity to review and play an 
         active role in evaluating any agreement with Iran”

c. Values 
   i. Prudence 
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
ii. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

14. D
   i. Who; “House Speaker John A. Boehner (R-Ohio)”
   ii. What: “bipartisan legislation the House passed”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “only way Congress will have that opportunity”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Key senator”
   iii. To whom: readers of the *Washington Post*, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “says to forget the deadline on Iran talks for a better deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. quotes: “urged Secretary of State John F. Kerry to ignore a looming deadline for nuclear negotiations with Iran if that's what it takes to secure a more ironclad deal”

c. values
   i. prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “Sen. Bob Corker (R-Tenn.)
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “spoke with Kerry by phone”
   ii. Attack
      1. Quotes: “thinks the administration is softening its positions in a rush to strike a deal by a self-imposed June 30 deadline”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

3. D
   i. Who: “Corker”
   ii. what: “June 30”
   iii. to whom: same
iv. how: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “artificial deadline”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “If it takes longer to get the right deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “take longer, please. Don't start cutting corners”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: [Corker]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “I know group dynamics; when you're close to the end of a deal, and your aides are pushing part of what's going to be a major legacy, I understand how that can affect things. But please, please stop!”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
   i. who: author
   ii. what: “Going much past the deadline”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “could cause problems for the administration”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Congress”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes; “has 30 days to review any deal and vote, if the lawmakers choose, on a resolution of disapproval … If they get it after July 10, the review period grows to 60 days”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
i. Who; same
ii. What: “Corker's remarks”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “underscore growing concerns in Congress about negotiations with Iran to rein in its nuclear program in exchange for lifting sanctions”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. justice
      1. rationale: appeal to fairness

9. d
i. who; same
ii. what: “United States”
iii. to whom: same
iv. how: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “one of six world powers negotiating with Iran”

c. Values
i. Fortitude
   1. Rationale: appeal to strength

10. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Kerry”
iii. To whom; same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “played a dominant role in the talks, which have produced a temporary framework agreement … expected to join discussions in Europe soon in a push for a final deal”
c. Values
i. Fortitude
   1. Rationale: appeal to strength
ii. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. d
i. who: same
ii. what: “Kerry on Tuesday said the United States”
iii. to whom: same
iv. how: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “more concerned about preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons in the future than with extracting a confession from Iran about past secret work that Iran has long denied conducting”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “One of the sticking points in the talks”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “how much access Iran will grant investigators from the International Atomic Energy Agency trying to account for the "possible military dimensions" of the work, meaning whether Iran was trying to build nuclear weapons”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
ii. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

13. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Kerry's remarks”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “seemed to suggest that the United States could agree to easing sanctions before the IAEA resolves all its outstanding questions”

c. Values
i. Prudence  
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
   i. Who; same  
   ii. What: “Kerry spokesman John Kirby said the secretary's remarks”  
   iii. To whom; same  
   iv. How: same

   b. FTC
   i. defense  
      1. Quotes: “were misinterpreted and the United States would not agree to lift any sanctions before the IAEA gets all the access it seeks”

   c. Values
   i. Prudence  
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
   i. Who; “Kirby”  
   ii. What: “Sanctions-lifting”  
   iii. To whom; same  
   iv. How; interview

   b. FTC
   i. Acclaim  
      1. quotes: “only going to occur as Iran meets agreed-to steps, including addressing the concerns IAEA has over possible military dimensions”

   c. Values
   i. prudence  
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom  
   ii. justice  
      1. rationale; appeal to fairness

