

Shurooq AL HASHIMI

Zayed University

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3572-9742>

DOI : 10.14746/ps.2022.1.21

FROM RHETORIC TO POSTURE: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF GEORGE W. BUSH, BARACK H. OBAMA AND DONALD J. TRUMP'S STANCES TOWARDS DPRK NUCLEAR ISSUE

INTRODUCTION

“The dialogue touted by the US is, in essence, nothing but a foolish trick hatched to keep the DPRK bound to dialogue and use it in favor of the political situation and election in the US ...It is entirely up to the US what Christmas gift it will select to get” (*North Korea's*, 2019: n.p.)

In this *communiqué*, Ri Thae Song, North Korea (aka the Democratic People's Republic of Korea 'DPRK') vice minister on US Affairs, warned Trump and his administration about a possible intercontinental ballistic missile (ICM) test, which might critically threaten US national security in 2019 Christmas Eve. This would be determined by US actions and decisions towards North Korea. Accordingly, Trump replied optimistically yet sarcastically that “We will discover what the surprise is, and we will treat it with great success... [it could be] a beautiful vase” (*Trump says*, 2019: n.p.). Nonetheless, 2019 Christmas celebration passed with no major action from North Korea. Could it be possible that Kim Jung-un is holding his horses and waiting impatiently for the New Year eve to come? Or it is merely a dramatic war of words between Kim Jung-un and Trump? Regardless of the answer, tension between US and DPRK has escalated since 2003 over the nuclear issue of the latter.

Before 2003, DPRK nuclear program was developing in slow motion. DPRK was generally more synchronized with the international standards of the use of nuclear technology. Indeed, no major international and unilateral sanctions were imposed on DPRK, since the regime did not conduct any nuclear test then. Historically, the establishment of DPRK nuclear program started as early as its foundation at the end of the 1940s. The development of nuclear program was intended for civil use. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) has supervised and monitored the DPRK Nuclear program since its birth in 1953. China also offered minimal support to DPRK nuclear project. Since the 70s, DPRK has started to solidify the development of its nuclear program domestically and lessen its reliance on the USSR, which was losing its ground slowly. There and then, USSR shared the monitoring burden with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). North Korea also joined multilateral and bilateral treaties to align with the international demands, namely: the Non-Proliferation of Nu-

clear Weapons Treaty (NPT) in 1984, the Joint Declaration of North and South Korea on the Denuclearization of the Korea Peninsula in 1992; and the Agreed Framework with US in 1994. However, the regime of North Korea started to feel insecure, due to the following reasons, namely: Russia and China normalizing their relations with South Korea; US flexing its muscles in the Pacific region; and G. W. Bush approaching North Korea with a hostile policy.

In 2003, North Korea withdrew unilaterally from the NPT. Since then, North Korea accelerated the development of its nuclear weapon and ballistic missiles technology. According to the data reported by the Nuclear Threat initiative (NTI), the number of missiles launches increased from 16 to 120 after 2003 (Lewis and Taylor, 2016, n.p.). The launch of missiles has reached its peak during the presidency of Obama, at 66 compared to only 15 and 39 during G. W. Bush and Trump presidencies respectively. Nonetheless, 2006 should be marked as a focal point in the history of US–DPRK relationship, when DPRK conducted its first nuclear test. With a record of 6 nuclear tests, North Korea stands out as the only country who has conducted nuclear tests in the 21st century. Eventually, US advocated the implementation of sanctions on DPRK at both international and domestic levels.

The gravity of this situation may not only deteriorate the relations between US and DPRK, but it could also adversely influence the peace process in the Pacific region. In worse case scenario, it might threaten the global security. Taking into consideration the important role of US in steering north Korea nuclear issue, this study examines closely the perspectives and the policies of the last three former US presidents towards DPRK. The study offers a new perspective to the previous literature by applying critical discourse analysis (CDA) as a methodological approach. Through deconstructing the rhetorical narratives and styles of G. W. Bush, Obama and Trump, the research reveals their stances towards North Korean nuclear issue. Objectively, the study answers the following questions: How do the rhetorical strategies of the three presidents differ? What does the rhetorical tone of each president reveal about his foreign policy towards North Korea? Finally, do the rhetorical narratives of G. W. Bush, Obama and Trump indicate continuity of a certain nuclear legacy on North Korea?

Hypothetically, the study claims that the ideological legacy of the Cold War has continuously influenced the perceptions of US presidents; namely: G. W. Bush, Obama, and Trump, about North Korea, despite pursuing different strategic approaches to deal with the nuclear issue. This article is divided into four main sections. The first section briefly describes the nature of the current relationship between US and DPRK. Then, it introduces the four major schools of thought on US foreign policy.¹ The first section ends with highlighting the outcomes of previous studies, which addressed this issue by using discourse analysis (DA). The second section explains the theoretical and methodological framework of the current study. Mainly, this study relies theoretically on Waltz's 'individual' level of analysis & Aristotle's modes of persuasion to conduct critical discourse analysis of the speech corpuses. The third section describes the linguistic, discursive, and socio-political results of the study.

¹ For more information review: "Special Providence American Foreign Policy and How It Changed the World" by Walter Russell Mead.

The last section deconstructs the findings by comparing rhetorical styles, strategic policies, and general IR perspectives of the three presidents in the context of North Korean Nuclear Issue.

1. RECAPPING US FOREIGN POLICY ON THE NORTH KOREAN NUCLEAR ISSUE

1.1. Historical snapshot: the Cold War Legacy and the Korean War

The North Korean nuclear issue is heavily rooted in the Cold war. It could be considered as one of its consequences. The war started immediately after the end of the Second World War. It has lasted over four decades and ended with the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. The Cold War was not merely a fight over supremacy between the US and the USSR. The world was not only torn between these bipolar gigantic powers. Precisely, it was a war which has penetrated all aspects of life including models of social development, culture and even religion (Pechatnov, 2012: 119). It is arguable that the cold war was mainly a war between the liberal protestants and the conservative orthodoxies. Nevertheless, the scientific competition between US and USSR in medicine, space and technology was a bright side of this war (Pechatnov, 2012: 122). Unfortunately, the development of nuclear technology and arm races was the shadow of this scientific competition, as it will be highlighted at the end of this section.

The Cold war was unique by its nature. First, many countries all over the world had to enter a military alliance with one of those two superpowers. This led to the creation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Warsaw Treaty Organization (WTO) (Krzymowski, 2002: 8). In other words, this was a clear defensive alliance between the West aka US & Western Europe and the East USSR and Eastern Europe. Second, the world was further divided into the socialist North and the democratic South, where many proxy wars took place. Indeed, the Korean war was the first to happen during the Cold War. Claiming that socialist regime has the right to rule the Korean peninsula, North Korea has invaded its Southern Neighbor by passing the 38th parallel in 1950. Today, the area surrounding the 38th parallel is known as the Demilitarized Zone (DMZ). The war has ended shortly after three years. Despite the high number of casualties, at approximately 5 million people, the war was almost negligible and barely covered by US media. It is even called the forgotten War, (History.com Editors, 2009, n.p.).

Lastly, both US and USSR ironically maintained the coolness of the Cold war by accelerating the development of nuclear technology and spreading it to their allies. For instance, the USSR incubated the development of nuclear technology in North Korea in early 50s. However, this was to be used mainly for peaceful purposes. By 60s, North Korea decided to militarize its nuclear technology and detach itself from USSR guardianship (Difilippo, 2014: 57–59). Generally, showcasing this hot file maintained the status-que during the cold war. Both superpowers were frightening each other by using these nuclear weapons under the strategy of deterrence.

