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ABSTRACT

This research which adapts a critical approach to analyze written discourse is intended to take the explanations and interpretations of the ideological relationships to the more applied spheres of translation. The competent translator goes through a seemingly roundabout process of analysis transfer and restructuring in order to achieve dynamic equivalence. Awareness of the complexity of the translation process and avoidance of the simplistic view which regard translation of political discourse as the mere process of transferring words from one text to another will result in realizing the importance of the ideology underlying a translation. In the present study we examined how underlying, socially shared representations as well as personal models may influence the structures of discourse. Through an analysis of the ideologically based discourse of politics in the editorial articles in newspapers all with the same subject, we have obtained some insight into how various categories in different levels of discourse play a role in the production of meaning. The empirical implications of this study draw out attention to the importance of acquiring critical awareness of power and ideological relationship in political discourse. We have obtained some insights on why the knowledge of both micro- and macro-text processing and awareness about the process of naturalization of ideologies on discourse levels should form an essential portion of the translator’s skills. On the other hand, the competent translator should also be able to denaturalize the discourse devices used to persuade the audience.
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1. INTRODUCTION

It is mainly in discourse that ideologies are transmitted and meanings and values are learned and taught. The most important social institution in bringing off these processes in contemporary studies is the mass media including newspapers. We live in an age of great change and instability in which the forms of power and domination are being radically reshaped in which changing cultural practices are a major constituent of social change. It means changing practices of language use and one of the main uses of language is translation.

One of the crucial social practices influenced by ideologies is discourse, which in turn also influences how we acquire, learn or change ideologies. Much of our discourse, especially when we speak as members of groups, expresses ideologically biased opinions. Some discourse genres, such as newspapers and political propaganda have the explicit aim of teaching ideologies to group members and newcomers. Thus ideologies are not innate, but learnt, and precisely the content and form of such discourse may be more or less likely to form intended mental models of social events, which finally may be generalized and abstracted to social representations and ideologies (Van Dijk, 2000).

Without a doubt, raising awareness about power relations embedded in discourse is important for translators. It seems that critical awareness of these relations can be useful in developing special language skills. Hence studies of CDA’s aims should be taken beyond the explanations and interpretations of the relationship between ideology and power to the more applied spheres of both applied linguistics and Translation Studies.

This paper is intended to take the explanations and interpretations of the ideological relationships to the more applied spheres of translation. The competent translator goes through a seemingly roundabout process of analysis, transfer and restructuring in order to achieve the dynamic equivalence. The analysis of a text in the source language must not be limited to a study of syntactic units or dominate meanings of the same units. Awareness of complexity of translation process and avoidance of the simplistic view of regarding translation of political discourse as
mere process of transferring words from one text to another will result in realizing the importance of the ideology underlying translation. Behind every one of the translator’s selections, as what to add, what to leave out, which words to choose and how to place them, there is a voluntary act that reveals the socio-political milieu that surrounds him.

Dominant writers may effectively limit the communicative goals of others and indirectly manage the public mind. They may do so by making use of semantic figures, argumentative strategies or rhetorical structures that manipulate the mental models of the audience in such a way that preferred social cognition, i.e. attitudes, ideologies, norms and values (ultimately in the interests of the dominant group) tend to be developed.

Most of the translators are not aware of the bias and ideologies which are hidden in the words of discourse, especially when their first language is the dominated language and they are translating a political text to a hegemonic culture. We assume that basic norms and values are involved in the formation of ideologies. But what social conditions a group must satisfy, what categories a writer should use to naturalize his or her ideology and achieve power, and how aware and critical a translator should be about the ideology masked by different strategies and categories, most of translators do not know exactly. Not having this knowledge make them yield to power of language. If the translators do not learn the strategies of presenting ideologies in a special discourse like politics in the press, it would be rather difficult for them to comprehend these texts. Besides, not being able to use these devices in different levels of a discourse can be a disadvantage for translators.

2. POLITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Political discourse can be described as “a complex form of human activity” which is based on the recognition that politics cannot be conducted without language. Politics is the use of language in the constitution of social groups. PDA, to put it simply, is the analysis of political discourse and relies on translation which can highlight socio-cultural and political practices, norms, constraints of political
discourse. Therefore, the scientific combination of concepts and methods of modern Translation Studies and Political Discourse Analysis can result in a more extensive study of political discourse (Chilton and Schäffner, 1997).

