

Received : 25 January 2024, Accepted: 20 February 2024

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33282/rr.vx9i2.17>

## **Framing Peace and Victory: A Critical Discourse Analysis of President Trump's Rhetoric on Ending the Afghanistan War and Defeating ISIS**

1. Muhammad Javed Ashraf, Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Political Science, Government College University Faisalabad, Pakistan. ([ranajavedashraf23@gmail.com](mailto:ranajavedashraf23@gmail.com))
2. Shamila, Lecturer, Department of Political Science, Govt. Islamia Graduate College (W) Eid Gah Road Faisalabad, Pakistan. ([Drshamila2024@gmail.com](mailto:Drshamila2024@gmail.com))
3. Dr. Salma Umer, Associate Professor, Department of Mass Communication, Government Collage University Faisalabad, Pakistan. ([salmaumber@gcuf.edu.pk](mailto:salmaumber@gcuf.edu.pk)) (Correspondence)
4. Muhammad Asim Khan, M. Phil Scholar, Department of Applied Linguistics, Government College University Faisalabad, Pakistan ([asim1412@gmail.com](mailto:asim1412@gmail.com))

### **Abstract**

This paper analyzed the Trump presidency's counterterrorism and the Afghanistan Peace Agreement discourse, analyzing how through strategic framing and meaning making tools, policies were justified and leadership narratives augmented. The research focused on how language, power and ideology construct and naturalize public opinion and provide legitimation for armed force and diplomacy. This study employed a qualitative research design and critical discourse analysis as the main theoretical perspective adopted from Fairclough's model, Framing Theory, as well as the Discourse-Historical Approach to analyze how nationalist considerations were aligned with the global agendas. Sources of data for this research were speeches, press releases, and media articles purposely identified and obtained in addition to secondary sources such as policies statements. Textual, framing, contextual and ideological analysis was performed to identify the rhetorical endeavors and taboos that are embedded in the discourse. The study shows that the administration used victory frames, leadership frames, and global threat frames with assertive language, appealing to vision, and expert validation to present itself as a change maker in response to contemporary threats. To some extent, the hatred towards other people was connected with reliance on nationalist values combined with international cooperation in order to mobilize public opinion to support policy objectives and

promote the image of the U.S as the defender of national interests and as a leader in the fight against terrorism. This work adds value to political communication scholarship because it shows how language facilitates the construction of power and action justification, and it offers an interpretative approach to leadership narratives in foreign policy. Future studies include synergy of comparative political language; analysis of media reports on political rhetoric; and appreciation of public views regarding utilization of political language in given policy determinations.

*Keywords:* Critical Discourse Analysis, political communication, counterterrorism, Afghanistan peace agreement, rhetorical strategies, framing theory, Trump administration, leadership narratives, ideological constructs

## Introduction

Some of the main trends in the American foreign policy that the Trump's presidency brought for the first time include the tendencies towards the protraction of military hostilities. One of the presidency campaigns by Donald Trump was his hard stance on ending America's participation in the endless wars with specific emphasis on Afghanistan (The Heritage Foundation, 2020). Started after the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, Afghanistan war broke down to be the longest conflict in U.S history, 3,500 and more U.S and NATO soldiers died and the total cost by the taxpayers reached \$ 900 billion (Time, 2020). The Trump administration presented its decision on bringing an end to the war as a way of fulfilling promises before the elections by avoiding protracted entanglements in armed conflicts (NPR, 2016). Besides Afghanistan, Trump's administration succeeded in an effective fight against the Islamic State (ISIS). In March this year Trump declared full liberation of ISIS-controlled territory and in autumn of 2019 U.S. Special Operations Forces eliminated the ISIS leader Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi. Such successes were claimed as the proof of organizational commitment of Trump and his team on leadership, management and decision making concerning counter terrorism that targeted an aggressive and proactive engagement supported by military forces and allied partners (U.S. Department of Defense, 2017).

The deal signed in 2020 between the United States and the Taliban was a significant process to ending America's longest conflict. Under the agreement, American forces were to be withdrawn dramatically –the full withdrawal depending on the Taliban's compliance with

assurances against hosting terrorists (NBC News, 2020). This treaty, which Defense Secretary Mark Esper posited as “the best chance we have ever had to end this conflict” was packaged by the administration as an opportunity to move from war, volatility, and mired entanglement to peace, stability, and release from a costly drain.

CDA has provided a strong theoretical background towards the study of how language creates power and Ideology in political discourse. Some of the source that have addressed the issue include: According to Fairclough (2015), the text, discursive practice, and the social practice all interconnect in the way that shows how discourse influences and is influenced by social power relations. Also, Wodak (2011) underscores historical and sociopolitical aspects of political discourse with relation to political communication. By expanding what is defined in Framing Theory, Reese (2010) also pointed out that frames are instrumental in defining information and understanding. These are helpful in understanding the method through which the Trump administration employed the use of Victory Frames, Leadership Frames and Global Threat Frames all in an effort to directly justify its actions and further solidify the leadership narrative being peddled out.

This paper also explores how assertiveness, imagery, and quantification work rhetorically to build legitimacy and create coalitions. According to Lakoff (2004), metaphorical and emotional arguments are core strategies in framing of the arguments increasingly associated with policy contestations. Language can mobilize moral purposes and build public trust – this is what the Trump administration’s discourse, which includes reference to ‘100 Percent of the ‘caliphate’” and descriptive images of Baghdadi as a terrorist, exemplifies.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) provides a sound framework for analyzing cue affiliation and knowledge in politics of war and peace processes. To understand the ideologies, discursive power relations, and commonplaces used to justify the Trump administration’s policies towards Afghanistan and ISIS, this work examines the Trump register of discourse. It is therefore the desire of this study to add to the existing literature on political narratives especially in as far as they would portray U.S foreign policy as success in the bid to achieve enhanced understanding of the role of political communication on the shaping of public opinions and policies.

## **Significance of the Study**

This research is important because it aims to understand the discursive moves that the Trump administration uses when explaining its foreign policy decisions, including the exit from Afghanistan and the military's triumph over ISIS. Methodologically framing the study with Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), the research offers the understanding of how political discourse forms people's attitudes, naturalizes the policy choices, and creates the lore of achievement and leadership in the conditions of the war-lasting operations. It is important for the theoretical approach to these phenomena and for the attempts to judge the relationship between political communication and public opinion in terms of the beliefs activating societal conflict and for the critical deconstruction of the politics of language into power relations in world politics. This research makes a significant contribution to the existing literature on political language and provides insightful insights for policymakers, scholars, and the media when interpreting politics and power in connection with discourse, rhetoric, and ideology.

## **Problem Statement**

Long lasting war in Afghanistan which is longest war in the history of United States has not only consumed a considerable amount of money but also influenced world opinion on the United States foreign policy. Although the accomplished endeavors of the Trump administration including to put an end to this warfare and to achieve the near victory over ISIS were appreciated by many, these moves were performed in parallel to rhetorical strategies with the aim of providing a justification to these policies and to sell them as favorable acts of leadership. However, such narratives tend, as a rule, to reduce all the numerous aspects of warfare, of peace-making, and of its aftermaths. However, there is a research gap regarding how the Trump administration's discourse constructed this set of policies, steered public opinion, and was aligned with ideological and geopolitical goals. An exploratory study of these discursive strategies will apply the critical discourse analysis (CDA) framework in order to reveal the power relations, politics and rhetorically enshrined prejudices inherent in the linguistic and stylistic approaches to politically construing war and peace.

## **Research Questions**

- 1) What rhetorical strategies and linguistic devices were employed in Trump's discourse to legitimize military decisions and policy shifts related to counterterrorism and troop withdrawal?
- 2) What ideological constructs and power dynamics are embedded in the Trump administration's discourse on ending the war in Afghanistan and combating ISIS, and how do these align with broader geopolitical and domestic priorities?
- 3) How did President Trump's administration frame the narratives of success and leadership in the discourse surrounding the defeat of ISIS and the Afghanistan peace agreement?

## **Literature Review**

The use of language in political works has received a lot research attention from different disciplines. CDA operates as the most effective approach to reveal how and where power and ideologies shape language (Fairclough, 2015). This has been proved helpful in showing how political actors employ language to justify actions, to mobilize opinions and to regulate stories (van Dijk, 2008). CDA is especially useful in political discourse since language in politics works to establish and perpetuate hegemonic discourses, (Wodak, 2015).