1.2. Insight into US–North Korea relation

The current tense relationship between the United States and North Korea is a product of the Cold War legacy. In other words, ideological and regime differences between the democratic US and the communist North Korea have significantly influenced their diplomatic communications. Indeed, US has no embassy to officially represent the country in North Korea and vice versa. As Husenicova (2018) indicated, US diplomatic missions are solicited and coordinated through the Swedish embassy in Pyongyang, the United Nations or directly through official senior channels (p. 67). Sweden acts particularly as power protector for the United States in DPRK. Being a Nordic country and historically, a member of the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission (NNSC) in the Korean War, Sweden also tries to facilitate peace and resolve conflicts between the US and North Korea (Tamkin, 2018: n.p.). In most of the cases, talks and negotiations between the two countries are conducted in multilateral settings. Direct bilateral talks are less favoured by US.

Overall, the relation between the United States and North Korea is best described as unsettled. Neither of the two sides has a clear understanding of the other's intention especially with regards to the nuclear issue. As an example, US does not take into consideration the fact that DPRK nuclearization is a matter of assuring security to North Koreans. On the one hand, the presence of United States Forces Korea (USFK) in South Korea is another source of threat to DPRK. From the North Korean regime perspective, being armed with nuclear weapons is a matter of survival and self-dependence, just as ideologized by Kim Il-sung, the first leader, in the *Juche* concept (Difilippo, 2014: 56). On the other hand, DPRK felt unsecured after the end of the Cold War, when both Russia and China started normalizing their relations with South Korea (Ahn, 2012: 72–74).

From the American perspective, DPRK should be deterred from developing its nuclear program at both civil and military levels. This is not only to avoid any possible threat to the United States but also to assure the security of its allies in Northeast Asia. The American presidents had for a long time relied on and are still relying on deterrence with the goal of denuclearizing DPRK (Hayes, 2018: 219–223). This resulted in a situation more or less similar to the *Déjà vu* phenomenon. New events are repeatedly happening all the time and at the same places yet increasing exponentially. According to Difilippo (2014), this situation is better referred to as “*steady state theory*” (p. 57). In other words, DPRK is continuously conducting nuclear and missiles tests, whereas US presidents and their administrations are pursuing the same old goal one after another. Before referring to the methodological literature of previous studies, it is worth to know the different theoretical foundations of US foreign policy.

1.3. IR theories & American foreign policy under the four schools of thought

Understanding the theoretical foundations and characteristics of U.S. foreign policy is highly crucial. It enables us to identify the paradigms, which the three former presidents built their own foreign policy style on. These paradigms have eventually influenced their perceptions and rhetorical narratives in addressing the North Korean nuclear Issue. Overall, there are four schools of thought on American foreign policy;

namely: Hamiltonian, Wilsonian, Jeffersonian and Jacksonian (Brands, 2001: n.p.; *The historical imperative*, 2002: n.p.). The first two schools are internationally oriented or “extraverts”; whereas the last two schools are domestically centred or “introverts.” Firstly, the Hamiltonian school of thought focuses on increasing the United States commerce globally. It was established to compete with if not replace the global economic leadership of United Kingdom. Hamiltonians laid out the foundation for capitalism and neoliberal economy. Brands (2001) points out that Hamiltonians are both Realist and liberal at the same time (p. 143). They are realist in disregarding the roles of international institutions. They do not mind waging wars whenever self-interest, especially economic one, are achievable. Yet, Hamiltonians are also liberal. They, hence, believe that enhancing economic ties between states leads to spreading peace and prosperity globally. Besides, Hamiltonians think that economic interests and gain could be shared with other, hence they are not necessarily a zero-sum game. Secondly, the Wilsonian school of thought follows the principles of liberal internationalism. Named after Woodrow Wilson, the main emphasis of the Wilsonians is to spread US values such as democracy and liberty around the globe. This is done through the assistance of international organizations such as the United Nations. From Wilsonian perspective, “America is safe by saving the world” (Brands, 2001: 144).

Thirdly, Jeffersonians favour isolationism the most. Accordingly, energy should be saved for maintaining democracy at homeland and tackling domestic issues. They favour non-intervention and oppose regime changes as a sign of respecting the sovereignty of other countries. Jeffersonians are hard-core realists. According to Hyun (2017), they advocate increasing national security via intensive military build-up. While facing any external threat to US national security, they prefer to use hard power such as military and economy. This hard power is applied through carrot and stick policy on the hostile regimes. Like the Hamiltonians, Jeffersonians are skeptical about the impact of international organizations. Still, the realist Jeffersonians prefer to work multilaterally with their allies as a form of power balancing (Huyn, 2017: 27–28). Finally, the Jacksonian school of thought represents the neoconservatives. They are the most hawkish among all. Like Jeffersonians, they tend to prioritize domestic issues especially with regards to the expenditures on military and defence. Rubin (2002) asserts that Jacksonians appetite for engaging in inter-state conflicts is the highest (*The historical imperative*, 2002: n.p.). If the Wilsonians are perceived as the American saviours, Jacksonians are the warriors of America. Jacksonians seek American victory with a strong patriotic sentiment and a mission to popularize democracy in the world. Next section discusses how discourse analysis was used in previous studies, to address US foreign policy on North Korean nuclear issue during G. W. Bush, Obama, and Trump presidencies.

1.4. Discourse analysis (DA) in the context of US FP on North Korean nuclear issue

To begin with, discourse analysis is not widely accepted among IR scholars. For example, it is favored by poststructuralists and constructivists, yet highly criticized by realist scholars. This is due to the fundamental epistemological differences between

the two schools. According to Hardy et al (2004), discourse analysis is “a methodology for analyzing social phenomena that is qualitative, interpretive, and constructionist. It explores how the socially produced ideas and objects that populate the world were created and are held in place” (p. 19). The core principle of discourse analysis indicates that reality is subjective and is socially constructed. This assumption directly clashes with realists’ point of view about reality. They perceive reality as an objective fact, which naturally exists in the world. Despite this disagreement, discourse analysis is an effective tool-kit when it comes to analyzing foreign policy. It could be used at individual level of analysis to explain how decision makers came up with a specific policy. In other words, it helps in explaining how a discursive practice can contribute to the political struggle of maintaining a specific social order or establishing a new one (Laffey and Weldes, 2004: 29). For instance, understanding how presidential speech might ignite a war with another state through endorsing a coercive foreign policy. Thus, it is worth to examine how the discursive aspects of power and politics were utilized in the context of United States foreign policy towards North Korean Nuclear Issue.

Literature on the discourse analysis of Bush and Obama’s North Korean nuclear policies is scarce. Previous studies are often indirectly related to the context of North Korea. As a matter of fact, the foreign policy of US on North Korea was barely addressed as sub issue in the major speeches of these presidents. Thus, there is no specific speech which focuses solely in addressing the North Korean nuclear issue. Hence, North Korean Nuclear issue was preceded by other priorities in the international agenda of US during Bush and Obama’s administrations. For instance, Bush was busy in waging War on Terror after the 9/11 event. Similarly, Obama was caught up with the war in Iraq and the Iranian nuclear issue. Both had different yet related world visions. While Bush envisioned a world free of terrorism, Obama envisioned a war free of nuclear weapons. In his study, Maggio (2007) analysed Bush’s State of the Union address in 2002. He explains how Bush has utilized his “sovereign” power as the president of US to define and identify his country’s enemies under the concept of “Axis of the Evil” in his speech (p. 831). Based on Bush definition, the Axis of Evil are three main rogue countries, who are involved in sponsoring terrorism and own [possibly] weapons of mass destructions. These countries are Iraq, Iran, and North Korea. On the other hand, Zhang (2010) analysed Obama’s 2009 Speech in Prague by using Aristotle modes of persuasion. He perceives Obama’s speech as an art of persuasion and art of public negotiation rather than a one-way imposed communication. Zhang concluded that Obama relied on Ethos and pathos, ethical and emotional factors, rather than logos, logical factors, to enhance the credibility of his speech. All in all, Obama had to be persuasive to convince his world-wide audience about his vision to free the world from nuclear weapons. Interestingly, Obama argued that US should ‘exceptionally’ be permitted to keep some of its nuclear weapons to defend not only the Americans but the world in general (Zhang, 2010: 297–298).