2.1. Political Discourse

Politics refers to people and the lives they lead in organized communities rather than more narrowly to the battle ground of conventional party politics. Politics like all other social activities has its own code, a language variety particular to a specific group. Discourse as one of these rituals needs detailed analysis. Although the study of the relationship between language and power began a long time ago, the detailed and subtle approach from a critical point of view is certainly new. Looking at the way the language reflects the ideological position of those who have created it and how the ideological position of the readers will affect their response is very significant (Beard, 2000).

The media play an important role in conveying opinions of politicians. Many studies have illustrated how media discourses transport ideological meanings in many different countries and cultures (Wodak, 1995). Newspapers represent the news often in a way that intends to guide the ideological stance of the reader. The editorials as personal opinion texts are good examples of political texts. Opinions and ideologies have prominent social, political and cultural functions. In our case opinions and ideologies regarding the topic of nuclear activities of Iran as one of the most controversial and important topics during the recent years are expressed in the socially and culturally relevant genre of newspaper editorials.

The purpose of a critical analysis of political jargon is to represent how a political group and is protagonists act upon their surroundings by means of the power and dynamics of their language (Wodak & Ludwig, 1999). Political commitment as one of the aims of CDA includes uncovering inequality and injustice, denaturalizing ideologies, demystifying dominance & power structures, and making the latter conscious to those who suffer under oppression. Political jargon can be analyzed on the lexical, syntactic and textual level (Wodak, 1986).
2.2. Critical Analysis of Political Discourse

Discourses as ubiquitous ways of knowing, valuing, and experiencing the world can be used for an assertion of power and knowledge, for resistance and critique, for regulation and normalization and for hegemony (Luke, 1997). Discourses are used in everyday texts to build power and knowledge, to develop new knowledge and power relations and to express oneself using words (McGregor, 2003). Discourse is to be seen as a form of social action, always determined by values and social norms, by conventions (as naturalized ideologies) and social practices, and always delimited and influenced by power structures and historical processes (Wodak, 1995).

The objective of a political discourse analysis which adopts critical goals is to denaturalize ideologies. Denaturalization involves showing how social structures determine properties of discourse and how discourse determines social structures (Fairclough, 1995). According to Fairclough (1989), CDA aims to systematically explore how these non-transparent relationships are factors in securing power and hegemony and it draws attention to power imbalances, social inequities, non-democratic practices, and other injustices in hopes of spurring people to correction actions. A critical discourse analyst should be able to differentiate ideology from knowledge so the concept of discourse is essential for a scientific understanding of discourse (Van Dijk, 2001).

Our words (written or oral) are used to convey a broad sense of meanings and the meaning we convey with those words is identified by our immediate social, political, and historical conditions. Our words are never neutral (Fiske, 1994). Translators should never again speak, or read/hear others’ words, without being conscious of the underlying meaning of the words. Their words can be politicized, even if they are not aware of it, because words carry the power that reflects the interests of those who speak. Opinion leaders, courts, government, editors, translators, even family and consumer scientists, play a crucial role in shaping issues and in setting the boundaries of legitimate discourse (Henry & Tator, 2002).
Discourses always involve power and ideologies, and because translators have different backgrounds, knowledge, and power positions, they can be interpreted differently by them. Therefore, we do not have the “right” interpretation whereas a more or less plausible or adequate interpretation is likely (Fairclough, 2002; Wodak & Ludwig, 1999).

2.2.1. Concept of Ideology

Ideology is a system of ideas which constitutes and pilots the large power blocks of our society. Language is a medium of ideological forces. It serves to legitimize relations of organized power. Insofar as the legitimating of power relations is not articulated, language is also ideological (Heberman, 1973). A language ideology can be a ‘correct’ conceptualization of language or it can dissent from the facts, and be a fallacious interpretation of language (Seargeant, 2009). Ideologies form the basis of the belief systems or social representations of specific groups (Van Dijk, 2001).

Translation as process or as product is political because it displays process of negotiation among different agents (Tahir-Gürçağlar, 2003). According to Tymoczko (2003), the ideology of translation is a combination of the content of the source text and the various speech acts represented in the source text relevant to the source context, layered together with the representation of the content, its relevance to the receptor audience, and the various speech acts of the translation itself addressing the target context, as well as resonance and discrepancies between these two ‘utterances’. She further explains that ‘the ideology of translation resides not simply in the text translated, but in the voicing and stance of the translator, and in its relevance to the receiving audience’. Schäffner (2003) believes that ideological aspect determined within a text itself can be more or less obvious in texts, depending on the topic of a text, its genre and communicative purposes.