### **Theoretical Framework**

As this study's primary theoretical framework, CDA will analyze how the Trump administration's discourse constructed its policies regarding the cessation of the Afghanistan and the eradication of ISIS. CDA has its theoretical grounding in the premise that language is more than just a means of conveying information, but also as a way of building and perpetuating the relations of power, ideology, and dominance figured on existent frameworks of social injustice in the societies in question. By identifying the modality, modes and technological affordances of a particular text or discursive event, by examining the patterns of text, discourse and social relations at the narration and discursive level, CDA deconstructs language use to demonstrate the inherent relations of power and social processes that exist within it.

### **Language, Power, and Ideology**

According to Norman Fairclough (2015) CDA is a theoretical and methodological model that recognizes and examines a reciprocal interaction between language and society as practice, discourse is simultaneously a form of representation and an enactment of social structure and power relations. This perspective is appropriate when analyzing political speech since it shows how political performers impose language to legitimate measures, give meaning to events, and maintain dominance. Van Dijk (2008) also points out that politics and media use various strategies to manage and steer people's opinions, and that especially elite discourses help construct ideologies on any given society.

### **Framing and Narrative Construction in Political Discourse**

Another theoretical construct which is used in the development of the theory is framing; this is a concept that has to do with choosing and creating some aspects of reality in order to facilitate the advancement of a particular perspective (Entman, 1993). Therefore framing theory is crucial when analyzing how the Trump administration set the agendas for success, leadership and moral purpose regarding Afghanistan and ISIS. For example, the administration's focus on killing of Abu Bakr al-Bagdadi and the drawing down of troops in Afghanistan served its purpose of publicizing its achievement in the realms of strategic and ethical victories in accordance with other nationalist principles embraced in "America First".

### **Legitimization Strategies in Political Discourse**

Drawing again upon the discourse-historical approach developed by Reisigl and Wodak (2009), we find that the strategies of legitimization, argumentation, and justification are used by political discourse. This approach considers the historical and sociopolitical setting of the discourses which makes it possible to understand different patterns of the Rhetorical recourse used by the Trump administration. The common politics of software patents are performed through national security, moral arguments, and fulfilling the campaign promises, which aims at mobilizing supporters to eliminate the opponent.

This theoretical lens lies at the basis of explaining in what ways the Trump administration discursively constructed its policies on Afghanistan and ISIS. Combining insights from Fairclough's power and ideology approach, van Dijk's elite discourse, Entman's framing theory, and Reisigl and Wodak's discourse historical analysis, this research provides

a theoretical framework that allows for the analysis of rich layers of political discourse. It not only allows critical analysis and the how of the administration's discourse but also makes a significant contribution to the debates on language-power and policy in today's geopolitics of the world.

## **Framing War and Peace in Political Discourse**

The discursive construction of war and peace consists of the building of argumentative structures legitimizing actions, appealing to the correct moral high ground and portraying leadership. The author has shown through academic findings that leaders use simple language, appeal to the emotions, and nationalistic sentiments as rhetorical devices in selling a particular war and its conduct and outcome (Chilton, 2004). For example, analysis of campaigns deploying the post-9/11 American nationalism and the War on Terror focused on the manner in which this war was portrayed as a divine mission based on the construction of bipolar ontologies "us" and "them" (Jackson, 2005). In the same way, policies of peace and demobilization are peddled as accomplishment of a powerful presidency while underlying possible doubt or perils (Bhatia, 2005).

## **Trump's "America First" Ideology in Foreign Policy**

The Trump administration's foreign policy, especially the campaign phrase – "America First" was different from conventional methods. This ideology entailed pulling out from the global leadership front and concentrating issuances on nationality (Restad, 2019). Within this framework, Trump aimed to rebrand US foreign policy that of deliberately ending 'endless wars'. Critics explain his administration as oversimplifying complicated geopolitical problems using strategic ambiguity and litotes while in actuality motivating a significantly sophisticated method (Miller, 2021).

## **Framing the Afghanistan Peace Agreement**

The departure of America from Afghanistan and the agreements that were reached with the Taliban in 2020 are fresh additions to Trump's policy of foreign affairs. The administration used this agreement as a step towards stable peace while on the other hand the exit as the fulfillment of campaign promises (Fox News, 2020). However, critics' reaction claims that such narratives tend to both undermine and mask socio-political situations in a given country and future consequences (Wright, 2020). There has been an understanding that constructing

the peace agreement poses challenges suggesting that such stories stress on positive aspects of peace processes yet tend to obscure volatilities and likely failures (Saikal, 2020).

While there is a considerable body of scholarship on political discourse and US foreign policy, few works focus on how the Trump presidency presented its policies on Afghanistan and the defeat of the ISIS. About the contemporary American foreign policy most of the prior work may be seen to center on more generic issues as part of extraneous American foreign policy or on the effects of the so-called 'America First' doctrine. To this extent, this study intends to use CDA to address the named gap in the literature by examining the discursive constructions of Trump's policy approaches towards Afghanistan and ISIS. It does so in order to reveal the beliefs, domination and discursive tactics employed to construct consent over these actions.

## **Methodology**

This research adopts a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) approach in order to analyze the textual and ideological features and relations of power concerning President Trump's policies on the war in Afghanistan, and the defeat of ISIS. Its main purpose is to following a rigorous analytic procedure to investigate how language builds stories, provides the rationale for policies, and sways people.

## **Research Design**

The current research uses a qualitative research approach to analyze textually and contextually the speeches, press releases and media coverage regarding President Trump's foreign policy on Afghanistan and ISIS. The approach is dominant interpretive and analytical one, in an attempt to understand the ideologies, framing and power relations.

## **Data Collection**

The data used for this study comprises both primary and secondary data. Primary sources of data collection consist of statements and speeches by President Trump, announcements concerning White House policy, press briefing regarding the policies of Trump administration, interviews with key administration officials including the Secretary of Defense. Also, such components as executive orders and policy documents regarding U.S. military



actions in Afghanistan and the fight against ISIS are discussed. Secondary data includes sources such as The Washington Post, The New York Times, or Fox News, as well as articles and reports from think tanks and academic authors who offer a backdrop and critique. Admission of history of US engagement of Afghanistan and world anti-terrorism activity are also encompassed. That is why, using purposive sampling, discourse excerpts corresponding to significant turning points like the signing of the Afghanistan peace agreement and the announcement of the death of Baghdadi are chosen. These excerpts are chosen to represent as many different organizations as possible: government, military, and press; they are chosen also with respect to the research goals of identifying framing techniques and ideological presuppositions.

## **Data Analysis Procedures**

This conceptual investigation uses a comprehensive analytical framework which follows main theoretical theories. Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) model examines the interplay between language, ideology, and power, focusing on three dimensions: words, speech, writing (semiotic resources), enunciation (creating and understanding meaning), and other enunciative practices (affordances for meaning making within any culture or society). Framing Theory is applied to determine the frames used in the presentation of policies that include victory, leadership, and security. Furthermore, inspired by a long disjunctive tradition, the Discourse-Historical Approach by Reisigl and Wodak shows how discursive formations result from specific historical and sociopolitical contexts. The analysis uses text analysis featuring metaphors and superlatives, framing featuring specific types and their construction, contextual analysis in the historical and political contexts, and ideological to reveal ideologies of nationalism or interventionism. When used in tandem, these two approaches afford a very specific contextual view of the process of the regulation and the rhetorical moves and stories which make up the discourse.

## **Data Analysis**

This paper's data analysis concerns identifying the strategies of appeal, framing, and the ideologies that underpin the Trump administration's counterterrorism and the Afghanistan peace agreement discourse. As the key theoretical approach, the research employs Critical

Discourse Analysis (CDA), including Fairclough’s model, Framing Theory, and the Discourse-Historical Approach to understand how language builds power, justifies actions, and synchronizes discursive practices with policy goals. The data is collected from a purposive sample of speeches, press releases, and media reports, backed by archival data including policy documents and expert opinion. Employing textual, contextual and ideological analyses, the research characteristics the following major linguistic features, frames, and contexts: This approach gives a far more complex perspective of how language and power as well as ideology serves to construct and inform the public minds and to justify political actions.