Finally, two studies on Trump’s rhetorical narratives are highlighted here. Beczkowska (2019) relied mainly on analyzing Trump’s tweets and address to the 72nd session of the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) to draw a conclusion about his policy towards North Korean nuclear issue. Her study indicates that US policy on North Korean Nuclear Issue under Trump administration remained ineffective and be-

came vague (pp. 111). This is due to the controversial threatening remarks of Trump, which remain only applicable to the word of mouth, as Beczkowska (2019) claimed. However, Beczkowska (2019) prejudgment of Trump Policy is highly debatable in two ways. First, she overgeneralized in describing Trump's North Korean policy as vague or unpredictable. Indeed, unpredictability is one of Trumps techniques to approach his policy. This has been highlighted by Kogan (2019), who analyzed over 70 public appearances of Trump during his two careers as businessman and as a president. He concludes that Trump's diplomacy is highly influenced by his business negotiation model. Trump's negotiation model is mainly coercive and unilateral. It is formed in four interrelated phases, namely: observation, performance, controlling and disrupting (Kogan, 2019: 66–67). Being unpredictable and risky is part of the disrupting phase, in which Trump is ready to opt for a drastic solution, even if it will lead to fighting his counterpart (Kogan, 2019: 78). Second, Beczkowska (2019) underestimated the effectiveness of Trump's policy. Contrary to the previous presidents, Trump prefers to engage his North Korean counterpart in direct bilateral negotiations. In other words, Trump favors direct "at table" negotiations rather than "behind the table" negotiations, in which a third party is involved or conducted in multilateral setting (Kogan, 2019: 78). Thus, the results were fruitful, indeed, such as conducting the first presidential meeting between US and North Korea in 2019 and the end of nuclear test since 2017. Still, more attention should be given to the analysis of US presidents discourses towards North Korea nuclear issue, to understand the link between their executive authority as presidents and their personal influence on the US foreign policy on DPRK.

2. FROM G. W. BUSH TO TRUMP: EXAMINING NORTH KOREAN NUCLEAR ISSUE THROUGH A NEW METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

2.1. Waltz & Aristotle: the inspiration of the current study's theoretical Framework

The First theoretical framework is Waltz's Level of Analysis (Signer, 1960: 453–461). Waltz introduced three levels for analysing Foreign Policy namely: individual, state, and international system. The individual level of analysis is the focus of this study. It relates to the main decision makers such as leaders, ministers, advisers... and so forth. In the state level of analysis, domestic factors are taken into consideration such as institutions, government units, culture, and public opinion. Finally, the international system level of analysis looks at how the state functions in the anarchical world; how it reacts to international organizations, its allies, and enemies; and how the state is positioned in term of power structure. This study focuses only on the individual level of analysis, US presidents particularly. Unlike other states with parliamentary systems, in which presidency is a prestigious position, US presidents hold superior executive power (Levy and McDonald, 2017: n.p.). This power is not only exclusive to domestic affairs, but also include foreign affairs. Under Article II of the constitution of the United States, the president is entitled to be the commander in chief of both

naval and ground forces of the country. He also shares the power with the Senate to make international treaties and assign ambassadors (The United States Senate, n.d.). Accordingly, under his commandship, the president has the sole authority to launch a nuclear strike on a country. Indeed, the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombings were executed under the command of the former US president Harry Truman. Taking into consideration the significant authority of US president, this study sheds light on the discursive analysis of these presidents individually. The second model contributes to the rhetorical analysis of the study.

Furthermore, Aristotle's Three Modes of Persuasion is important to understand how negotiators and speakers are successful in convincing their audiences with their rhetorical arguments. From Aristotle point of view, rhetoric is not a mere ornamental linguistic art but rather a tool to pursue an action and impact the audience (Wróbel, 2015: 409). Three main factors play an important role in determining the level of persuasion in a rhetoric. First, *Ethos* "Ethics" refers to the legitimacy of the scope of actions, which the speakers aim to achieve. It also relates to the credibility and authority of the speakers him/herself. Second, *Pathos* refers to the emotional impact of the speech on the audience and how a speaker could connect the audience to the context of the speech. Third, *Logos*, "logics" refers to the reasoning and supporting evidence. Additionally, Weiss (2015) indicates that there is a fourth factor that could be added to Aristotle's modes of persuasion (p. 219). Timing is as important as other factors to determine the success of the speech. In one hand, speakers should choose the right time to deliver their speeches. On the other hand, speakers should pay attention to which period of time their speeches are directed (past, present or future). These four factors are taken into consideration during the analysis process of the presidents' rhetoric.

2.2. From G. W. Bush to Trump: North Korean Nuclear issue under the Critical Discourses analysis (CDA)

This research relies on Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as a main methodological approach. Fan (2019) explains that CDA aims to investigate the relationship between discourse, ideology, and power (p. 1041). It could be applied to various research topics in IR, ranging from gender studies to nuclear weapons and political strategies (Fan, 2019: 1041). Thus, this approach is also applicable to foreign policy studies. Additionally, CDA suggests that a dynamic relationship exists between language and society. This means that cultural and social contexts do not only influence our language choices, but the opposite is also true. In other words, our social reality can be influenced and formed by language too. According to Banta (2012), language is utilized as a strategic tool to create different meanings to target different segment of the society for achieving a specific goal (p. 393). By applying CDA as an analytical tool for this study, one can examine the strategy, which was used by each president to deliver his discourse to different audiences, such as American citizens, government officials or the international community. It is worth to note that CDA is an interdisciplinary approach. Thus, there is no specific way to conduct this type of analysis.

However, Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis model has been chosen in this study. Fairclough relies on three dimensions of analysis. Description is the first dimension. It identifies the speaker's attitudes based on his/her words' choices. Interpretation is the second dimension, which looks at how the discourse have been produced at text level. Last, explanation take into consideration the normative aspects of the audience, power structure and ideologies. 17 presidential speeches have been chosen as units of analysis.² Speeches were selected based on their relevance to the topic as well as the targeted audiences. For instance, remarks by the presidents on the nuclear tests are released by the Office of the Press Secretary at the White House for media purposes. They are considered as high-level communiqué. Speeches at the State of Union targets domestic audience such as the US Congress specifically and the American citizens in general. Finally, the address to UNGA targets states delegates and the international community.

3. WHAT HAS BEEN FOUND SO FAR? DATA REPRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE CURRENT STUDY

3.1. Data description: linguistic analysis of G. W. Bush, Obama, and Trump speeches

According to Fairclough's model, the first level of CDA should describe the linguistic feature of the rhetoric. These features include words repetition frequency, words choice, the tenses, and lengths of the sentences. Concerning the words repetition, three frequency intervals were measured; namely: low repetition frequency (3–14 recurrences), medium repetition frequency (15–27 recurrences) and high repetition frequency (28–40 recurrences)³. Based on the aggregated corpus analysis of the 17 documents, the most used words by the three presidents were 'North Korea' followed by 'United States'. Table 2 indicates that most of the words belong to the low repetition frequency interval. Sentimentally, word choices by each president trigger specific modes or emotions. For instance, words chosen by Trump are loaded negative emotions such as fear and aggression, namely: 'hostile', 'nihilation', 'many military options', 'travesty' and 'starved to death. On the contrary, former president Obama generally chose words which stimulate positive emotions, such as: 'committed', 'International community', 'safeguard', 'resolution', 'responsibility', 'cooperation' and 'prosperity and peace'. Noteworthy, G. W. Bush choice of words has shifted from negative at his first term of presidency to positive toward the end of his second term of presidency.