2.2.2. Concept of Power
Wodak (1989) writes that CDA chooses the perspective of those who suffer most and critically analyses those in power, those who are responsible, and those who have the means and the opportunity to solve such problems. According to Atawneh (2009), power is maintained through language.

Power play is an important issue in cultural commentators and translation. When a translator theoretically and practically uses language as an ideological weapon for excluding or including a reader, a value system or even an entire culture, power makes a parade. Some scholars have called the underlying and potentially distorting presence of the translator’s choices in the target language as the *translator’s voice*. However, Fawcett (1995) states that the main actors and victims of power play are not just translators. “Power in translation is not always exercised against the reader. It can also be directed against the original text or author or translator.”

Hegemony is the power over society as a whole of one of the fundamental economically defined classes in alliance with other social forces. It is about constructing alliances and integrating subordinate classes through ideological means. It is focus of constant struggle around points of greatest instability between classes and blocs, to construct or sustain alliances and relations of domination which takes economic, political and ideological forms (Gramsci, 1971).

### 3. TRANSLATION STUDIES AND CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF POLITICAL DISCOURSE

The analysis of a text in the source language must not be limited to a study of syntactic relationships between linguistic units or to the denotative meaning of words and should treat the connotative values of the formal structure of the communication. According to Nida (1964), the connotative evaluation of the formal structures of the message is essentially an analysis of the style of the communication and the main area of stylistic concern is the discourse; this evaluation involves a number of highly complex techniques.

The nature of the message, the purpose of the author and the translator and the type of audience can affect the type of translation. In many cases the translator
wants to suggest a particular type of political behavior. He may rather have an imperative purpose, i.e. to make an action explicit and compelling and that is what happens in translation of political discourse. So what Nida calls gloss translation which typifies the formal equivalence is not appropriate for this discourse.

Halliday focuses on language use as a communicative act and describe three strands of functional meaning as ideational, interpersonal and textual meaning. Interpersonal meaning refers to use of language in order to establish a relationship between text producer and text receiver. Power is one of the basic types of relationship in the analysis of interpersonal meaning. The patterns of choices made by translator from among the lexico-grammatical resources of language can establish the interpersonal meaning. Then notions like context, functions, culture, textuality, style, genre and discourse which are studied in pragmatics, discourse analysis, cultural studies, and communication studies had an effect on Translation Studies. Nord (1997) mentioned that the purpose of the target text and not the linguistic surface structure of the source text is the starting point of any translation.

Translation studies and intercultural communication are closely linked. Translators should be able to work at high levels of cross cultural competence into which complex problems carry over. Cultural turn is a true indicator of the interdisciplinary nature of contemporary Translation Studies and refers to the analysis of translation in its cultural, political and ideological context. Postcolonialism is one of the most thriving points of contact between Cultural Studies and Translation Studies. Before Postcolonialism one of the main assumptions was that translation is always controlled by the target culture. Postcolonialists believe that primary control of the translation process was clearly in the hands of the source culture. Their approaches tended to study power relations between different groups, cultures and peoples, which control translation. According to this approach, there is a more tendency to translate from a hegemonic culture to a dominated culture and when the translator of a hegemonic culture translates a text produced by the dominated culture, his work will be perceived as difficult and inscrutable (Robinson, 1997). The words of those in power are taken as
self-evident truths and the words of those not in power are dismissed as irrelevant, inappropriate, or without substance.

Through translation as a bridge between various discourses information is made available to addressees beyond national borders; it is very frequently the case that reactions in one country to statements that were made in another country are actually reactions to the information as it was provided in translation. The linguistic behavior which is related to political behavior may well reflect evidence of behavior mediated by translation (Schäffner, 2004).

A translator must come to recognize the ideological devices which are typical of a special discourse and period in order to use them in restructuring the semantic relations in the target text. The recognition of interdiscursivity is also crucial to the translator specially to define ambiguous meanings. Any text contains a mix of homologous and contiguous discourses which interact reciprocally. The translator should know that fundamental regulate principles interact and influence each other in political discourse (Hatim & Munday, 2004). In modern translation studies there has been a shift of attention from language to human activity in cultural contexts.

A translator must be aware of the characteristics which define the discourse in which a text is located if any sense of historical or semantic identity is to be maintained. The translator should know the relation between discourse and text is one of emergence; discourse is embodied in texts and texts make up discourse. Discourse goes beyond the aggregate of texts, i.e. the abstract structures are related to the material conditions which are at the basis of the articulation of meaning (Bruce, 1994). One of the domains of textual analysis is critical approaches to translation. They are concerned with the ways in which translating and interpreting are related to concerns like ideology. Critical approaches to translation can pose some interesting challenges for applied linguistics.