**Table 1**

*The Campaign Trail in 2016 (NPR, 09/15/16)*

<b>Key Element</b>	<b>Analysis</b>	<b>Explanation and Implications</b>
<b>Language and Power Dynamics</b>	Trump positions himself as a transformative leader by explicitly differentiating his policies from Hillary Clinton’s.	This establishes a contrast between his vision and that of his opponent, portraying himself as a candidate for change.
<b>Framing Strategies</b>	<b>Victory Frame:</b> Trump promises to "end America’s endless wars." <b>Leadership Frame:</b> Positions himself as the leader who will bring decisive action to foreign policy.	These frames enhance his image as a problem-solver and align with public fatigue over prolonged conflicts.
<b>Rhetorical Devices</b>	Use of the term "endless wars" to evoke emotional fatigue and frustration among the electorate. Contrast with Clinton to create a binary opposition.	The emotional appeal resonates with voters seeking change, while the contrast simplifies complex policy differences.
<b>Legitimization Techniques</b>	Refers to campaign promises as a justification for future actions.	By framing this as a commitment, Trump establishes credibility and signals accountability to his audience.

<b>Ideological Constructs</b>	Aligns with the "America First" ideology by emphasizing disengagement from international conflicts.	This reflects a nationalist approach, appealing to voters prioritizing domestic interests over foreign engagements.
<b>Contextual Influences</b>	Leveraging public dissatisfaction with the U.S.'s prolonged military involvement overseas.	The context of war fatigue and opposition to interventionism amplifies the appeal of this narrative.
<b>Impact on Public Opinion</b>	Appeals to war-weary voters who seek a departure from traditional interventionist policies.	Builds trust and optimism among his base, while potentially alienating interventionist-leaning audiences.
<b>Policy Implications</b>	Sets the stage for future actions such as the Afghanistan withdrawal agreement.	Positions his administration as one committed to fulfilling campaign promises and redefining U.S. foreign policy.

Trump's discourse consecutively and effectively employed leadership framing, emotional appeal and ideological positioning in an attempt to create a new regulative paradigm of American diplomacy. Since the prolonged war did not fit the voters' expectations, and since Trump focused on campaign promises, his administration could have balanced the move with the voters' expectations. His appeals not only rationalized the aforementioned dramatic changes to policy like the Afghanistan pullout but also constituted the main narrative of his focused and effective leadership. These accounts aligned with the general political position of nationalism where the American self-interest prevails when it comes to world issues of security. Through this synthesis, the author demonstrates how Trump's discourse was a product of the public as well as a strategic process, which he used for policy-making and consolidating his administration's political agenda.

**Table 2**

*The New York Times (02/29/20)*

Key Element	Analysis	Explanation and Implications
-------------	----------	------------------------------

<b>Language and Power Dynamics</b>	The phrase "sets the stage to end America's longest war" portrays the U.S. as taking proactive and decisive action.	Highlights the administration's control over the narrative, emphasizing leadership in achieving peace.
<b>Framing Strategies</b>	<p><b>Victory Frame:</b> The agreement is framed as a culmination of efforts to end a two-decade-long conflict.</p> <p><b>Leadership Frame:</b> The Trump administration is positioned as successfully addressing a challenge that "vexed three White House administrations."</p>	These frames portray the agreement as a major achievement and Trump as a transformative leader.
<b>Rhetorical Devices</b>	<p>Use of "America's longest war" to evoke the historical significance of the conflict.</p> <p>Emphasis on casualties and mistrust ("killed tens of thousands of people, left mistrust and uncertainty") to underline the importance of resolution.</p>	This language amplifies the gravity of the conflict and the need for decisive action, enhancing the narrative of leadership.
<b>Legitimization Techniques</b>	References the war's historical context (Sept. 11 attacks, prolonged U.S. involvement) to justify the agreement as a necessary step.	Positions the agreement as a practical and ethical resolution to a costly and prolonged conflict.
<b>Ideological Constructs</b>	Aligns with the "America First" ideology by focusing on withdrawing from international conflicts and prioritizing domestic interests.	Reflects the administration's nationalist approach, appealing to those critical of prolonged foreign engagements.
<b>Contextual Influences</b>	Addresses public fatigue with the Afghanistan war and the financial and human costs of prolonged U.S. involvement.	The historical context of the war adds weight to the agreement's significance in public discourse.

<b>Impact on Public Opinion</b>	Builds public perception of the administration as fulfilling promises and making progress on peace and disengagement.	Appeals to voters seeking a resolution to the war, enhancing the administration's image as effective and results-driven.
<b>Policy Implications</b>	Signals a shift in U.S. foreign policy with potential risks, such as reliance on Taliban commitments to prevent terrorism.	Sets the stage for future scrutiny of the agreement's implementation and its impact on regional stability.

Analyzing Trump’s discursive strategies in presenting the Afghanistan peace agreement shows how leadership success is strategically framed by using historical and persuasive discursive moves. In its focus on the positive moral and pragmatic values of the conflict resolution, the administration also followed the sentiment of the population and presented the agreement as a turning point in the American foreign policy. This compliance with the “America First” policy enhances nationalist objectives of pulling out from expensive global entanglements as regards security issues. This synthesis concerns the specific discourse of how language was chosen and employed to build credibility and influence the general populace, portray the administration as a results-oriented actor in the continuous search for new forms and opportunities for peace and in addressing historical grievances.

**Table 3**

*NBC News (02/29/20)*

Key Element	Analysis	Explanation and Implications
<b>Language and Power Dynamics</b>	The gradual reduction in troop numbers is portrayed as a calculated and responsible move rather than a sudden withdrawal.	Emphasizes control and strategic planning in the decision, reflecting U.S. authority in negotiating terms.
<b>Framing Strategies</b>	<b>Peace Frame:</b> The reduction is framed as a step toward ending the war and achieving peace.	These frames convey a balance of optimism (peace) and caution

	<p><b>Conditional Frame:</b> The withdrawal is contingent on Taliban commitments to prevent terrorism.</p>	<p>(monitoring commitments) to reassure stakeholders.</p>
<p><b>Rhetorical Devices</b></p>	<p>Use of specific numbers ("reduce its forces to 8,600 from 13,000") lends a sense of precision and accountability. Conditional language ("depend on the Taliban meeting commitments") emphasizes the U.S.'s cautious approach.</p>	<p>Numerical precision enhances credibility, while conditionality mitigates risks by highlighting oversight mechanisms.</p>
<p><b>Legitimization Techniques</b></p>	<p>The pact is justified as a step toward reducing U.S. involvement while maintaining conditions to safeguard national security.</p>	<p>Positions the agreement as pragmatic, addressing both public demand for withdrawal and concerns about terrorism.</p>
<p><b>Ideological Constructs</b></p>	<p>Aligns with the "America First" ideology by emphasizing troop reduction and reduced financial and human costs.</p>	<p>Reflects a nationalist approach that prioritizes disengagement while retaining safeguards against global threats.</p>
<p><b>Contextual Influences</b></p>	<p>Responds to domestic and international pressures to reduce U.S. military presence in Afghanistan after nearly two decades.</p>	<p>Highlights the administration's response to war fatigue while addressing global expectations for stability.</p>
<p><b>Impact on Public Opinion</b></p>	<p>Offers reassurance to war-weary voters that the administration is acting to end the conflict responsibly and securely.</p>	<p>Balances public approval of troop reduction with concerns about ensuring terrorism prevention and regional stability.</p>
<p><b>Policy Implications</b></p>	<p>Demonstrates a phased approach to withdrawal, allowing time for monitoring Taliban commitments and minimizing abrupt changes.</p>	<p>The conditional withdrawal strategy reduces immediate risks but introduces potential challenges in enforcement.</p>

The Trump administration’s language of optimism and calculation of precaution is clearly an enabling language that has proactively couched its decisions on the question of troop withdrawal from Afghanistan within quantitative precision and conditional contingency. In appealing to domestic self-interested audiences the concept reverts to the ‘America First’ mode by affirming its commitment to engagement while reliably outsourcing the task of formulating security policies to international overseers. The way in which the reduction has been staged as gradual and deliberate also enshrines the values of the administration as prudent and rational and responsive to the war-weariness of the public as regards to the conflict with terrorism. This synthesis addresses how language is employed to manage intricate policy issues and foster people’s trust in the authorities’ approach to winding down the nation’s most enduring war.

**Table 4**

*The Washington Post (02/18/20)*

<b>Key Element</b>	<b>Analysis</b>	<b>Explanation and Implications</b>
<b>Language and Power Dynamics</b>	The inclusion of "secret annexes" highlights the unequal power dynamics between the U.S. and the Taliban, with the U.S. retaining strategic advantages.	This reflects the U.S.’s desire to maintain control and oversight despite the broader narrative of withdrawal.
<b>Framing Strategies</b>	<b>Security Frame:</b> Emphasizes the importance of counterterrorism and monitoring mechanisms to maintain stability. <b>Transparency vs. Secrecy Frame:</b> Acknowledges the existence of "secret annexes" while downplaying their implications.	These frames justify ongoing U.S. involvement as necessary for security while mitigating concerns about undisclosed details.
<b>Rhetorical Devices</b>	Use of technical terms like "monitoring," "verification," and "counterterrorism" conveys a sense of precision and professionalism.	This language legitimizes U.S. oversight as essential and portrays the agreement as cautiously optimistic rather than naïve.