16. d  
   i. who: author  
   ii. what: “Corker”  
   iii. to whom; same  
   iv. how: author language

   b. FTC
   i. Acclaim  
      1. Quotes: “heard remarks similar to Kerry's during a series of briefings by administration officials in the past month … written letters he characterized as "strident" to the administration, hoping to stiffen its spine to resist any backsliding”

   c. Values
   i. Prudence  
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom  
   ii. Fortitude  
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength
17. D
   i. Who: [Corker]
   ii. What: [Obama administration]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “have a fixation on 'We don't want to offend Iran's national pride by forcing them to come clean … Are you kidding me”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Corker”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “considers getting Iran to account for its secret weapons work a key issue so nuclear experts can better assess the country's potential ability to build nuclear weapons”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
   i. Who: [Corker]
   ii. What: “experts”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “emphasize it's important to get it on the front end”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Obama's deal with Iran”
   iii. To whom: readers of the Washington Post, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes; “tests politics at home and abroad”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “President Obama's quest to get a deal with Iran on its nuclear program”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “hinges on not only reaching across the aisle in Congress but also across oceans to find common ground with enemies”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “That strategy - which links two themes that have dominated his presidency, a yearning for post-partisan politics and a belief in engagement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “receives a new test Tuesday as the Senate Foreign Relations Committee begins debate on a bill that would severely restrict Obama's ability to cut a nuclear arms deal with Iran”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength
3. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “bill”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. acclaim
      1. quotes: “would veto such a bill”

C. Values
   i. fortitude
      1. rationale: appeal to strength

5. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “issue of Iran”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “pushed Obama's core principles to the limits on two fronts”

C. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “His overtures to Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “inflamed already-simmering partisan politics at home … tested his broader theory of engagement, straining relations with U.S. allies without any guarantee of easing sectarian fighting that appears to be spinning out of control throughout the Middle East”

C. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

7. D
   i. Who: same
ii. What: “Success”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “may be close ... failure looms almost everywhere”

c. Values
i. Fortitude
   1. Rationale: appeal to hope/faith

8. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Even if the Iran deal holds, the result”
iii. To whom; same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “will lack the pomp and promise that mark some of the historic foreign policy of the past, such as President Richard M. Nixon's opening to China ... will be no equivalent of Nixon's walk on the Great Wall or banquet in the Great Hall of the People”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. d
i. who: same
ii. what: “Obama”
iii. to whom: same
iv. how: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “will not stroll through the ruins of Persepolis or dine in Qom”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
i. Who: “Richard H. Solomon, former president of the U.S. Institute of Peace and a former U.S. ambassador who worked with then-national security adviser Henry Kissinger on Nixon's trip to China”
ii. What: “big disappointment for Obama”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: interview

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “what he was hoping would be his signature foreign policy agreement, even if he gets a deal, will be one that generates
enormous opposition abroad and political discord at home … Internationally, it's going to mean further gaps and tensions, not just with the Israelis, but with a number of the Sunni states”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “began his presidency's seventh year with high hopes and an impassioned plea for what he called a "better politics" to replace the partisan divisions that have marked much of his time in office”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

12. D
   i. Who: “Obama”
   ii. What: “imagine”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “if we broke out of these tired old patterns … if we did something different”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Republicans”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “did, indeed, produce something "different" - an open letter, signed by 47 GOP senators, that sought to undermine the talks by warning that a future president or Congress could undo any nuclear deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. d
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “stopped talking about a "better politics."”

15. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. what: “White House”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will be scrambling simultaneously to stop or alter legislation that could prompt the Iranians to back out of the deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. what: “biggest worry”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “the Senate Foreign Relations Committee bill, sponsored by committee Chairman Bob Corker (R-Tenn.)”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “praised Corker as "a good and decent man" and spoke with him by phone Wednesday as part of an effort to find common ground”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Some Democrats”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “want to strip the terrorism portion out of the bill”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “some Republicans”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would go even further”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

20. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.)”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would demand that Iran explicitly recognize Israel's right to exist”
c. Values
   i. justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

21. d
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “If Obama's outreach to Congress fails”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “could doom the Iran accord and extend bitter partisan infighting far beyond "the water's edge," where, in the mid-1940s, Republican Sen. Arthur Vandenberg famously said it should end”
c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

22. D
   i. Who; “Earnest”
   ii. What: “Essentially”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. Quotes: “we would have 535 secretaries of state … Not just one”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

23. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Such an outcome”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “would damage not only relations with Iran, but with Britain, France and Germany - members of a group that also includes Russia and China and that has been negotiating alongside the United States”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