3.1. Persuasion in Translation
A prerequisite of persuasion is intelligibility of text, i.e. the person to be convinced has to understand every bit of information and every strand of associative meaning. A precondition for the intelligibility of texts involving the dependence of one text upon another is intertextuality. The translator should transmit the sense of the more readily explicable referential network to the culturally, temporally or spatially distanced reader.

Soring (1986) made a distinction between persuasion that attempts to convince the reader and seduction. Trusting in the truth or credibility of arguments, the reader may be convinced and change his or her mind consciously or deliberately. While seduction is when external factors instigate people do thing as if of their own impulse. Ideologically biased political beliefs of a translator can change conviction to seduction and exploits the outward appearance and seeming trustworthiness of himself as the persuader. In Washington Post (10 November, 2004) the result of the talks between Iran and Europe was metaphorically called *a diplomatic fig leaf*. An Iranian translator translates it as ‘teke kâqaz’ (i.e. a piece of paper) and another one translates it as ‘tavafoqânâmeye suri’ (i.e a formal agreement); both try to persuade their readers while they are transmitting their own ideological belief. However, a fanatic manipulation of the relationship which is to be established between the writer and the reader of target language can endanger reliability, or fidelity of translation.

4. CATEGORIES OF IDEOLOGICAL ANALYSIS: IMPLICATIONS FOR TRANSLATION

The existence of different political groups in a social institution is the source of different political ideologies and translators as members of this institution have their own political ideology and this effect can be presented in their translation. Iranian translators who agree with nuclear activities of Iran defend them against sanctions and threats and those translators whose political ideology of atom show their disagreement. The aim of this paper is to disentangle some of the complex
relationships between political discourse and ideology and to show to translators or translator trainers how a preferred ideology can be expressed through analytical categories.

Different ideologically based ways to represent meaning makes us able to analyze the expression on many levels. In another study the ideological analysis was applied to three levels: argument, meaning and rhetoric (Shafiee, 2005) and some ideological categories were determined in each level of discourse (table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. The ideological categories of each level of discourse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meaning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclaimer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display of power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polarization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Self – Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presupposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vagueness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In that research I found out that there are a lot of ideological categories used in a special genre but the number of occurrence of each depends on the writer’s attitudes and preferences. Different languages may employ the same ideological categories in the same context but the significant difference for the use of categories showed that different languages have different tendencies for some categories. In the present study I gave the same editorial to some translators. Before that I tried to determine their political attitude about nuclear activities of Iran. After studying their questionnaires, they were divided into groups: those who agree with nuclear activities of Iran and defend it (P1) and those who disagree and talks against it (P2). In this part some examples will be given and I discuss whether the ideological devices of P1 and P2 are the same or not.

**Fallacy:** Fallacies are normative breaches of argumentative rules and principles. Using an irrelevant argument, playing on people’s emotions, begging the question,
overgeneralization, false analogies, and making claims that need to be substantiated (Van Dijk, 2000).

Iran announced on Saturday that it had resumed the construction of centrifuges that are capable of producing material for a nuclear bomb. (New York Times, August 4, 2004)

P1: Iran shanbe ealam kar ke saxte saniyuzhâ râ az sar gerefte ke albate qâbeliyate tolid mavade bombe atomi râ dårânnd. (...that certainly are...)
P2: Iran shanbe ealam kar ke saxte saniyuzhâ j râ az sae gerefte ke mitavânand mavad bârâye tolide bombe atomi râ tolide konand. (...those cebtrifuges that are capeable...)

In P1, the translator added the word certainly and this is the device of ‘display of power’: we can do it if we want to. In P2 the translator tries to add ‘demonization’ to ‘fallacy’.

Display of Power: This semantic device is used to represent OUR dominance, but not an evil power. Again it is an analytical category that is used to illustrate OUR positive characteristics. Turning aside U.S. suggestions of sanctions or U.N. action, the Europeans persisted, but even if they reach another interim agreement, their diplomatic efforts probably won’t succeed without American support.