Lexically, there are certain patterns which could be noticed from analysing sentences' structures. For instance, most of the remarks on the DPRK nuclear tests were in simple tenses, whether past, present, or future. This is to indicate urgency, directness, and certainty of actions, which will be taken against these provocations. On the other hand, more complex and various sentences tenses were used in the presidents'

² See table 1.

³ See table 2.

address to the State of Union. This is simply because different issues and actions were addressed in the State of Union. Eventually, this urged to take into account different periods of time. Interestingly, action items delivered to the United Nations General Assembly were mainly stated in future tense. They were intentionally supported with auxiliary verbs such as *must*, *have to*, *should* and *ought*. This is to obligate North Korea to obey international Law and to make the international community responsible for taking actions towards this issue at the same time. Finally, the length of the sentences varied based on the speaker. Majority of the sentences in G. W. Bush rhetoric were long, in contrast to Trump, who favoured short sentences. After highlighting the main textual features of the results, the next section offers a discursive interpretation of the results.

3.2. Data interpretation: G. W. Bush, Obama and Trump rhetorical production and speech delivery analysis

The second level of Fairclough model is the interpretation of the context in which the rhetoric was produced and delivered. This includes analysing features such as the venue and the platform through which the rhetoric took place or was communicated; the modes of persuasion, which the sender relied on to convince his audience; body language as well as other non-verbal means of communication. First of all, locations might not be an option of choice in some cases such as the State of the Union and the United Nations General Assembly. They are held annually in the US House Chamber and the UN Headquarters in New York, respectively. However, in other occasions, US president has the advantage to decide on who, how and where to deliver his remarks. For instance, Trump opted for a unique technique to deliver his remarks on the 6th Nuclear test by DPRK. He has used twitter as platform for digital diplomacy to reach out as many as possible audiences. Several studies such as Edwards (2018); Šimunjak & Caliandro (2019); and Beczkowska (2019) confirm that twitter is a crucial medium for Trump to communicate with both his national and international audiences. This has increased his populism as well as his unilateral-national leverage. At the same time, Trump delegated J. Mattis, the US Secretary of Defence, to deliver his message officially as sign of credible and hard power. The venue of the rhetoric has often symbolic meaning. As an illustration, Obama selectively chose Hradcany Square in Prague to deliver his famous “nuclear-free world” speech.

More importantly, nonverbal communication, specifically body language can either empower the speakers or fail them. First, politicians are careful in choosing their place and postures. As an example, Trump decided to sit in the centre of the round meeting table, holding his arms tightly, while he was delivering the remarks on North Korea ballistic missiles test. These position and posture were chosen intentionally to demonstrate power and strength. During most of his remarks, Trump appeared to hold the podium with strong grip to show confidence and strength. Likewise, Obama stood on a higher stage above the audience during his speech in Prague. Also, during the Q & A session at the joint statement with Park, the former president of South Korean, Obama had intentionally interfered to answer a question on behalf of Park while slightly giv-

ing his back to her. This demonstrates that US was leading the press conference and imposing the conditions of the joint statement. Additionally, interaction with audience is another Key factor. In 2018 State of Union, Trump was filmed while showing his compassion and admiration to both Otto's parents as well as Seong. Finally, micro-facial expressions are highly critical. For a while, it could be noticed that Bush was contemptuous about DPRK first nuclear test. Other examples show that US delegates were dissatisfied with Trump's address to UNGA in 2018. Next section examines the socio-political factors of the presidents' rhetoric.

3.3. Data explanation: analysing the socio-political factors behind the speeches of G. W. Bush, Obama, and Trump

Last level of Fairclough CDA model is to analyze the socio-political factors. Each one of the three presidents went through specific events, which influenced their rhetorical production on DPRK's nuclear issue. To begin with, G. W. Bush was under the influence of three main political factors. First, the Sep. 11th event left an enormous impact on G. W. Bush, if not a lasting effect. Soon, he waged a global War on Terror. G. W. Bush described North Korea as a rogue nation as well as a major sponsor of terrorism in 2002 State of Union. The second factor was the dominance of the neoconservative republicans during the first term of G. W. Bush presidency. This made him further hawkish towards both North Korea and Iran. Nevertheless, both countries were and are still pursuing the development of their nuclear program. Therefore, they are unwilling to give up to external pressures. Thirdly, North Korea is accused of supplying arms and missiles to Iran and terrorist groups. Thus, both countries are considered as direct threat to US national security. From neoconservatives' perspective, the path to end this threat and denuclearize North Korea and Iran is overthrow their tyrannical regimes (Boot, 2004: 24). G. W. Bush was also deeply influenced by the ideology of Western culture supremacy. To him, North Korea's regime is barbaric; and its nuclear power presents a threat to the civilized world. Thus, under UN umbrella, US and other western states must share the "white man burden" to stop this threat. G. W. Bush indicated in the UNGA 2008 that,

"We [US and the West] must remain vigilant against proliferation – by fully implementing the terms of Security Council Resolution 1540 and enforcing sanctions against North Korea and Iran. We must not relent until our people are safe from this threat to civilization" (Office of the Press Secretary, 2008: n.p.).

On the other hand, North Korea was almost neglected in the first term of Obama's presidency. There and then, he was busy with tackling domestic issues in the US. Externally, Obama's FP was focused on tackling issues in the Middle East such as ending the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. However, by the second term of his presidency, US foreign policy shifted to more engagement in the Asia-Pacific. Under the influence of his administration, especially Hilary Clinton, Obama was pursuing the Pivot to Asia Policy, (Clinton, 2011: n.p.; Weitz, 2013: n.p.). Accordingly, North Korean nuclear issue was back again to US foreign policy agenda. By 2013, Obama started to follow Bush steps by taking more unilateral actions and deploying further forces to South Ko-

rea. This was declared later in the joint statement with South Korea President. Nonetheless, The Asian Pivot policy had put Obama into more critical position when dealing with North Korea as shall be discussed later.

Finally, Trump was also influenced by several factors. Politically, realism dominates Trump words and actions. His urge to take unilateral actions and defend US national security and interests are stated clearly in his speeches. He is also not reluctant to use military forces to compel Kim Jung-on to stop threatening US with its nuclear power. This constitutes a direct departure from Obama's strategy, which was described as a total failure by Trump. His patriotic and popular leadership style made the people of US and North Korea the centre of his argument. To him, the main goal is to "make America great again," which is often depicted in his rhetoric. Thus, ensuring the safety and dignity of the Americans comes first. Second, people of North Korea must be liberated and free from the oppression of the current regime. However, Trump is not as hawkish as his rhetorical narratives might reveal. Indeed, he opposed John Bolton, the former hawkish United States National Security Advisor, for proposing 'Libya model' to cope with the North Korean nuclear issue. This leads to two conclusions. First, Trump is not in favour of intervening in North Korea akin to the 2011 NATO intervention in Libya. Second, despite his hatred to the leadership and the regime in DPRK, Trump does not wish for the North Koreans to live in a dysfunctional state like the Libyan people (*How the 'Libya Model'*, 2018: n.p.). All in all, what matters to Trump is solving the domestic issues in US. His hawkish tone remains only applied to the verbal skirmish with Kim Jong-Un.