Contrast between "publicly" (Taliban's statements) and "secret annexes" suggests a dual-layer strategy.

<b>Legitimization Techniques</b>	The presence of monitoring and verification mechanisms legitimizes the agreement by addressing concerns about Taliban reliability.	Positions the U.S. as responsibly ensuring peace and counterterrorism efforts, even post-withdrawal.
<b>Ideological Constructs</b>	Aligns with a pragmatic interpretation of the "America First" ideology, allowing limited U.S. involvement to safeguard national interests.	Suggests a blend of withdrawal and strategic engagement to balance domestic and international expectations.
<b>Contextual Influences</b>	Reflects the historical context of mistrust between the U.S. and Taliban, necessitating stringent monitoring and counterterrorism measures.	Addresses global and domestic skepticism regarding the Taliban's commitment to reducing violence and preventing terrorism.
<b>Impact on Public Opinion</b>	Balances public satisfaction over troop withdrawal with concerns about ensuring long-term security and stability.	The inclusion of counterterrorism and CIA permissions may reassure security-focused stakeholders but could raise transparency concerns.
<b>Policy Implications</b>	Retains U.S. strategic footholds in Afghanistan despite the narrative of withdrawal, ensuring continued influence and oversight.	Highlights potential challenges in balancing public demands for withdrawal with the need to maintain regional security.

It is evident that the November Afghanistan agreement's message in Trump's administration was moderated optimism, overlaid with pragmatic caution and flows skillful management control. The Security Frame and the concentration on counterterrorism and monitoring mechanisms inspired the perception of the administration's activity to prevent danger and guarantee harmony. Just as in the case of using technical language overtly and according to 'secret annexes', the narrative made the U.S. supervision look lawful while addressing the previous complaints about the lack of transparency and the mistrust of the Taliban. It is couched in the pragmatic neorealist 'America First,' excluding China from



engagement through simultaneous pullout and calibrated entanglement to address both American societal and global systemic needs. This synthesis supports the standpoint of the administration as the agreement is seen as the accountable and visionary decision made in the view of the end of the long-standing war that still has many implications for the United States.

**Table 5**

*The Washington Post (03/02/20)*

Key Element	Analysis	Explanation and Implications
<b>Language and Power Dynamics</b>	The phrases "best chance to end this conflict" and "road map to peace, security, and stability" underscore U.S. leadership in achieving peace.	Highlights the administration's control over the narrative, emphasizing optimism and leadership in conflict resolution.
<b>Framing Strategies</b>	<p><b>Peace Frame:</b> The deal is framed as a landmark achievement toward ending the Afghanistan war.</p> <p><b>Leadership Frame:</b> Trump's leadership is credited for providing the "best chance" to secure peace and stability.</p>	These frames reinforce the administration's image as decisive and capable of resolving a long-standing conflict.
<b>Rhetorical Devices</b>	<p>Use of superlatives ("best chance," "decisive move") amplifies the perceived significance of the agreement.</p> <p>Metaphor of a "road map" conveys guidance and direction toward peace.</p>	Superlative language bolsters the administration's credibility, while metaphors simplify complex processes for public understanding.
<b>Legitimization Techniques</b>	References to support from the Afghan government and NATO allies validate the agreement as a multilateral and credible initiative.	Positions the deal as a cooperative effort, mitigating criticisms of unilateralism or lack of local buy-in.

<b>Ideological Constructs</b>	Aligns with the "America First" ideology by emphasizing troop withdrawal and preventing Afghanistan from becoming a terrorist safe haven.	Balances domestic priorities with global security commitments, aligning with nationalist and pragmatic policies.
<b>Contextual Influences</b>	Reflects the historical context of Afghanistan as a hub for terrorism post-9/11 and the public demand for disengagement from prolonged wars.	Acknowledges the dual challenges of ensuring security while meeting public expectations for withdrawal.
<b>Impact on Public Opinion</b>	Frames the agreement as a responsible step toward peace, appealing to voters fatigued by war and concerned about security.	Strengthens the administration's image as delivering on promises while addressing national security priorities.
<b>Policy Implications</b>	Positions the deal as a comprehensive strategy addressing both peacebuilding and counterterrorism. Admits to "imperfections and uncertainties," suggesting potential challenges in implementation.	Acknowledges potential risks but projects confidence in the agreement's effectiveness as a sustainable solution.

The war of rhetoric in the Trump administration is employed to define the Afghanistan peace agreement as one historical and indeed as a comprehensive peace accord. In this case, the administration labeled the agreement as a road map to peace and used great descriptive language to portray the super role of the administration in solving a protracted conflict. Its syntax mixes the demobilization pressure on the domestic front with the vision of global counterterrorism, obeying the "America First" paradigm while not denying interdependence. The phrases like multilateral support and the aspects of the agreement, as well, ensured the agreement's reliability, being prepared for potential issues. This synthesis is here able to explain how the administration in the use of language and framing managed domestic and international expectations while at the same deepening its reputation as a revolutionizing force in the American foreign policy.

**Table 6**

*Fox News (03/02/20)*

<b>Key Element</b>	<b>Analysis</b>	<b>Explanation and Implications</b>
<b>Language and Power Dynamics</b>	Descriptions like “decisive move” and “best path” emphasize U.S. leadership and control in navigating the peace process.	Highlights the U.S. administration's authority and strategic role in shaping the future of Afghanistan.
<b>Framing Strategies</b>	<p><b>Peace Frame:</b> The deal is portrayed as a negotiated pathway to peace and stability.</p> <p><b>Pragmatism Frame:</b> The possibility of returning to military action is presented as a fallback plan, showing adaptability.</p>	These frames balance optimism for peace with readiness for action, appealing to both peace advocates and skeptics.
<b>Rhetorical Devices</b>	<p>Use of terms like “art of negotiation” and “decisive move” adds weight to Trump’s leadership in achieving the agreement.</p> <p>Phrase “disentanglement process” metaphorically conveys the complexity of the U.S. withdrawal.</p>	Positive descriptors enhance the perception of effective leadership, while metaphors simplify the narrative for public comprehension.
<b>Legitimization Techniques</b>	Endorsements from military experts (Cory Mills and Jim Hanson) lend credibility and authority to the deal.	Positions the agreement as a rational and strategic decision, supported by experienced professionals.
<b>Ideological Constructs</b>	Reflects the "America First" ideology by emphasizing disentanglement from prolonged foreign conflicts while retaining options for re-engagement if needed.	Aligns with nationalist priorities to minimize overseas involvement while maintaining global security commitments.

<b>Contextual Influences</b>	Acknowledges public fatigue with war and the strategic need to reduce violence before full withdrawal.	The seven-day violence-free test period adds a layer of accountability and confidence in the process.
<b>Impact on Public Opinion</b>	Builds trust by presenting the agreement as a carefully negotiated solution supported by experts and tested for feasibility.	Enhances the administration's image as competent and results-oriented, addressing concerns from both supporters and critics.
<b>Policy Implications</b>	Establishes a phased approach to peace that allows flexibility in case of non-compliance from the Taliban.	Reinforces the administration's preparedness to pivot if peace efforts fail, ensuring continued national security.

The analyzed samples of the Trump administration's discourse concerning the Afghanistan peace agreement show positive attitude, reasonableness and power. Since the management presented this as a well thought-out deal and backed up by experts, the administration appeared competent and result-oriented. Besides, positive language, metaphors and expert endorsements supported the creation of the agreement's legitimacy within domestic and international frameworks thus framing it in accordance to the withdrawal and international security requirements. The addition of contingency measures and measures of recounting, including the seven-day violence-free test, intensified the readiness of the administration. This synthesis looks at how the administration used language and framing to maneuver through the subtleties of peacebuilding while keeping voters at home and citizens abroad on their side.

**Table 7**

*Time (02/15/20)*

<b>Key Element</b>	<b>Analysis</b>	<b>Explanation and Implications</b>
<b>Language and Power Dynamics</b>	The emphasis on the "longest war in U.S. history" and the financial and human costs underscores the gravity of the conflict.	Highlights the urgency for decisive action and the responsibility of leadership in addressing the protracted conflict.