24. D
   i. Who: “Charles W. Freeman, Jr., former U.S. ambassador to Saudi Arabia”
   ii. What: “impact on alliance structure”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “would be devastating … Who would trust us after that”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

25. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “coming months”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “will also test Obama's broader world view that "principled" engagement - even with America's longest-standing enemies such as Cuba and Burma, also called Myanmar - can produce sweeping change”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

26. D
   i. Who; [Obama]
   ii. What: “engagement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “more powerful force than isolation”

   c. Values
      i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength

27. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “view”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

   b. FTC
      i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “born in part of Obama's criticism of President George W. Bush's strategy of removing dictators by force, in the hope that democratic leaders, with help from the United States, would come forward”

   c. Values
      i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

28. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “On Iran, Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “navigated this issue carefully, saying the framework deal was primarily about stopping Iran from producing a nuclear weapon and heading off an arms race in one of the most unstable regions of the world … voiced repeatedly the hope that an Iran free of sanctions and open to Western investment would change, spending more money on improving living standards and less on destabilizing proxy militias and terrorist groups”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. rationale: appeal to fairness, safety
   iii. Fortitude
      1. rationale: appeal to hope

29. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “nuclear deal”
   iii. to whom; same
   iv. how: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “seems just as likely to increase tribal infighting between Iran and America's allies abroad”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

30. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “Saudi Arabia”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “remains deeply suspicious of Iranian intentions”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust

31. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Before the framework was complete, a former Saudi intelligence chief, Prince Turki al-Faisal”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. acclaim
      1. quotes: “warned that a flawed deal could spark a global nuclear arms race”

c. values
   i. prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

32. d
   i. who; same
   ii. what: “Kerry”
iii. to whom; same
iv. how: same

b. FTC
i. Defense
   1. Quotes: “traveled to Riyadh, the Saudi capital, to calm nerves, assuring Saudi leaders that the nuclear deal would not mean a U.S. rapprochement with Iran - and that the old divisions Obama once talked about overcoming would remain comfortably and familiarly intact”

   c. Values
      i. Fortitude
         1. Rationale: appeal to faith

33. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “has begun providing weapons and intelligence to help Saudi Arabia in its battle against Iranian-supported Houthi fighters in Yemen”

   c. Values
      i. Fortitude
         1. Rationale: appeal to faith

34. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. what: “Pentagon”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “would expedite weapons deliveries to the Saudis and that it was using air-refueling planes to support the Saudi-led coalition conducting airstrikes in Yemen”

   c. Values
      i. Fortitude
         1. Rationale: appeal to faith

35. D
   i. Who: Same
   ii. What: “Saudi Arabia”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “has given the nuclear deal tepid support”
c. Values
   i. prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

36. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “state news agency said that the kingdom's council of ministers”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “expressed hope for attaining a binding and definitive agreement" and stressed a need for "good neighborliness and non-interference in the affairs of Arab states."

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

37. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “statement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “hinted at an important question: How far will U.S. engagement go? Should the technical details of an agreement be linked to understandings about Iran's conduct in the region - where it lends support to allies such as Hamas, Hezbollah, the Iraqi government and Houthi rebels while questioning Israel's right to exist?”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

38. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama has said that those sorts of demands”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “would torpedo the preliminary deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

39. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “president”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “promised to bolster security assistance to America's Arab allies so that they can better defend themselves against what he said are some "very real external threats." … principally means Iran … vowed new efforts to make sure that the Israeli people are "absolutely protected." … hopes that Iran will keep at home whatever money it gets from a full or partial lifting of economic sanctions”

c. Values
i. Fortitude
   1. Rationale: appeal to faith
ii. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

40. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Some critics”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “doubt that will be the case”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

41. D
i. Who: “Tamara Cofman Wittes, a former top Obama administration State Department official and director of the Center for Middle East Policy at the Brookings Institution”
ii. What: [Iran]
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: interview

b. FTC
i. acclaim
   1. Quotes: “it's an authoritarian regime”
ii. attack
   1. Quotes: “has never focused on its people and sanctions relief won't change it.”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom
ii. Justice
1. Rationale: appeal to justice

42. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “extra money that comes from lifting sanctions”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would give Iran more resources to fund proxy fighters and terror groups”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

43. D
   i. Who: [Tamara Cofman Wittes]
   ii. What: [Iran]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will react to a nuclear deal by acting more aggressively in other domains”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

44. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “such an outcome”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “doesn't mean the nuclear deal is a bad idea … puts new pressure on the Obama administration to articulate a clearer vision for how it plans to counter Hezbollah and Iranian influence, especially in Syria where critics have said that the administration lacks a coherent strategy”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

45. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “matters that the administration”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “has to be willing to up its game in the region”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

I. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Obama, Cameron”
   iii. To whom: readers of the Washington Post, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

b. Functional theory categories
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “warn congress that more sanctions could endanger talks with Iran”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “sternly warned Congress on Friday that he would veto proposed bipartisan legislation to impose additional sanctions on Iran”

   ii. attack
      1. Quotes: “saying such a move would undermine talks over Tehran's nuclear program and risk setting up a military confrontation”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength
   ii. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: “Obama”
   ii. What: “main message to Congress at this point”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “hold your fire”

c. Values
   i. Temperance
      1. Rationale; appeal to patience
3.  
   D  
   i.  Who; “Obama”  
   ii. What; “said to my [Senate] Democratic Caucus colleagues”  
   iii. To whom; same  
   iv. How; public statement  

b. FTC  
   i. Acclaim  
      1. Quotes; “I will veto a bill that comes to my desk … respectfully request them to hold off for a few months to see if we have the possibility of solving a big problem without resorting potentially to war”  

c. Values  
   i. Prudence  
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom  
   ii. Temperance  
      1. Rationale; appeal to patience  

4.  
   D  
   i. Who; author  
   ii. What; “United States and Britain”  
   iii. To whom; same  
   iv. How; author language  

b. FTC  
   i. Quotes; “among the nations engaged in talks with Iran aimed at preventing Tehran from developing the capacity to produce nuclear arms”  

c. Values  
   i. Prudence  
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom  

5.  
   D  
   i. Who; same  
   ii. What; “talks”  
   iii. To whom; same  
   iv. How; same  

b. FTC  
   i. Acclaim  
      1. Quotes; “follow significant economic sanctions imposed by the United States and an international coalition”  

c. Values  
   i. Prudence  
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom  

6.  
   D  
   i. Who; same  
   ii. What; “Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle”  
   iii. To whom; same  
   iv. How; same  

b. FTC  
   i. Acclaim
1. Quotes: “called for more sanctions”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “negotiations”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “have less than a 50-50 chance of succeeding, he emphasized that Iran has frozen development of some of its nuclear capability while the talks continue”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale; appeal to hope

8. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “Obama and Secretary of State John F. Kerry”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. quotes; “announced recently that the talks would be extended for a few more months after the two sides failed to meet an initial deadline to complete a deal”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale; appeal to hope

9. d
   i. who; same
   ii. what: “Cameron”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes; “agreed with Obama and acknowledged that he had called U.S. senators to lobby them directly”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

10. D
    i. Who; “Cameron”
    ii. What: “More sanctions”
    iii. To whom: same
iv. How: interview
b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “would fracture the international unity which has been so valuable in presenting a united front to Iran”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

11. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “if diplomacy fails, other actions”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will be explored, and it would not immediately spur the United States into a conflict with Iran”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to hope

12. D
   i. Who: “Obama”
   ii. What: [war footing with Iran]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. quotes: “not, repeat, not suggesting that we are in immediate war footing should negotiations with Iran fail”
c. values
   i. Fortitude
      1. rationale: appeal to hope