4. INTERREGNUM OR CONTINUUM? G. W. BUSH, OBAMA AND TRUMP STANCES ON THE NORTH KOREAN NUCLEAR ISSUE

4.1. A unique rhetorical strategy?

How do the rhetorical strategies of the three presidents differ? Each one of the three presidents leaned toward using a specific mode of persuasion in his rhetoric. These selective modes of persuasion are no more than strategic tools to pursue their diplomatic goals. To begin with, G. W. Bush used mainly pathos to justify his coercive diplomacy towards DPRK. His style is full of imageries and contrasts. As an illustration, he metaphorized North Korea as one of the axis of evil to refer to both factual as well as religious meaning. Axis symbolizes the axis power in WW II; whereas, evil refer to sin and demon. US; on the other hand, is the land of righteousness and moral. Inspired by God, Americans are the chosen people to spread peace, democracy, and civilization in the world. DPRK's nuclear power and its brutal regime is threats to the civilized world. Based on G. W. Bush perception, denuclearizing North Korea is a white man's burden. Thus, war on North Korea is inevitable and is a natural follow up on the War on Terror. Accordingly, this finding supports Maggio (2007) claim about G. W. Bush top-down communication style. In other words, he used his presidency power to define enemies of US and command which actions should be taken against them. Not worthy,

G. W. Bush's communication style became more constructive and horizontal during his second term of presidency. By then, he relayed heavily on logos in his speeches to gain the support of international community and pursue a multilateral approach toward North Korea Nuclear issue.

Obama, on the other hand, relied on public diplomacy to tackle the worldwide nuclear issue in general and with regards to DPRK specifically. According to Zhang (2010), building trust with people and gaining their support was the most important tool for Obama to spread his "Nuclear-free world" doctrine globally. Thus, he mainly utilized Ethos in his speeches as a technique. First, he took advantage of his competences for being a former politician, attorney, and a graduate from Harvard School of Law. Secondly, he relied on both his charisma and his status as the first African American US president. Finally, his goodwill enabled him to establish trustworthiness with his public audience. He relied the least on pathos to deliver his speeches.

Finally, Trump favoured pathos the most, while balancing between the use of ethos and logos. To him, dealing with North Korean nuclear issue is a risky business. This indeed, reflects his business negotiation style, which was denoted by Kogan (2019). First, Trump reacted by exposing his economic and military muscles to Kim Jong-un. This could be seen in delegating Mattis, the former defence secretary, to give the remark on his behalf. At the same time, by using threatening words, Trump is imposing his maximum psychological pressure on North Korea. Second, he used evidences to gain support from main stakeholders in the game such as UN, China and Russia against Kim Jong-un regime. As an example, Trump excessively relied on narrating actual stories such as the tragic death of Otto Frederick Warmbier, a US citizen, and the oppression of Seong, a North Korean citizen, by Kim-Jung-on regime. These stories were repeatedly stated in most of his remarks. Beside utilizing emotional intelligence in his speech, Trump often uses sarcasm. Words such as rocket-man and suicidal mission are good indicators. Thus, each one of these three presidents has a personal rhetorical style and a unique mode of persuasion to pursue their strategic policies towards DPRK.

4.2. A continued legacy?

What do the rhetorical tones of G. W. Bush, Obama, and Trump reveal about their foreign policies towards North Korea? and do their rhetorical narratives indicate continuity of a certain nuclear legacy on North Korea? Indeed, the Cold War legacy is present until now. All three presidents aimed for deterring North Korea from proliferating its nuclear weapons and ultimately denuclearize the country. Still, each one of them has his own specific foreign policy. Nevertheless, these strategic policies do overlap occasionally. G. W. Bush diplomacy and foreign policy were generally influenced by his evangelical religious affiliation and his neoconservative political affiliation. However, the rhetorical narrative indicate that he went through two different policy phases. During his first presidency term, G. W. Bush followed a hostile policy towards North Korea. During this phase, the rhetorical narrative of G. W. Bush was bombarded by negative words and actions towards North Korea's nuclear issue.

The second phase of G. W. Bush presidency was known by its pragmatic diplomacy towards DPRK. This strategic shift was due to several factors. First, hawkish republicans, who held key cabinet positions, such as Powell and Rumsfeld have been replaced by the democrats by 2006. Second, the latest developments of the War in Iraq were critical. Despite his success in overthrowing Saddam Hussain, the costs and burdens of invading Iraq were beyond the estimation of G. W. Bush administration. Consequences such as the growth of anti-American vibes all over the globe; ISIS establishment in Iraq; the failure to democratize Iraq; and the failure of CIA to prove the accuracy of Iraqi WMD capability resulted in recalculating and reframing Bush's strategy towards North Korea. As a result, G. W. Bush coercive diplomacy on North Korea eventually weathered. In the second turn of his presidency, G. W. Bush used more constructive words and cooperative actions in his speeches, and so does his policy. All in all, G. W. Bush neoconservative Jacksonian foreign policy, which started as unilateral, domestically centred and military oriented has become more liberal and multilateral during his second term of presidency.

On the contrary, Obama started his presidency with a diplomacy of détente and a "strategic patience policy" towards DPRK to shift to more engaged and decisive policy by the second term of his presidency. Obama as a liberal internationalist and a Wilsonian has always favoured to resolve the North Korean Nuclear issue by cooperating with the international community. This could be seen in his Prague speech and UNGA 2009. However, after 2011, Obama reconstructed his détente policy to consider more engaged options such as bilateral and unilateral actions as well as taking military defensive measures. The 2015 joint statement with Park, the former president of South Korea, the 2003 and 2016 remarks on North Korea's nuclear tests reveal such changes. Additionally, these remarks highlight the strategic shift of Obama foreign policy from focusing on the Middle East to engaging more in the Asia-Pacific region.

"From opening new markets for American businesses to curbing nuclear proliferation to keeping the sea lanes free for commerce and navigation, our work abroad holds the key to our prosperity and security at home" (Clinton, 2011: p. 57).

Indeed, Clinton's statement about the Asian Pivot synchronizes with Obama's Wilsonian FP. However, building a harmonious relationship with the Asia-Pacific does not mean only ensuring the security and the prosperity of US allies in the region, namely: Japan and South Korea, but establishing also a more peaceful relationship with US counterparts such as China and Russia. On the one hand, US must increase its defence and military deployment to South Korea. On the other hand, convincing China to implement their political and economic pressures on DPRK to denuclearize the Korean Peninsula is a challenging mission. As a result, the Asian Pivot was not effective in solving the North Korean Nuclear Issue, rather it further endured Obama's Strategic Patience. Indeed, North Korea took this situation as an advantage to advance its nuclear program and conduct further nuclear and ballistic testes (Weitz, 2013: 312).

Last, Trump with his realist approach has pursued a policy like G. W. Bush towards North Korea. He is indeed influenced by the Jacksonian foreign policy of the United States as observed in most of his remarks. For instance, he repeatedly stated that US might unilaterally use hard power such as military and economic options against North

Korea regime. At the same time, he is also influenced by the Jeffersonian school of thoughts in the sense that he does not wish to interfere in North Korea or change its regime. He has only expressed in his speeches that the current regime in North Korea is fully accountable for its people suffering. Thus, Trump policy towards North Korea is based on “strategic accountability” despite his direct aggressive tone. By using threatening action-words such as “death, nihilation and suicide mission” in his rhetoric, Trump strategy is not a mere deterrence. His strategy is rather a compellence, which could further develop into a mutual assured destruction (MAD) in theory. Nevertheless, these threats remain limited to the verbal sphere, which intend to create more psychological pressure on DPRK regime. It is basically a strategic diplomacy known as “Try-and-See.”