<b>Framing Strategies</b>	<p><b>Cost Frame:</b> Focus on the financial burden of \$900 billion to taxpayers.</p> <p><b>Humanitarian Frame:</b> Highlights the loss of life, displacement, and suffering caused by the war.</p>	<p>These frames appeal to both economic and moral concerns, building public support for ending the conflict.</p>
<b>Rhetorical Devices</b>	<p>Use of quantitative details ("18 years," "\$900 billion," "3,500 troops") provides credibility and specificity.</p> <p>Emotional appeal through references to "thousands of Afghans dead and millions displaced."</p>	<p>Numerical precision enhances the argument's legitimacy, while emotional appeals evoke empathy and urgency.</p>
<b>Legitimization Techniques</b>	<p>Frames the war as an unsustainable and unjustifiable burden, legitimizing the pursuit of peace through the agreement.</p>	<p>Positions the administration's actions as addressing a moral and financial imperative to end the conflict.</p>
<b>Ideological Constructs</b>	<p>Aligns with nationalist ideologies by emphasizing the cost to U.S. taxpayers and the prolonged involvement overseas.</p>	<p>Reflects the "America First" approach, prioritizing domestic interests and reducing foreign engagements.</p>
<b>Contextual Influences</b>	<p>Acknowledges the historical and ongoing costs of the war, both financial and humanitarian.</p>	<p>Resonates with a war-weary public seeking resolution and closure after nearly two decades of conflict.</p>
<b>Impact on Public Opinion</b>	<p>Strengthens the case for withdrawal by highlighting the toll on American lives, finances, and moral standing.</p>	<p>Appeals to voters prioritizing fiscal responsibility and human rights, bolstering public support for the administration's peace efforts.</p>
<b>Policy Implications</b>	<p>Reinforces the need for a comprehensive and effective exit strategy to prevent future entanglements and ensure stability.</p>	<p>Frames the agreement as not just a political necessity but a moral and financial responsibility.</p>

Analyzing the Trump’s administration rhetoric of the Afghanistan war, this research presented the economical and humanitarian narratives as the key reasons to deplore the war as ineffective and requiring an end. The Humanitarian Frame alongside the Cost Frame meant that the administration painted the picture of being financially wise and humane; this opinion helped in achieving troop withdrawal. Cognitive and affective elements extended the rationality of the White House decisions based on the ‘America First’ policy with regard to worldwide safety issues. This synthesis focuses on how the administration adopted language and framing to downplay and owned responsibility on ending a costly and long war both locally and internationally.

**Table 8**

*The Heritage Foundation (02/19/20)*

<b>Key Element</b>	<b>Analysis</b>	<b>Explanation and Implications</b>
<b>Language and Power Dynamics</b>	The narrative emphasizes U.S. leadership in initiating Operation Enduring Freedom and collaborating with NATO and allied forces.	Highlights the U.S. role as a global leader in combating terrorism and stabilizing the region.
<b>Framing Strategies</b>	<b>Security Frame:</b> The invasion and subsequent operations are framed as essential responses to the 9/11 attacks to ensure global security. <b>Collaboration Frame:</b> Emphasizes NATO’s involvement and multinational support to reinforce legitimacy.	These frames position the U.S. as both a defender against terrorism and a cooperative leader in global efforts.
<b>Rhetorical Devices</b>	Use of historical milestones ("October 7, 2001") and specific troop numbers ("150,000 NATO and U.S. forces") conveys precision and significance. Terminology such as "combat al-Qaeda"	Historical and numerical details lend credibility, while moral appeals justify the prolonged engagement.

and "Taliban supporters" highlights the moral justification for military actions.

<b>Legitimization Techniques</b>	References to 9/11 and international collaboration legitimize the U.S. and NATO's extended presence in Afghanistan.	Positions military actions as necessary for global security and aligned with international interests.
<b>Ideological Constructs</b>	Reflects a commitment to global counterterrorism efforts and the moral imperative of safeguarding freedom and democracy.	Aligns with internationalist ideologies, balancing U.S. interests with global responsibilities.
<b>Contextual Influences</b>	Acknowledges the initial rationale for intervention post-9/11 and the evolving complexity of insurgency and counterterrorism efforts.	Provides historical context for the sustained military presence and evolving mission scope in Afghanistan.
<b>Impact on Public Opinion</b>	Appeals to public support by framing U.S. actions as morally justified and internationally endorsed responses to terrorism.	Reinforces narratives of leadership and sacrifice while justifying the costs and duration of the conflict.
<b>Policy Implications</b>	Demonstrates the evolution of U.S. and NATO roles, transitioning from combat to training and counterterrorism missions.	Reflects the complexity of withdrawing forces while ensuring stability and security in the region.

The application of the episodic framework for the case of US military intervention in Afghanistan reveals a pragmatic combination of ethic, power, and hyper power. Thus using the Security Frame and Collaboration Frame, the discourse sought to locate the actions of the United States as both moral and legal. Historical allusions as well as numerical specificity positioned military activities as competent and gained the people's sympathy too. The shift from combat operations to training and counterterrorism is characteristic with the changing nature of U.S and NATO mandate, while trying to avoid the pitfalls of ambiguous withdrawal. This synthesis builds on the following narratives, by demonstrating how the Trump

administration employed these narratives to frame its policies as a continuity and a shift of U.S. obligations concerning both the domestic and the international sphere.

**Table 9**

*The White House Press release (10/27/19)*

<b>Key Element</b>	<b>Analysis</b>	<b>Explanation and Implications</b>
<b>Language and Power Dynamics</b>	The description of Baghdadi's actions emphasizes his extreme brutality and the moral justification for eliminating him.	Establishes the U.S. as a defender of human rights and global morality by addressing such atrocities.
<b>Framing Strategies</b>	<b>Moral Frame:</b> Highlights Baghdadi's actions as an affront to human dignity, reinforcing the necessity of the U.S. mission. <b>Threat Frame:</b> Portrays Baghdadi as a symbol of global insecurity and terror.	These frames justify the military operation by emphasizing the moral and security imperatives of removing Baghdadi.
<b>Rhetorical Devices</b>	Use of graphic imagery ("mass crucifixions," "sex slaves," "burning them alive") evokes emotional responses and underscores the severity of ISIS's actions. Terms like "trademark" and "gleefully executed" add vividness and horror to the narrative.	Graphic descriptions amplify the perception of Baghdadi as a uniquely evil figure, bolstering the legitimacy of U.S. actions.
<b>Legitimization Techniques</b>	Depicting Baghdadi as the embodiment of ISIS's atrocities legitimizes the military operation as a necessary act of justice and security.	Positions the U.S. action as a morally righteous response to a global threat.



<b>Ideological Constructs</b>	Aligns with ideologies of protecting universal human rights and combating terrorism as a global responsibility.	Frames the U.S. role as both a protector of its citizens and a leader in global moral and security initiatives.
<b>Contextual Influences</b>	References ISIS’s historical violence to contextualize Baghdadi’s leadership and the urgency of eliminating him.	Builds a compelling narrative linking past atrocities to the necessity of decisive action against terrorism.
<b>Impact on Public Opinion</b>	Creates a sense of moral outrage against Baghdadi, garnering public support for the U.S.’s counterterrorism operations.	Reinforces the legitimacy of U.S. actions by aligning them with public values of justice and security.
<b>Policy Implications</b>	Strengthens the narrative that eliminating terrorist leaders disrupts their organizations and enhances global security.	Supports broader U.S. counterterrorism policies by demonstrating the tangible impact of such operations.

About the killing of Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi the Trump administration employed a securitizing language based on moral claims and strong imagery to portray the operation as obligatory following the American security and moral standards. By means of the Moral and Threat Frames, the narrative reasserted the lone star principles for counterterrorism and emphasis on the role of the current administration in managing threats. Laying explicit passion on Baghdadi’s actions increased informants’ support through rhetorical techniques of anger and identification of the operation as just and secure. Thus, connecting the mission to the existing anti ISIS efforts helped the administration tie this victory up to the overall counter terrorism agenda and demonstrate the results of efficient policy making which is both in line with global commitments and domestic agendas.