13. d
   i. who: author
   ii. what: “Sen. Bob Corker (R-Tenn.), chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “spoke with Cameron about the issue … developing additional legislation that would require the administration to gain approval from Congress for a final nuclear deal with Iran”
c. Values
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i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D

i. Who: “Corker”
   ii. What: [congressional involvement]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “Congress should be in position to approve any final deal that doesn't interfere with the negotiations and strengthens the administration's hand … approve civilian nuclear deals with India and Vietnam. Something of this magnitude, Congress should play a role”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D

i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Obama said Friday that additional sanctions”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “would give Iran an excuse to break off the nuclear talks while blaming the United States … if the talks fail to bring a deal, he would be "the first to come to Congress about the need to tighten the screws."”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D

i. Who: same
   ii. What: “remarks”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “came a day after Obama delivered a blunt, face-to-face warning to fellow Democrats at the retreat in Baltimore”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. D

i. Who: same
   ii. What: “push for more sanctions on Iran”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “enjoys significant support from Democrats, and Sen. Robert Menendez (D-N.J.) is one of the lead authors of a new sanctions bill”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength

18. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “a question on Iran from Menendez”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “prompted a blunt exchange between them”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
   i. Who: “one attendee”
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “was very firm and so was Menendez, but it was not heated or contentious”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

20. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Obama and Cameron”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “pledged Friday to strengthen partnerships to protect against cyberattacks that pose national security threats, promising greater information-sharing and beefed up cybersecurity”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to faith
21. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “Cameron”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “critical of companies encrypting information, saying it prevents intelligence agencies from gaining access to data that could be used in counterterrorism operations”
   ii. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “suggested this week that he would consider banning applications such as WhatsApp or Apple iMessage if intelligence agencies cannot intercept communications”

22. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Obama”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “did not endorse or criticize Cameron's views on encryption, but the president said that if "we get into a situation in which the technologies do not allow us at all to track somebody that we're confident is a terrorist . . . that's a problem.”

23. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “men”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “spoke of the need to counter extremists in the wake of deadly attacks in Paris last week and police raids in Belgium”

24. D
   i. Who: “Obama”
ii. What: “phenomenon of violent extremism, the ideology, the networks, the capacity to recruit young people”

iii. To whom; same

iv. How: public statement

b. FTC

i. Acclaim

1. Quotes: “metastasized and it is widespread, and it has penetrated communities around the world … do not consider it an existential threat … will ultimately be destroyed”

c. Values

i. Prudence

1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

25. D

i. Who: author

ii. What: “countries”

iii. To whom; same

iv. How: author language

b. FTC

i. Acclaim

1. Quotes: “must remain vigilant against the threat and that they would not be cowed by extremist groups, including the Islamic State in the Middle East and Boko Haram in West Africa”

c. Values

i. Temperance

1. Rationale: appeal to vigilance

ii. Prudence

1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

26. D

i. Who: same

ii. What: “Cameron”

iii. To whom; same

iv. How: same

b. FTC

i. Acclaim

1. Quotes: “spoke of "countering this poisonous, fanatical death cult of a narrative that is perverting the religion of Islam."”

c. Values

i. Prudence

1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

27. D

i. Who: same

ii. What: “one advantage the United States has in combating homegrown terror”

iii. To whom; same

iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “America's Muslims "feel themselves to be Americans."
The country's tradition of assimilation is "probably our greatest
   strength," he said.”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Administration, lawmakers”
   iii. To whom: readers of the Washington Post, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language

2. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “clash over Iran policy”

3. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “lawmakers”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

5. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “clashed with top administration officials over U.S. strategy in nuclear talks with the Islamic republic and indicated that they would drive headlong toward tougher legislation”

6. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “The determination of a group of bipartisan lawmakers to pass measures they believe will raise pressure on Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

8. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “escalates a high-stakes battle with the Obama administration”

9. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

10. D
    i. Who: same
    ii. What: “White House”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “warned that new sanctions will scuttle hopes of reaching
         an agreement with Iran and unravel an international coalition
         enforcing existing sanctions”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “members of Congress, including Obama's nominal Democratic
        allies on foreign policy”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “expressed no willingness on Wednesday to cede the issue
         of how to best deal with Iran”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. rationale; appeal to wisdom

5. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “Sen. Bob Corker (R-Tenn.), chairman of the Foreign Relations
        Committee”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. quotes: “wants the administration to submit any final deal to
         Congress for approval”

c. values
   i. prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. d
   i. who: same
   ii. what: “Other key lawmakers”
   iii. to whom: same
   iv. how: same
b. FTC
   i. Quotes: “want legislation that would impose a series of escalating
         penalties should the talks fail”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

7. D
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “suggested a nonbinding resolution stating Congress's intent to impose crippling sanctions if negotiations fail”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “members from both sides of the aisle”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “insisting on a role in shaping the outcome of the talks”
   ii. attack
      1. Quotes: “pushing back against the administration's appeal to give diplomacy room to work”

9. D
   i. Who; “Sen. Robert Menendez, the ranking Democrat on the Foreign Relations Committee”
   ii. What: [talks]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “moving closer to their [the Iranians'] positions on all key elements … more I hear from the administration in its quotes, the more it sounds like talking points that come straight out of Iran”

10. D
    i. Who: author
    ii. What: “Administration officials”
    iii. To whom: same
    iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Attack
1. Quotes: “insisted that further sanctions or other pressure would only risk undermining the diplomatic effort by the world powers”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

11. D
   i. Who: “Deputy Secretary of State Antony J. Blinken”
   ii. what: “intent”
   iii. to whom; same
   iv. how: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “is to further increase pressure on Iran and, in so doing, strengthen the hand of our negotiators”

   ii. Attack
      1. Quotes: “administration believes that additional sanctions are unnecessary at this time and "risk unraveling" the current sanctions regime”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “well aware that the sword of Damocles hangs over its head … needs no new sanctions”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
   i. Who; author
   ii. What: “Menendez, of New Jersey”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “drafted legislation with Republican Sen. Mark Kirk of Illinois, who sits on the Banking Committee, that would not impose sanctions for the duration of the talks”

   ii. Attack
      1. Quotes: “if the negotiations fail, the bill would reimpose sanctions lifted in the interim and escalate them in a series of steps”
Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
ii. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to fairness

14. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “high emotions on display during the hearing”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “suggest that both sides are girding for battle”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “aides to House Speaker John A. Boehner (R-Ohio)”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “announced that he is inviting Israel Prime Minister
         Benjamin Netanyahu to address a joint session of Congress on Feb.
         11 on the threats posed by Iran and radical Islam”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

16. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Netanyahu”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “skeptical of the talks and has taken the position that any
         agreement should not leave Iran as a "nuclear threshold" country,
         one that could move to acquire nuclear weapons quickly”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. D
   i. Who: “Robert Einhorn, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution and a
      former member of the U.S.team negotiating with Iran”
   ii. What: “majority in congress”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: interview

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “in support of additional sanctions ... whether they have
      the 67 votes to override a veto is another story. The administration
      will go all out to gain the necessary 34 votes to sustain a veto.”

c. Values
i. Fortitude
   1. Rationale: appeal to strength

18. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “Administration officials”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “reiterated their position that an interim deal between Iran
      and six world powers in November 2013 has frozen Iranian nuclear
      activity in several key respects, including forcing the regime to
      reduce the size of its stockpile of enriched uranium ... making
      progress toward a final agreement, even as "real gaps" remain”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

19. D
i. Who: “Blinken”
ii. What: “assessment”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: interview

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “credible chance to reach a deal that's in the best interests
      of America's security, as well as that of our allies and partners”

c. Values
i. Fortitude
   1. Rationale: appeal to hope

20. D
i. Who; author
ii. what: “goal”
iii. to whom: same
iv. how: author language

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “reach agreement on core elements by the end of March,
      with an agreement on technical details by July ... elements would
include provisions to cut off Iran's pathways to obtain fissile material for a nuclear weapon; strict requirements of international access to facilities; and confidence that if Iran broke its commitments, it would take at least one year to produce enough fissile material for a bomb"