To conclude, this study has addressed the US–DPRK foreign policy from a new perspective. CDA was introduced as the main methodological tool to understand the postures of the last three former US presidents concerning DPRK. By analysing selected speeches thoroughly, this study revealed that G. W. Bush, Obama, and Trump share the same dogmatic posture on the North Korean nuclear issue. This posture is highly influenced by the Cold War legacy through which communist regimes should be deterred from using nuclear weapons. Therefore, the goal for Bush, Obama and Trump is to denuclearize North Korea. Several factors such as ideologies; political affiliations; academic backgrounds; professional experiences; administrative structures and current socioeconomic events contributed to constructing and de-constructing the discourses of these president. Eventually, their strategic policies have overlapped, despite their uniqueness. For instance, there was a noticeable strategic shift in both G. W. Bush and Obama’s second terms of presidency which influenced their speech tones while addressing DPRK nuclear issue. Nevertheless, both G. W. Bush and Trump used mostly pathos to persuade their audience with their hawkish policy towards North Korea. Obama, on the other hand, approached North Korea nuclear issue in a more dovish and restrained policy by relying rhetorically on ethos. All in all, regardless their rhetorical style and foreign policy differences, US presidents continue to share the same stance against North Korea nuclear issue, so long it is governed by a communist regime. Future studies could extend the application of CDA to discover the stances of other key decision makers in US administration(s). This will help in connecting the dots and understanding the dynamics of US–DPRK foreign policy decision making process.

REFERENCES

- Ahn T. (2012), *Patience or Lethargy? U.S. Policy toward North Korea under the Obama Administration*, “North Korean Review”, Vol. 8, No. 1, <http://dx.doi.org/10.3172/NKR.8.1.67>.
- Banta B. (2013), *Analyzing discourse as a causal mechanism*, “European Journal of International Relations”, Vol. 19, No. 2, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066111428970>.
- Beczowska J. (2019), *Korean Crisis and a War of Words*, “International Studies: Interdisciplinary Political & Cultural Journal”, Vol. 23, No. 1, <http://dx.doi.org/10.18778/1641-4233.23.07>.
- Boot M. (2004), *Neocons*, “Foreign Policy”, No. 140, <https://search-proquest-com.zulib.idm.oclc.org/docview/224033677?accountid=15192> (22.07.2021).

- Brands H. W. (2001), *The Four Schoolmasters*, "The National Interest", No. 66, <https://nationalinterest.org/bookreview/the-four-schoolmasters-1181> (03.05.2021).
- Clinton H. (2011), *America's Pacific century: The future of geopolitics will be decided in Asia, not in Afghanistan or Iraq, and the united states should be right at the centre of the action*, "Foreign Policy", No. 189, <https://foreignpolicy.com/2011/10/11/americas-pacific-century/> (29.10.2021).
- Difilippo A. (2014), *Steady State: The North Korean Nuclear Issue from Bush to Obama*, "Asian Affairs: An American Review", Vol. 41, No. 2, <https://doi-org.zulib.idm.oclc.org/10.1080/0927678.2014.910423>.
- Edwards B. T. (2018), *Trump from Reality TV to Twitter, or the Selfie-Determination of Nations*, "Arizona Quarterly", Vol. 74, No. 3, <http://dx.doi.org.zulib.idm.oclc.org/10.1353/arq.2018.0014>.
- Fan X. (2019), *The Research and Application of Critical Discourse Analysis*, "Journal of Language Teaching & Research", Vol. 10, No. 5, <http://dx.doi.org.zulib.idm.oclc.org/10.17507/jltr.1005.17>.
- Hardy C., Harley B., Phillips N. (2004), *Discourse Analysis and Content Analysis: Two Solitudes?*, "Qualitative Methods", No. 2, DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.998649.
- Hayes P. (2018), *Trump and the Interregnum of American Nuclear Hegemony*, "Journal for Peace and Nuclear Disarmament", Vol. 1, No. 2, <https://doi.org/10.1080/25751654.2018.1532525>.
- History.com Editors, *Korean War*, "A&E Television Networks", 11.9.2009, <https://www.history.com/topics/korea/korean-war> (30.04.2021).
- How the 'Libya Model' Became a Sticking Point in North Korea Nuclear Talks* (2018), "The New York Times", <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/05/16/world/asia/north-korea-libya-model.html> (20.04.2021).
- Husenicova L. (2018), *U.S. Foreign Policy Towards North Korea*, "International Studies. Interdisciplinary Political and Cultural Journal", Vol. 22, No. 1.
- Hyun K. (2017), *Comparing North Korea Policies of The Obama and Trump Administrations*, "Nanzan Review of American Studies", Vol. 39, <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/236159121.pdf> (02.04.2021).
- Kogan E. B. (2019), *Art of the Power Deal: The Four Negotiation Roles of Donald J. Trump*, "Negotiation Journal", Vol. 35, No. 1, <http://dx.doi.org.zulib.idm.oclc.org/10.1111/nej.12265>.
- Krzymowski A. (2002), *Czy NATO grozi rozpad? / Is NATO in danger of disintegrating?*, "Unia & Polska (Union & Poland)", No. 12/13.
- Laffey M., Weldes J. (2004), *Methodological reflections on discourse analysis*, "Qualitative Methods", Vol. 2, No. 1, <http://www.asu.edu/clas/polisci/cqrm/Newsletter/Newsletter2.1.pdf> (13.12.2020).
- Levy M., McDonald F. (2017), *Presidency of the United States of America*, "Encyclopædia Britannica", <https://www.britannica.com/topic/presidency-of-the-United-States-of-America> (29.03.2021).
- Lewis J., Taylor N. (2016), *North Korea's Nuclear Year in Review – And What's Next*, "Nuclear Threat Initiative (NTI)", <https://www.nti.org/analysis/articles/north-koreas-nuclear-year-reviewand-whats-next/> (10.04.2021).
- Maggio J. (2007), *The Presidential Rhetoric of Terror: The (Re)Creation of Reality Immediately after 9/11*, "Politics & Policy", Vol. 35, No. 4, <https://doi-org.zulib.idm.oclc.org/10.1111/j.1747-1346.2007.00085.x>.
- North Korea's 'Christmas gift' could be a new anti-US hard-line policy, source says* (2019), "CNN a", <https://edition.cnn.com/2019/12/24/politics/donald-trump-troops-call/index.html> (16.04.2021).