**Table 10**

*The New York Times (10/28/19)*

<b>Key Element</b>	<b>Analysis</b>	<b>Explanation and Implications</b>
<b>Language and Power Dynamics</b>	The narrative emphasizes Baghdadi’s global influence by highlighting attacks in multiple countries, linking his leadership to widespread violence.	Positions the U.S. as taking decisive action to combat a global threat and restore security.
<b>Framing Strategies</b>	<p><b>Global Threat Frame:</b> Highlights the transnational reach of ISIS and Baghdadi’s followers.</p> <p><b>Unity Frame:</b> The attacks are presented as a collective affront to global peace and security.</p>	These frames emphasize the necessity of international cooperation and U.S. leadership in combating terrorism.
<b>Rhetorical Devices</b>	<p>Specific examples of attacks (“San Bernardino,” “Nice,” “Sri Lanka”) add vividness and relatability to the global scope of ISIS’s violence.</p> <p>Use of geographic diversity strengthens the narrative of ISIS’s worldwide impact.</p>	Concrete examples make the threat tangible for a global audience, reinforcing the urgency of counterterrorism efforts.
<b>Legitimization Techniques</b>	By linking Baghdadi to specific attacks and casualties, the narrative legitimizes the U.S.’s military operations as proactive measures to dismantle a global terror network.	Frames the action as a justified response to protect lives and global security.
<b>Ideological Constructs</b>	Aligns with ideologies of protecting global peace and combating terrorism as an international responsibility.	Demonstrates the U.S.’s commitment to safeguarding democratic and human rights globally.
<b>Contextual Influences</b>	Draws on public memory of high-profile terror attacks to contextualize Baghdadi’s influence and the urgency of his removal.	Links the elimination of Baghdadi to preventing future attacks and ensuring justice for past victims.

<b>Impact on Public Opinion</b>	Reinforces public support for counterterrorism operations by tying them to tangible outcomes, such as disrupting future plots and avenging past victims.	Enhances trust in the U.S. administration’s ability to address global security challenges effectively.
<b>Policy Implications</b>	Supports the argument that eliminating key leaders weakens terrorist networks and reduces the likelihood of future attacks.	Highlights the importance of sustained international collaboration in addressing transnational threats.

In their story about the extermination of Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi the Trump administration effectively sold America’s narrative of the ISIS’ malicious threat to the world and the essential American role in the effort to defeat global terrorism. By using the Global Threat Frame and the Unity Frame, the operation was presented as inevitable necessary measures in order to save lives and punish those responsible for past offences of terrorism. With reference to continuing disasterization led by ISIS, the ‘narrative’ underscored public support and confidence in U.S. counter-terrorism actions. This synthesis reveals that the administration majored into both the domestic and global issues setting itself as a security niche and a peace initiator.

**Table 11**

*The White House Press release (03/23/19)*

Key Element	Analysis	Explanation and Implications
<b>Language and Power Dynamics</b>	The narrative underscores U.S. leadership and Trump’s proactive role in defeating ISIS in collaboration with coalition partners.	Highlights U.S. dominance in global counterterrorism and emphasizes the administration's fulfillment of campaign promises.
<b>Framing Strategies</b>	<b>Victory Frame:</b> The announcement is framed as a significant achievement, emphasizing the complete liberation of	These frames enhance the administration’s image as effective

	ISIS-controlled territory.	and results-driven in global security matters.
	<b>Leadership Frame:</b> Positions Trump as a decisive leader who delivered on his campaign promises.	
<b>Rhetorical Devices</b>	Use of phrases like “100 Percent of the ‘caliphate’” and “gone quickly” amplifies the perception of a swift and comprehensive victory. Repetition of “liberated” reinforces the idea of progress and success.	Positive and assertive language creates a strong narrative of accomplishment, resonating with both domestic and global audiences.
<b>Legitimization Techniques</b>	References to coalition efforts (e.g., Iraqi Security Forces, Syrian Democratic Forces) and Pentagon-led strategies lend credibility to the achievement.	Positions the victory as a collaborative and strategically sound effort, aligning with global and national interests.
<b>Ideological Constructs</b>	Aligns with the "America First" ideology by emphasizing U.S. leadership while acknowledging international cooperation.	Demonstrates the administration’s ability to lead global efforts while prioritizing national interests.
<b>Contextual Influences</b>	Reflects public expectations for strong action against ISIS following its prominence in global terrorism headlines.	Links Trump’s leadership to tangible security outcomes, reinforcing public confidence in his administration’s policies.
<b>Impact on Public Opinion</b>	Reinforces trust in Trump’s ability to fulfill campaign promises, particularly in the domain of national security and global leadership.	Builds public approval by framing the defeat of ISIS as a definitive and lasting success.
<b>Policy Implications</b>	Establishes a precedent for the administration’s approach to counterterrorism, emphasizing rapid and decisive action.	Positions the U.S. as capable of achieving significant results in global security, bolstering future policy credibility.

In fact, the triumph over ISIS became one of the keys in the Trump administration’s Victory and Leadership Frames in order to emphasize its efficiency and the accomplishment of some of the campaign’s promises. In claims and tones, the narrative boosted how home and foreign spectators viewed an assured and almost totalistic triumph. Through the invocation of the coalition partnerships, the administration wanted to show that achievement in this case is a result of a partnership and all the strategies that such partnerships entail. Here, this synthesis shows how the administration employed language and framing to lead, reassure the public and to fashion the U.S. as a world power in counterterrorism, which not only served nationalist, but internationalist goals as well.

**Table 12**

*Donald Trump, Remarks At the Center for the National Interest, Washington, D.C. (4/27/16)*

<b>Key Element</b>	<b>Analysis</b>	<b>Explanation and Implications</b>
<b>Language and Power Dynamics</b>	The narrative highlights Trump’s role in delegating authority and directing strategic changes to military operations.	Emphasizes presidential control and decisiveness in shaping military actions against ISIS.
<b>Framing Strategies</b>	<b>Leadership Frame:</b> Positions Trump as a proactive leader who drives innovative and aggressive strategies. <b>Effectiveness Frame:</b> Focuses on the tactical shift and accelerated operations to underscore operational success.	These frames build the image of Trump as a results-oriented leader capable of achieving critical objectives.
<b>Rhetorical Devices</b>	Use of assertive language like “accelerated operations,” “timely manner,” and “annihilate ISIS” conveys urgency and effectiveness. Metaphor of "surrounding the	The language reinforces the narrative of decisive and impactful leadership in counterterrorism efforts.

	enemy in strongholds" emphasizes strategic precision.	
<b>Legitimization Techniques</b>	References to the Department of Defense review and Secretary Mattis's endorsement lend credibility to the administration's decisions.	Positions the strategy as well-informed and supported by military expertise, enhancing public trust.
<b>Ideological Constructs</b>	Reflects an ideology of aggressive intervention to protect national and global security interests.	Aligns with the administration's broader narrative of prioritizing U.S. safety and demonstrating military strength.
<b>Contextual Influences</b>	Builds on public demand for stronger action against ISIS following its peak in global terror activities.	Links the tactical shift to the broader goal of preventing the resurgence of ISIS and ensuring long-term security.
<b>Impact on Public Opinion</b>	Reinforces public confidence in the administration's ability to implement effective and timely counterterrorism strategies.	Appeals to voters seeking swift and definitive actions to neutralize threats like ISIS.
<b>Policy Implications</b>	Establishes a precedent for delegating authority and pursuing aggressive, adaptive military strategies.	Highlights the administration's commitment to achieving operational success while addressing evolving threats.

Regarding employment of ISIS by the Trump administration, Leadership Frame Dominance and Effectiveness Frames were employed to emphasize operational and tactical achievements. By using assertive words and experts, the whole story reassured the audience that this administration is brought forward by decisive and productive leaders. The concern with flexible courses and the strategic accuracy was consistent with an interventionist action plan pertaining both to national and international tasks. This synthesis also shows how the administration managed through language, framing, and professional endorsement to establish itself as a leader in counterterrorism, and thereby increase public trust and serve broader policy interests.