Implication: Large part of discourse remains implicit and such implicit information may be inferred by recipients from shared knowledge or attitudes. Politeness, face-keeping, or cultural propriety are also some interactional and sociopolitical conditions provided by implications. Therefore, information may be left implicit precisely when it may be inconsistent with the strategy of positive self-presentation. We may tend to make OUR negative details implicit and negative details of outgroup explicit. A powerful instrument of critical study of discourse is to make explicit implied meaning. In the following example the implied meaning of this headline “The Mullahs and the Bomb” (New York Times, October 23, 2003) is that those are religious teachers are trying to make atom bombs. The word mullah which is also used in Persian usually implies to someone not very well-educated. The word ‘ruhâni’ is used to talk about an educated and wise cleric while ‘âxund’ is the same as mullah. The reason of the selection is clear.

P1: ruhâniyun va bomb
P2: âxund va bombe atomi
Euphemism: Euphemism is a semantic move which is especially useful talking about negative acts of the own group, the avoidance of negative impression formation and also as a part of politeness conditions or other interactional rules (Van Dijk, 2000). Euphemism is motivated by the assumption that a change of name can also import new and different qualities to a thing or a person (Soring, 1986). In the example P1 translator uses the phrase ‘râhkâr na chandân qâteáâne’ (i.e. not too decisive strategy) and P2 translator uses the ‘râhkâre ahmaqâne’ (i.e. ridiculous strategy) to render the meaning of ‘soft-line strategy’ (Charleston News, June 28, 2004). The P1 translator tries to show the uncertainty of Europeans. He does not say ‘molâyem’ (i.e. gentle or soft). While the P2 translator wants to draw the attention of the reader to necessity of more precision.

Metaphor: Metaphors are semantic-rhetoric figures to make abstract, unfamiliar or emotional meanings more concrete and familiar. They refer to when a word or a phrase is used which establishes a comparison between one idea and another.

Litotes: You may express your meaning by using a word that has the opposite meaning with a negative word, or a negative prefix like un-. This category can be used to de-emphasize negative things about US and positive things about THEM.

Demonization: The word often used to describe your enemies in very negative words is demon. The most explicit way to describe or represent the others as evil is demonization most accompanied by dramatization.

Agreeing to live with an Iran that is a screwdriver’s turn away from the bomb would be a bitter pill to swallow. It would accommodate a charter member of President Bush’s "axis of evil" and a sworn mortal enemy of Israel. (Washington News, June 17, 2004)

P1: tavâfoq bâ Irani ke az bomb fâseleye chandân nadârad sharâyete namonâsebtari ijâd mikonad va be ân komak mikonad tâ hamishe barham zanandeye siâsathaye Bush va dishmane shomare yeke Israel bâshad.

P2: tavâfoq bâ Irani ke tanhâ yek ghadam az bomb fâsele dârad hatâ badtar ast va be in ââmele hamishegiye sherârat barâye Bush va doshmane qasa m xordye Israel yâri miresanad.

While in English the terror of Iran’ access to bomb is presented as ideological device of the metaphor (i.e. a screwdriver’s turn), in P1 it is manifested as litotes (...that is not too far away from bomb...) and in P2 the translator has dramatized it (... that is just one step away from bomb...). Then we can see the translation of the metaphor
of ‘a bitter pill to swallow’ is different in P1 and P2. In P1 the what we have is again litotes(...provide not appropriate conditions)and in P2 again dramatization (...is even worse...). Finally P1 uses the words in such a way that the device of demonization in English text changes to display of power in Persian (...and it helps Iran disrupt Bush’s policies and be number 1 enemy of Israel.). In p2 the demonization of English text is present.

**Threat:** In the political discourse of nuclear debates, threat as an ideological category implicitly refers to this fact that THEY are dangerous and enhances the terror of THEM and the need to contain such danger. It is also a way to represent WE are worry about world peace. Consider this sentence about Iran’s nuclear activities: It is a problem that could turn a cold war to a hot one. (Charleston News, September 14, 2004).There is a very delicate metaphorical expression of military attack to Iran as hot war. The translation in P1 doesn’t contain the threat in the form of a metaphor but more a device of demonization has been used and in P2 we can see a new metaphor in Persian under the hegemony of power language.

P1: in moshkel mitavand jange sard râ tabdil be jang nezami konad (...cold war to military war.)
P2: in moshkel mitavand jange sard râ tabdil be noâe garmash bekonad (...cold war to hot one.)

**Rhetorical Question:** A rhetorical question is not exactly a question but rather a device to draw the attention of the readers to something because the explicit expression of the content will not be that effective.