- Office of the Press Secretary (n.d.), *President Bush Addresses United Nations General Assembly*, <https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2008/09/20080923-5.html> (04.10.2021).
- Pechatnov V. (2012), *The Cold War and Its Legacy*, in: *International Relations Since the End of the Cold War: New and Old Dimensions*, (ed.) G. Lundestad, Oxford University Press, <https://oxford.universitypressscholarship.com/view/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199666430.001.0001/acprof-9780199666430-chapter-7> (20.04.2021).
- Šimunjak M., Caliandro A. (2019), *Twiplomacy in the age of Donald Trump: Is the diplomatic code changing?*, “Information Society”, Vol. 35, No. 1, <https://doi-org.zulib.idm.oclc.org/10.1080/01972243.2018.1542646>.
- Tamkin E. (2018), *Why Trump Needs the Swedes in Pyongyang*, “Foreign Policy”, <https://foreign-policy.com/2018/04/25/why-trump-needs-the-swedes-in-pyongyang/> (29.07.2021).
- The historical imperative* (2002), “The Guardian”, <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2002/mar/16/books.guardianreview1> (29.03.2021).
- The United States Senate. (n.d.), *Constitution of the United States*, The United States Senate, https://www.senate.gov/civics/constitution_item/constitution.htm (07.03.2021).
- Trump says he’s ready to handle North Korea ‘gift,’ it might be a ‘beautiful vase’* (2019), “CNN b”, <https://edition.cnn.com/2019/12/24/politics/donald-trump-troops-call/index.html> (14.04.2021).
- Weiss J. (2015), *From Aristotle to Sadat: A Short Strategic Persuasion Framework for Negotiators*, “Negotiation Journal”, Vol. 3, No. 3, <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1704124945?accountid=15192> (17.01.2021).
- Weitz R. (2013), *An Enduring Partnership: South Korea and the United States*, “Korean Journal of Defense Analysis”, Vol. 25, No. 3, <http://web.a.ebscohost.com.zulib.idm.oclc.org/ehost/detail/detail?vid=0&sid=1ef3624d-0d64-4b63-ac7a-87b3a6bd6362%40sdc-v-sessmgr01&data=JnNpdGU9ZWwhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#AN=90262438&db=poh> (29.03.2021).
- Wróbel S. (2015), “*Logos, Ethos, Pathos*” *Classical Rhetoric Revisited*, “Polish Sociological Review”, Vol. 12, No. 5, www.jstor.org/stable/44113896 (19.01.2021).
- Zhang J. (2010), *Exploring rhetoric of public diplomacy in the mixed-motive situation: Using the case of President Obama’s ‘nuclear-free world’ speech in Prague*, “Place Branding and Public Diplomacy”, Vol. 6, No. 4.

Appendix

Table 1

Units of analysis list

Units of analysis	Contents summary
1) G. W. Bush addresses to the State of union (SOTU) (2002)	G. W. Bush started his 2002 addresses to the SOTU by emphasizing external issue such as US recovering from the shock of the 9/ 11th and embarking in the War on Terror. For Bush administration, fighting terrorism globally and targeting the “Axis of Evil” were the two external objectives of the US. Here, North Korea was listed as the first and the most dangerous country followed by Iran and Iraq. These rogue countries possibly own weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and supply them to the terrorists network globally. Then, Bush moved to address main domestic issues encountered by Amircans in that period.
2) G. W. Bush remarks on the first North Korea’s nuclear test (Oct 2006)	G. W. Bush began his remarks with condemning North Korea act and calling for urgent actions by the international community. Then, he moved to seek the support from regional actors in East Asia to denuclearize North Korea. Echoing his statement in 2002 STOU, Bush stated that North Korean missiles technology has been trans

Units of analysis	Contents summary
	ferred to both state and non-state actors, who support terrorism. All in all, G. W. bush perceived North Korean nuclear weaponizing as a threat to the global and national security as well as the source for impoverishing North Koreans.
3) Bush addresses to United Nations General Assembly UNGA (2008)	The 2008 G. W. Bush addresses to the UNGA highlighted the 21st century challenges for human rights. These challenges are Terrorism and tyrannical regimes. Regimes in Afghanistan, Iraq as well North Korea being viewed as threat to the “civilized nations”. The approach to face these challenges is to spread freedom and democracy vertically in these states by pursuing regimes change; increasing neoliberal trade and investment; and improving the living conditions of their people. All actors have to cooperate and coordinate their actions to address these challenges. Although Bush seemed to endorse a more liberal approach in his speech, still he resembled his neoconservative ideologies. He referred to terrorism and tyrannical regimes as evil; whereas US and the western world as the God’s heirs of Justice and liberty. Eventually, he concluded his address by stating that US mission was to free the world.
4) Bush press conference on North Korea’s Nuclear Declaration (2008)	In this press conference, Bush stressed the importance of using multilateral diplomacy to solve the nuclear issue in the Korean Peninsula. This will be done through intensifying the effort of the Six-Party Talks. G.W. Bush also ordered to lift the application of Trading with the Enemy Act (TWEA) on North Korea as a cooperative measure. Then, He renounced the designation of North Korea as State Sponsor of Terrorism (SST). On the other hand, North Korea has to obey the protocols and the decisions proposed by the six-party partners and to resolve promptly the issue of Japanese citizens abduction.
5) Obama speech in Prague (2009)	Obama outlined his “Nuclear Free World” vision in this speech. According to Obama, nuclear weapons proliferation, which is the last remaining legacy of the Cold War, has not ended yet. This require a global effort which goes beyond the US-Europe cooperation. First, US to reduce its domestic fund of and reliance on nuclear arms. However, few to remain at disposal for deterrence purposes. Second, state and non-states actores will not further acquire nuclear weapons and those, who already have them shall proceed to disarmament. However, state can still use nuclear technology for civil purpose. This will be monitored and regulated by the creation of Global Cooperation for civil nuclear usages. More importantly, a stronger global regime must be built to cope with countries, who breach international laws and protocols such as North Korea and Iran.
6) Obama remarks on the second North Korea’s nuclear test (May 2009)	While planning to commemorate the American Civil war, Obama swiftly gave his statement on the 2nd North Korean nuclear test. He condemned the act as a total violation of international law and a serious threat to the North East Asian Region. Thus, two major actions should be taken. First, US along with the UN must jointly maximize the pressure on North Korea. Secondly, the international nonproliferation regime must be further solidified. Obama concluded his remarks by re-emphasizing the US role as world police, which not only secure American citizens but also people of the world.
7) Obama addresses to UNGA (2009)	In his first addresses to the UN, Obama promised to end the pervious unilateral hegemonic era of US and to start a more cooperative phase. Reshaping US image required taking several positive actions. Furthermore, Obama outlined four principles for the international community futuristic agenda, namely: global nuclear nonproliferation and disarmament; peace and security promotion; tackling environmental issues and enhancing global economy as well as the living standards. He reaffirmed his vision of pursuing a world free of nuclear weapons and standing still against states, who violates international Law such as Iran and north Korea.
8) Obama remarks on the third North Korea’s nuclear test (2013)	In this written statement, Obama shed light on North Korea continuous provocation of international law, the need for further resolutions by UN and recontinuation of the six party talks. By echoing Bush statement in 2006, Obama stressed that the enhancement of DPRK nuclear weapon technology will result in deepening its isolation and impoverishing its people. US would further coordinate its effort with both the UN and the six-party partners to resolve this issue.