**Table 13**

*U.S. Department of Defense Press release (05/19/17)*

<b>Key Element</b>	<b>Analysis</b>	<b>Explanation and Implications</b>
<b>Language and Power Dynamics</b>	Trump’s decision to grant greater latitude to commanders emphasizes his trust in military leadership and decentralization of power.	Highlights a shift from previous administrations, empowering on-the-ground decision-makers for operational effectiveness.
<b>Framing Strategies</b>	<b>Leadership Frame:</b> Frames Trump as a leader willing to adapt strategies and empower commanders to achieve goals. <b>Collaboration Frame:</b> Emphasizes close cooperation between U.S. and Iraqi forces to liberate Mosul.	These frames present Trump’s approach as pragmatic and results-driven, fostering collaborative success.
<b>Rhetorical Devices</b>	Phrases like “loosened the reins” and “latitude to American commanders” convey flexibility and empowerment. “Most complex mission to date” highlights the significance and challenges of liberating Mosul.	The language portrays the administration as responsive and adaptive to the demands of modern warfare.
<b>Legitimization Techniques</b>	References to the success of joint operations with Iraqi forces lend credibility to the administration’s strategy.	Demonstrates the value of local partnerships in achieving strategic objectives, reinforcing the legitimacy of the approach.
<b>Ideological Constructs</b>	Reflects an ideology of operational pragmatism, where empowering commanders and fostering international partnerships are prioritized.	Balances nationalist priorities with a global responsibility to defeat ISIS and stabilize the region.
<b>Contextual Influences</b>	Responds to the complexity of fighting ISIS in urban strongholds	Acknowledges the evolving nature of warfare and the necessity of

	like Mosul, requiring close coordination and tactical innovation.	adapting command structures to meet challenges.
<b>Impact on Public Opinion</b>	Builds public confidence by showcasing the administration’s willingness to innovate and delegate effectively in complex scenarios.	Reinforces trust in Trump’s leadership and his ability to make strategic decisions to achieve military success.
<b>Policy Implications</b>	Establishes a precedent for decentralizing decision-making in military operations, emphasizing collaboration with local forces.	Positions the U.S. as both a leader and a partner in international security efforts, fostering credibility and cooperation.

The numerous policy shifts by the Trump administration that decentralized command, and supplemented American forces with Iraqi, are highly pragmatic and results-oriented to counterterrorism. Using the Leadership and Collaboration Frames, the discourse focused on the Trump’s task-contingent behaviors, specifically the notion of flexibility and strategic thinking and more broadly on the concepts of power and shared responsibility as being instrumental in achieving success. In Vogue and authorizing words and allusions to combined operations made the strategy acceptable as an operational adaptation to the changing nature of contemporary warfare. This synthesis shows how especially the administration kept an operational/technical logic in operation and international leadership and reaffirming the image of a resourceful and responsible partner in the fight against ISIS and for the stabilization of the region.

## Discussion

To promote legitimacy of military decisions and related shifts on counterterrorism and troop pullout, Trump relied on all four categories of rhetorical strategies and linguistic devices. These tactics were deliberately crafted in order to draw on the emotional sentiments support, re-establish the credibility of the administration and integrate actions in to more generalized conceptualizations of ideology. Challenges were expressed using assertiveness including the manner in which the operation would be ‘accelerated’, the time in which it would happen and the general abolished language or ‘annihilate ISIS’. This choice of words: created an illusion of a strong leadership and business like functioning. For example, in descriptions of actions



towards ISIS such as ‘outflanking the enemy in strategic positions’ it provided a nuance of strategy based on the phrase where the administration was characterized as technique and prosperous. This added to enhancing the public trust in the ability of the administration in tackling all complicated military activities. During the operations termed as the most complicated throughout the liberation of Mosul the importance of Trump’s strategies along with the versatility of the approaches he has been using were underlined.

Magnifiers or boosters like ‘100 Percent of the ‘caliphate’ ‘world’s number one terrorist leader’ was used to exaggerate the achievements of the administration. These terms focused on the coverage of territory and finality of warfare to optimize the story with the public’s ethos of nationalism and contentment. The cruelties that Baghdadi committed that were visually depicted in the videos and which included “mass crucifixions” as well as burning the victims alive” rationalized actions by dubbing them as morally compulsory. Baghdadi labeled as a leader of an ‘inhumane and brutal terror group’ aroused ethical anger, thereby giving the U.S. action to wipe him out as ethical and logical. Names and figures were common in Trump’s rhetoric with examples including the number of troops from “13,000 to 8,600” or the financial cost of the Afghanistan war at “\$900 billion.” This kind of quantitative focus provided credibility to the administration’s actions, placed its decisions as rational and based on proven statistics. It showed responsibility and was attractive to the frugal vote conscious citizens to vote for. In specific, the signal of troop withdrawal emphasized the responsibility to withdraw ‘America’s longest war’ and reduced citizens’ support for this long-term conflict, security risks.

Policies, like calling the Afghanistan agreement the ‘road map to peace, security, and stability’ used language to draw easy to understand pictures. Use of terms like ‘liberated’ was repetitive for progress and success anthropomorphizing achievement across the population. The use of the word ‘roadmap’, as a metaphor that captured the administration’s posture on ending long wars while at the same time guaranteeing security was a mix of domestic and international appeal. The administration rationalized its action by pointing to endorsements from professional soldiers. These validations recast policies as being evidence based and consonant with national security imperatives. Furthermore, the context, for instance September 11, 2001 offered an evincible and ethical pretext for the military operations. The mention of

partnership with the Iraqi Security Forces and the Syrian Democratic Forces added a coalition multilateralism to the defeat of ISIS, which is a feature the administration prides itself in.

These ingredients that include assertiveness, appeal to passion, appeal to authority, and all manifested within Trump's language assured the legitimization of military decisions and policy changes. In addition to providing rationalizations for actions taken, the administration located those actions within more encompassing ideological parameters – protecting American interests and engaging the world responsibly, which cast the White House as both the world's steward and guide. This kind of two- and three-part rhetorical mix appealed to the public, which placed the story on both pragmatic and ethical grounds.

Using the discursive approach as a framework of analysis of the samples of Trump's official speech, this paper examines how the discourse on ending the war in Afghanistan and fighting against ISIS is constructed and carried out within the framework of major ideological, power and control relationships that reflect the tension between nationalist and internationalist imperatives. All these elements influenced the direction the administration took to tackle both national and geo-political issues as a furthering of their overarching ideology. The leads to a fairly high level of correlation with the "America First" paradigm, which implies that the United States should prioritize national interests in terms of attempting to diminish internationally-related risks while enhancing internal security. This nationalist construct informed action like withdrawal of troops, described as way to save US lives and taxpayer dollars. Though, it also found important to protect the security of United States and preserve conditions of counter terrorism. The story packaged the Afghanistan deal in a way to save the taxpayers' \$900 billion and bring an end to America's 'endless war.'

Still, the discourse remained very nationalist, as it presupposed the leadership of the United States as the world's security guarantor. The administration supported its actions by referring to successful operations such as the defeat of ISIS and paints actions as necessary in order to achieve and maintain international order. The narrative that the Baghdadi operation was a special-operations raid against the 'menace to the world,' put the United States on the pedestal of a global counterterrorism force, with the moral and diplomatic muscle to wipe out world security threats. From the narrative, one got to understand that the military decentralization was going to mean more powers to the commanders. This change of dynamics mirrors a contract between institutional centralization and disciplined organizational execution

for a more fluid reliance on the professional judgment of the military for service delivery that better suits a dynamic security threat environment. There are many examples of such as “latitude to American commanders” and “the rook that had been loosened” showed the concern of strategy to the issue of decentralizing tactical authorities as a response to the difficulty of engaging opponents similar to ISIS in dense cities.

Nevertheless, the discourse also included the collaboration by stressing on U.S. hegemony, cooperation with local and international forces namely NATO and Iraqi forces apart from the drop in their reliance on foreign troop aid. This focus on multilateralism was used to justify the American actions as not really unilateral but multilateral thus effectively and necessarily. Mentioned encounters with Iraqi Security Forces and Syrian Democratic Forces were aimed at stressing international cooperation in achieving the goal and had stressed the successfully accomplished task of ‘liberating a hundred percent of the caliphate’. Morality was often employed as patterns of reasoning by the administration, putting away measures against the ISIS and the Taliban as the effort to protect human rights and prevent genocide. This framing made the United States action globally equal justice and security making their military intervention as morally correct. Naming Baghdadi ‘the cruel,’ ‘the monster,’ and describing his actions, including ‘mass crucifixions,’ ‘turning captives into sex slaves,’ the US redefined its mission beyond mere security necessity for the international community: it became a purveyor of justice for the world.

The discourse depicted national and international forces such as a war weary, financial and fiscal challenges, and a need for rendition in counter-terrorism. In addressing such contextual factors, a lot of disengagement was done alongside with a continued alertness so as to offer quick solution as well as long term safety. This balance to the Afghanistan peace agreement was the conditional troop withdrawal mechanism compounded by the public demand for the war to end, it was however, Third Test important to retain counter-terrorism measures to prevent a resurgence of threats. The Trump administration’s rhetoric, therefore, combined nationalist policies with international obligation, in the capacity of an "America First" policy, although insisting on American supremacy in global security. This way, the administration sustain its leadership role concerning pragmatism in operations’ management, multilateralism, and morality; at the same time, it respond to domestic cost & safety concerns.