Does Iran's pledge to suspend uranium enrichment mean that it has agreed to stop building the centrifuge facilities in which enrichment would be performed ...?(Washington Post, October 22, 2003)
P1: âyâ taâhod Iran be taâliqe qanisâzi uranium be in maânâst ke bâ tavaqofe sâxte tashilât santrifiyuzhhâ ke dar ânhâ qanisâzi anjâm mishavad tavâfoq karde ast?
P2: taâhod Iran be taâliqe qanisâzi uranium shâyad be in maânâst ke bâ tavaqofesâxte tashilât santrifiyuzhhâ ke dar ânhâ qanisâzi anjâm mishavad tavâfoq karde ast. (Iran's pledge to suspend uranium enrichment may mean that it has agreed to stop building the centrifuge facilities in which enrichment would be performed, or has it merely agreed not to activate the centrifuges once they are built.)

P1 is the same as English text and in P2 we cannot find the rhetorical question and use of modal verb ‘may’ to make a decision and think about the answer; an option is given to the reader and the device of positive self-presentation has been applied.
5. EMPIRICAL IMPLICATIONS

The emergence of various critical perspectives in applied linguistics has been known as critical applied linguistics. One of these perspectives is CDA. Applied linguistics tends to operate with decontextualized contexts, i.e. with only a limited view of what constitutes the ideologies. The conceptualization of context is frequently limited to an under-theorized or over-localized view of social relations. Hence, Critical Applied Linguistics (CAL) finds way of understanding a relationship between concepts of ideology. Its other challenge is to suggest the effects of these relations on classroom utterances, translation, conversations, genres, and media texts. Its primary concern whether as a form of critical text analysis like this study or as an approach to understanding the politics of translation is how the text is related to broader social cultural and political relations (Pennycook, 2004).

The pedagogical implication of this study is a mixture of everyday categories of applied linguistics - text, context, reading, writing and translation- and ideological categories. CAL research has the potential to offer ways to improve current educational practices for translator/interpreter training. The translators need to realize ideological preferences of culture and be aware and critical about the ideology masked by different strategies and categories. Regarding the complexity of the ideological relationships in media texts, this knowledge seems to be very necessary for the translators.

The analysis of parallel Persian texts shows how a form of critical discourse analysis across languages reveals the ideological underpinnings of the translation. Tendency of translations to domesticate cultures, the dominance of translation from English in other languages rather than the other direction and the challenges to the notion of authorship posed by translation all make the application of such an approach to translation necessary. It is based on an anti-hegemonic stance, locates itself within a view of language politics and tries to move towards change. Translators should possess the knowledge of both micro- and macro-test processing. Awareness about the process of naturalization of ideologies on discourse levels should form an essential portion of the translator’s skills.
Linguistic barriers are more due to a lack of this critical awareness than a lack of grammatical competence. Considering language use as one of the crucial social practices influenced by power and ideology and being able to use certain discourse categories of a special genre like politics can reduce many mistranslations. Therefore behind the systematic linguistic choices a translator makes, there is inevitably a prior classification of reality in ideological terms. Whatever is said about the degree of freedom the translator has, the fact remains that reflecting the ideological force of the words is an inescapable duty.

6. CONCLUSION

Not only do the ideologies influence what we say and how we say it, but also they can be acquired and changed through the content and form of discourse. That is, as we may learn some ideological propositions more directly in a specific discourse, the ideologies can control the most important social practice of a group, i.e. discourse.

The exercise of power in the modern society is increasingly achieved through the ideological workings of the language. The makers of power have become less overt through the use of media. The objective of a discourse analysis which adopts critical goals is to show how social structures determine properties of discourse and how discourse determines social structures, that is, denaturalize the ideologies. To recognize and denaturalize these ideologies, there is a need for a critical approach to analyze the ideological relations and categories in a discourse like politics. Such a critical analysis can reveal the ideology and power relationships which are perpetuated by skillful writers.

A critical awareness of power and ideology relationship in discourse makes the translators not yield to this power. The implications of this study draw our attention to the importance of acquiring this awareness. The complexity of the use of the ideological categories and the relationship emphasizes that a translator should be aware and critical about the ideology covered by language in discourse. Therefore a crucial reading skill is to recognize the implied message of text and to
unmask its naturalized ideology and an important writing skill is to be able to use ideological categories in discourse to make the preferred ideology more naturalized.

Finally, the practitioners and translator trainers are supposed to utilize teaching methods to increase this knowledge. They should make the translators and interpreters aware of the existence of ideological relationships in discourse. As a matter of fact, they should not limit their discourse practices to teaching cohesion, coherence, speech acts, politeness and some other functional usages of language. Ideologies are not innate and also the ways of their representations and strategies to naturalize them.
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