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

21. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Iran's economy”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “severely hurt by financial, banking, oil and trade sanctions, whose impact was exacerbated by a steep drop in oil prices”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

22. D
   i. Who: “David Cohen, Treasury undersecretary for terrorism and financial intelligence”
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “negotiating with its back against the wall”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

23. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Iran”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: author language
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “still . . . stiff-arming” nuclear inspectors who are seeking access to Iranian facilities”

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

24. D
i. Who; same
ii. What: “crucial”
iii. To whom; same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “for Congress to sign off on any final agreement”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

25. D
i. Who: [Corker]
ii. What: “yet to talk to anyone who”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: interview

b. FTC
i. Defense
   1. Quotes: “has said our weighing in would jeopardize the negotiations”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

26. D
i. Who: author
ii. what: “Corker”
iii. to whom: same
iv. how: same

b. FTC
i. acclaim
   1. Quotes: “threatened to pull the national security waivers that Congress granted the administration in sanctions legislation, which allow the president to waive sanctions if doing so is important to national security”

c. Values
i. fortitude
   1. Rationale: appeal to strength

27. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “waivers”
iii. To whom; same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “key to any deal that would involve suspending sanctions at the president's discretion”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

28. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “administration's concern”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. attack
      1. quotes: “Corker's idea "could set a precedent for future executive branch action" and undermine the "executive prerogatives" to conclude agreements in national security without formal congressional approval”

c. values
   i. prudence
      1. rationale: appeal to wisdom
https://search.proquest.com/docview/1696123635?accountid=26417

1. Decontextualization: title
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Clinton”
   iii. To whom: readers of the *Washington Post*, internet searchers
   iv. How: author language
b. Functional theory categories
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “making a sales pitch for the agreement”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

1. D: sentence one
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Former secretary of state Hillary Rodham Clinton”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “now helping to lead the sales effort for it - both with her own party and the electorate at large”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

2. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “The 2016 Democratic presidential front-runner's endorsement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How; same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “stands against nearly unanimous Republican opposition, led by denunciations from the large and growing field of GOP candidates”
c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to courage

3. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “clash”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “offers further evidence that foreign policy could loom as a crucial issue in the election”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

4. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “Clinton's endorsement”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “underscores the degree to which her political fortunes have been joined with Obama's legacy”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

5. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “given how the two tangled over Iran during the 2008 race for the Democratic nomination, with Clinton dismissing Obama's talk of overtures to Iran as "irresponsible and, frankly, naive."”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “ironic turn”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

6. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “Clinton”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “took credit Tuesday for "having been part of building the coalition that brought us to the point of this agreement." … spoke supportively of the deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

7. D
   i. Who; “Clinton”
ii. What: “Based on what I know now”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: public statement

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “this is an important step in putting the lid on Iran’s nuclear program”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

8. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: “Clinton”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “said the key questions now are the degree to which the agreed-upon terms are enforced and whether Iran continues its "bad behavior" in other areas, including sponsoring terrorism, undermining other governments in the Middle East, human rights violations and threatening Israel”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

9. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Republican candidates”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “offered near-apocalyptic assessments of the agreement, which will go forward unless Congress can muster two-thirds veto-proof majorities to oppose it in both houses”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

10. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Sen. Ted Cruz (Tex.)”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same

b. FTC
i. Attack
1. Quotes: “called the deal a "fundamental betrayal of the security of the United States and of our closest allies."

c. Values
   i. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to trust, safety

11. D
   i. Who: same
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “told MSNBC that it ensures "that the Arabs will go nuclear" and is "a death-over-time sentence to Israel if they don't push back.""

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Justice
      1. Rationale: appeal to fairness, trust

12. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “Former Florida governor Jeb Bush”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Attack
         1. Quotes: “said it "paves Iran's path to a bomb.""