Units of analysis	Contents summary
9) Obama addresses to the State of Union (2013)	–Obama started his addresses by pointing at the current economic status in America then moved to highlight the role of US leadership in the international sphere. These international issues are defeating AL Qaeda, controlling the spread of nuclear weapons globally, tackling cyber-attacks... and so forth. Again, North Korea and Iran were major concerns with regards to the proliferation of nuclear weapons.
10) Obama – South Korea Joint statement (2015)	– In his joint statement with president Parker, Obama stressed the importance of South Korea as geostrategic partner to US. The partnership between US and South Korea went beyond Security to include trade, developmental aid, cyber defense and clean energy. It was also important for US to reinforce military deployment and defense capabilities in South Korea. Both countries condemned North Korea for the attack on the DMZ and the continuous abuse of human rights. The two presidents also refused to recognize DPRK as a nuclear weapon state. Obama further praised President Park in her policy to engage with North Korea.
11) Obama remarks on the fourth and fifth North Korea’s nuclear tests (Sep 2016)	– Obama repeatedly stated that North Korea is breaching the international law taking into consideration that it is the only country which is testing nuclear in the 21st century. DPRK is causing nothing than impoverishing its people. US took swift action to respond by engaging into multilateral negotiations with its Asian counterparts in the G-20 and East Asia Summit meetings. Additionally, US was took defensive measures by deploying the THAAD system to South Korea.
12) Trump and South Korean President Joint Statement (2017)	– Trump started his joint statement by praising the South Korean democratic election of the current president Moon Jae-in. He also highlighted the special cultural, economic and military ties, which bound the two countries. The common challenge which faces the two countries is the advancement of nuclear program by the current regime in DPRK. It is considered as direct threat to both countries. It led to the impoverishment of the North Koreans. Furthermore, the DPRK regime has extended its human rights violation to other countries citizens such as the Japanese and American citizens. Finally, Trump indicated that Obama’s patience strategy was ineffective; therefore, to start a new approach in reaching peace with North Korea. This will include engaging other regional powers, maintaining military support to South Korea and increasing the reciprocal trade with South Korea.
13) Trump remarks on North Korea’s Ballistic missiles test (2017)	– Trump warned North Korea to stop threatening US by launching ballistic missiles and advancing its nuclear technology. Otherwise, hard power such as military will be used against Kim Jong-Un regime.
14) Trump tweets on the sixth North Korea’s nuclear test (2017)	– Trump stated that North Korea nuclear test is a direct threat to US national security. Thus, US were about to take several actions including economic sanction. Then, he indicated that both China and South Korea engagement with North Korea failed to resolve the issue.
15) Mattis remarks the sixth North Korea’s nuclear test (2017)	– Mattis echoed Trump “Fire and Fury” statement by indicating that US could use several military options including conventional weapons to deter the North Korean Nuclear threat. This possible preemptive action is justified by reassuring the protection of US allies in the region as well as the protection of Guam, a US Pacific island. This would be further justified by the UN security council’s consensus in denuclearizing North Korea.
16) Trump addresses to UNGA (2017)	– Trump started his first addresses to the UNGA by shedding light on the domestic progress in the US, especially in term of dealing with the recent natural disasters, economic nourishment and strengthening military capability. Then he highlighted the principles of the Marshall Plan which contributed to the recovery of Europe aftermath the WWII. These principles are the core of Trump’s foreign policy. Sovereignty and security to be valued the most. Trump declared that US is going to approach unilateral realist approach under his administration. Other should do the same by encouraging patriotism and independency rather than dependency. Then, Trump listed the challenges which face the world today such as rogue states and authoritarian regimes; terrorists and international criminal network; and poverty. Accordingly, Trump indicated that DRPK nuclear program is the most urgent issue to be dealt with. The same charges were raised against North Korea such as the regime brutality, violation

Units of analysis	Contents summary
	of human rights and threatening the global security. Trump verbally warned again to completely destroy North Korea, if it did not commit to the denuclearization process
17) Trump addresses to the State of Union (2018)	The 2018 Trump’s addresses to the SoTU was the most theatrical and dramatic. It was titled by ‘America’s New Heroes’. It carried “Let’s make America Great Again” as the main slogan. The main purpose of the address was to increase the patriotic sense of Americans and focus on the national and domestic issues. Among many interna-
17) Trump addresses to the State of Union (2018)	tional concerns, the regime of North Korea was elaborated the most. By narrating Otto and Seong-ho stories, Trump emphasized the need to democratize and free the people of North Korea from the current regime. Trump also requested the congress to fully fund and support US military and rebuild its nuclear weapons capabilities for deterrence purpose.

Table 2

Words repetition frequency

	Low repetition frequency: 3–14 R	Medium repetition frequency: 15–27 R	High repetition frequency: 28–40 R
G. W. Bush	must, party, Korean, weapons, talks, world, international, actions, free, nations, threat, proliferation, security, people, Japan, goal, continue, terrorists, south, remains, peninsula, plutonium, community, have, process, regime, sanctions, action, diplomacy, claim	Will, nuclear, United States	North Korea
Obama	people, missile, allies test, world, action(s), stand, threat, work, take, obligations, peace, ballistic, never, council, response, strong, treaty, responsibility, secure, south, clear, commitment	Weapons, must, international community, security, United nations, United States	North Korea, nuclear, will
Trump	Regime, United Nations, will, world, Korean, have, nuclear, only, states, allies, security, Otto Warmbier, Seong, threat, death, defend, reckless, America, country, many, China, failed, wonderful, understand, options, past, people, brother, patience, citizens	–	North Korea

ABSTRACT

This article explores the postures of the last three former US presidents towards North Korean nuclear issue. The study applies Fairclough’s critical discourse analysis (CDA) model as a new approach to examine this topic. By analyzing 17 speech corpuses, this study sheds light on the foreign policy adapted G. W. Bush, Obama, and Trump to address North Korea Nuclear issue. Theoretically, the study uses both Waltz’s foreign policy analysis model and Aristotle modes of persuasion to analyze the findings. It also clarifies the original foundations of each presidents’ foreign policy based on the four American IR school of thoughts. Results indicate that the legacy of the Cold War continues to shape and influence the stances of US presidents toward DPRK, despite the differences in their rhetorical and political strategies. While this study focuses individually on presidents as the main unit of analysis, future studies can further expand the use of CDA analysis to examine the stances of other key decision

makers in the presidents' administration to fully understand the relation between discourses and power structure.

Keywords: North Korea Nuclear issue, G. W. Bush, Barak Obama, Donald Trump, critical discourse analysis (CDA)

**OD RETORYKI DO POSTAWY: STUDIUM PORÓWNAWCZE PODEJŚCIA
GEORGE'A W. BUSH, BARACKA H. OBAMY ORAZ DONALDA J. TRUMPA
WOBEC KWESTII PROGRAMU ATOMOWEGO KOREI PÓŁNOCNEJ**

STRESZCZENIE

W artykule analizie poddano postawy administracji G. W. Busha, Baracka Obamy oraz Donalda J. Trumpa wobec kwestii zagrożenia nuklearnego ze strony Korei Północnej. W badaniu zastosowano model krytycznej analizy dyskursu (CDA) Fairclougha jako nowe podejście do badania tego tematu. Analizując 17 korpusów przemówień, niniejsze badanie rzuca światło na politykę zagraniczną przyjętą przez administrację G. W. Busha, Baracka Obamy oraz Donalda J. Trumpa wobec zagrożeń związanych z programem atomowym Korei Północnej. Jako podstawą teoretyczną autorka posłużyła się zarówno modelem analizy stosunków międzynarodowych K. Waltza, jak również perswazją w ujęciu arystotelesowskim. Artykuł ten wyjaśnia również pierwotne podstawy polityki zagranicznej każdego z prezydentów w oparciu o cztery szkoły myślenia amerykańskich badań nad stosunkami międzynarodowymi. Wyniki analizy wskazują, iż dziedzictwo zimnej wojny nadal kształtuje i wpływa na postawy prezydentów USA wobec KRLD, pomimo różnic w ich strategiach retorycznych i politycznych. Podczas gdy niniejsze badanie koncentruje się indywidualnie na urzędzie prezydenckim jako głównej jednostce analizy, przyszłe badania mogą jeszcze bardziej rozszerzyć wykorzystanie analizy CDA np. do zbadania roli i zachowania innych kluczowych członków administracji prezydenckich, aby w pełni zrozumieć związek pomiędzy różnymi dyskursami a strukturą władzy.

Słowa kluczowe: problem jądrowy Korei Północnej, G. W. Bush, Barak Obama, Donald Trump, krytyczna analiza dyskursu (CDA)