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

13. D
   i. Who: same
   ii. What: “influential Republican leaders in Congress”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: same
   b. FTC
      i. Acclaim
         1. Quotes; “took a somewhat more measured tone”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

14. D
   i. Who; “Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Bob Corker (Tenn.)”
   ii. What: [himself]
iii. To whom; same
iv. How: interview

b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “I want to read the agreement in detail and fully understand it”
ii. Attack
   1. Quotes: “but I begin from a place of deep skepticism that the deal actually meets the goal of preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

15. D
   i. Who; author
   ii. What: “Sen. Rand Paul (Ky.)”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How; author language
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “Notably silent”
c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

16. D
   i. Who: “Drew Ivers, who was Iowa chairman for the 2012 presidential campaign of Paul's father, former congressman Ron Paul (R-Tex.)”
   ii. What: “small-government group”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How: interview
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “doesn't want him to be a knee-jerk militarist. I don't think he wants to be, either … can of worms for him, whether to show thoughtful statesmanship versus dried-out partisanship”
c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

17. D
   i. Who: author
   ii. What: “Reservations on Capitol Hill”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How; author language
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “not confined to Republicans”
c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

18. D
   i. Who; “Sen. Robert Menendez (N.J.), a Democrat on the Foreign Relations Committee”
   ii. What: “deal”
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview
b. FTC
   i. Attack
      1. Quotes: “concerned that the deal ultimately legitimizes Iran as a threshold-nuclear state … concerned the red lines we drew have turned into green lights; that Iran will be required only to limit rather than eliminate its nuclear program”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
   ii. Fortitude
      1. rationale: appeal to courage

19. d
   i. who: author
   ii. what: “If Clinton were elected”
   iii. to whom; same
   iv. how: author language
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes; “she would have to implement the deal, which is one reason her assessment carries such weight with her fellow Democrats”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

20. D
   i. Who; “Rep. Steve Israel (D-N.Y.)”
   ii. What: [Clinton]
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How; interview
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes; “one of the two most important and most influential voices of this debate, the other being President Obama”

c. Values
   i. Fortitude
      1. Rationale: appeal to strength

21. D
i. Who: author
ii. What: [Steve Israel]
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: author language

b. FTC
i. Attack
   1. Quotes: “remains "skeptical" of the Iran deal”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

22. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Public polls show that majorities or pluralities of Americans”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “support the broad outlines of a deal with Iran that would lift economic sanctions in exchange for restrictions on or inspections of its nuclear program”

ii. Attack
   1. Quotes: “also indicate that most do not trust Iran to abide by the terms of an agreement”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom
ii. Justice
   1. Rationale: appeal to trust

23. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Duke University professor Peter D. Feaver”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
i. Acclaim
   1. Quotes: “said that as debate over the deal goes forward, the political advantage is likely to rest on whichever side frames the choice”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

24. D
i. Who: same
ii. What: “Obama”
iii. To whom: same
iv. How: same
b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “will prevail if Americans consider the Iran deal an alternative to further military conflict in the region, Feaver said”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom

25. D
   i. Who; same
   ii. What: “Republicans”
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How; same

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “could win the argument if they are convinced that tougher negotiations could have produced a better deal”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

26. D
   i. Who; “Feaver”
   ii. What: [deal]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How; interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “It's a jump ball, and it's not untethered to facts on the ground … Iran's behavior going forward also will be a factor”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

27. D
   i. Who; author
   iii. To whom; same
   iv. How; author language

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes: “strolled out of a Democratic lunch with her and told reporters he welcomed Clinton "back to the United States Senate … went on to sketch out the areas where he and Clinton disagree, including on trade policy, climate policy, financial regulation and her past support for the Iraq war … drawing large crowds of progressives on the campaign trail - said he said hello to Clinton in the luncheon but did not question her”

c. Values
i. Prudence
   1. Rationale: appeal to wisdom

28. D
   i. Who; [Sanders]
   ii. What: [himself]
   iii. To whom: same
   iv. How: interview

b. FTC
   i. Acclaim
      1. Quotes; “known the secretary for 25 years … I like her, I respect her, and I hope that we can run a campaign where we can express the differences of opinion that we have and do it in a way that is straightforward”

c. Values
   i. Prudence
      1. Rationale; appeal to wisdom