This twin strategy not only justified its policies but also, advertised the U.S as a decisive and agile power in counter terrorism at par with both domestic and geo political needs.

The current research found that the Trump administration used Victory Frames, Leadership Frames, and pragmatic storytelling in the construction of the defeat of ISIS and the Afghanistan peace agreement to frame this discourse as a success and support Trump's image as a president of change and results. These narratives focused on the performance accomplishments and management activities that would appeal to the domestic as well as the international public. They retried this course of action as the sole guarantors of counter-terrorism and peace dividends. If we focus on Trump's announced victory as the USA completes the 'liberation of ISIS-controlled territory' and the signing of the Afghanistan peace agreement that the President insisted was the 'biggest deal' to bring 'America's longest war' to an end, then the constructed narrative reads more like a triumph. These frames showed the administration not only in terms of policy achievements but in matters of the world security and peace. As we saw throughout the discourse, the 'victory' narratives repeatedly emphasized the freeing of '100 Percent of the 'caliphate' and the removal of high profile individuals such as Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi.

The administration told the American people that Trump was a president with great executive orders and accomplishment, keeping his campaign promises and work even with the complexity of everyday tasks. Authorizing commanders and steering the tactics by words such as "encircling enemy in bunkers" the talk bolstered the idea of Trump as a strategic leader who is capable of dealing with global challenges. The narrative focused on how Trump cranked up operations and provided the means to accomplish "the most complex mission to date" in liberating Mosul and make him decisive for success to happen. The administration justified its actions as moral and practical presenting ISIS scourge and analyzing financial and human impact of continuing wars. : The duality of moral responsibility and security rationalization coordinated Trump's administration as ethical and efficient. The actions of Baghdadi, as described by sources like 'mass crucifixions' 'burning them alive' were used to validate the military expedition as necessary to prevent threat to world peace and to promote freedom.

While centered on the American policy, the rhetoric of success paid attention to the allies – NATO and the Iraqi troops. This cooperative construction emphasized Trump's capacity to operate in an international system whilst nonetheless preserving American primacy.

While references to coordination with the Iraqi Security Forces or the Syrian Democratic Forces served to validate counterterrorism accomplishments of the administration. The Afghanistan peace agreement was presented as a rational way to end the war and reduce the responsibility accordingly and simultaneously protect it by some conditional steps to withdraw troops. By so doing, the administration disguised the agreement as ‘the road map to achieving durable peace, security and stability.’ The conditional, dependent character of the agreements was stressed time and again, referential to the Taliban’s hypothetical promises, in order to inspire confidence in the pessimistic skeptics and still louder encouragement in the optimistic enthusiasts.

The ‘rhetoric’ of the Trump administration successfully performed fictionalizations of professional success stories, portrayal of Trump as a decisive commander, and moral and strategic call-narratives. These stories served to play on the population’s sympathies of both domestic perquisites together with international obligations, thus maintaining the continuance of the administration’s stance as the guardians of both American interests and the world’s safety. This way or another, the administration framed its counterterrorism measures, relations with militancy, and peace-building activities as the courses of change, as fitting into the established liberal-democratic and global security that define goals and expectations in counterterrorism and peace building.

## **Findings of the Study**

Consequently, based on the analysis of a number of media materials reflecting the counterterrorism policy of the Trump administration as well as talking about the Afghanistan peace deal, the following conclusions can be drawn: The discourse of the Trump administration regarding counterterrorism was constructed in a designated leaders’ manner as innovational and pragmatic one. With two main frames: the Victory Frames and the Leadership Frames, the administration was establishing itself as a competent and capable actor in front of global security issues such as ISIS and the Afghanistan conflict. Legalistic approach, emphasis on the choice of words and concentration on the ethical and tactical features of the actions were aimed at the legitimization of some actions. The discourse ensured that nationalist concern of shedding American long drawn foreign wars was met, as well as possession of international obligations through partnership and strengthening of military authorities. Narrative frames

such as the Global Threat Frame, Collaboration Frame and the Effectiveness Frame tightened the screw of success around the narrative about the administration and portrayed it as a shield of the American interest as well as a global security leader. Intended or not, this seemingly complex narrative played nicely into public opinion, providing calls for security, balanced budget, and moral justice as well as paint the administration and its policies as agents of change in US foreign policy.

The results of this work support other works that explain the reliance on strategic framing and mastery of rhetoric when referring to the policy and reinforcing the narrative of leadership. I found that, according to the Critical Discourse Analysis made by Nikolas Fairclough in 2015 and Ruth Wodak in 2011, language constructs power and authority especially by using language assertiveness and symbols such as Victory and Leadership Frames. Likewise, the tension between nationalism and globalism corresponds to the latest research of Reese (2010) who investigated biculturalism in political discourse. The consistent use of visual imagery that brings out morality in Trump's speeches supports Lakoff (2004) that appeals to reason buttress compliance in the community. In addition, the Collaboration Frame and pragmatic leadership as analyzed in this study accords with Nye's (2014) analysis of the U.S. foreign policy communication, which focuses on the need to balance soft power and force. These parallels support the Trump administration's compositionality of rhetorical and ideological trends effectively computed in political and security discourses.

## **Conclusion**

This research concluded how counterterrorism and the Afghanistan peace deal was couched in carefully crafted language and rhetoric by the Trump administration. As can be observed, the two primary modes – Victory and Leadership Frames – were used actively by the administration to depict the former as a clear-souled beneficial actor that adapts efficient measures against intricate issues of international security, such as ISIS and Afghanistan. The language, imagery and framing techniques such as; the Global Threat Frame, Collaboration Frame and Effectiveness Frame rationalized its conduct in terms of nationalism and globalization. This approach again sounded a popular note, reflecting the call for security, prudence in spending, and justice, all the while painting the picture of America as defend of national interest, and of counter-terrorism. The results are consistent with prior work focusing

on how rhetorical strategies and framing processes in political discourse create authority and legitimacy. The case of how the Trump administration can pursue the international cooperation and retain control over U.S. security interests speaks of the careful interweaving of nationalist discourse and pragmatic policy making. Through these strategies, the administration doubled down on trust, and consolidated the story of change in U.S. foreign policy to deliver on both internal and foreign policy goals efficiently.

Some of the ideas that this study presents are very useful for understanding the impact of political lexicon on the public and policies concerning counterterrorism and diplomacy. Employing Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), it shows how the Trump administration politically mobilized and demobilized counter terrorism and legitimized the Afghan peace deal. The research covers the questions of language, power and ideology and provides the methodological foundation for considering the relation between the nationalist and internationalist agendas. Future research can follow from it by conducting multi-administration comparisons on discourse, chronic research on the changes in discourse and the processes and media framing involved in either reinforcing or contesting political narratives. The study of reception of such discourses among the audience could also reveal extensive insight into its effects on the voters, relations between countries, and peoples' opinion towards leadership across the world. In doing so, this study adds to the literature by illustrating how SC support s complex FP decisions among the public, advancing two academic fields – political communication and international relations.

## References

Bhatia, A. (2005). *Terrorism and the language of war*. Routledge.

Chilton, P. (2004). *Analyzing political discourse: Theory and practice*. Routledge.

Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51–58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x>

Fairclough, N. (2015). *Language and power* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Fox News. (2020, March 2). President Trump demonstrates the art of negotiation in Afghanistan peace deal. *Fox News*. Retrieved from <https://www.foxnews.com>

Jackson, R. (2005). *Writing the war on terrorism: Language, politics, and counter-terrorism*. Manchester University Press.

Lakoff, G. (2004). *Don't think of an elephant!: Know your values and frame the debate*. Chelsea Green Publishing.

Miller, B. (2021). Trump's rhetoric and the reshaping of American foreign policy. *International Studies Review*, 23(2), 156-170.

NBC News. (2020, February 29). U.S. signs historic agreement with Taliban to end America's longest war. *NBC News*. Retrieved from <https://www.nbcnews.com>

NPR. (2016, September 15). Trump promises to end endless wars during campaign trail. *NPR*. Retrieved from <https://www.npr.org>

Nye, J. S. (2014). *Soft power: The means to success in world politics*. PublicAffairs.

Reese, S. D. (2010). Finding frames in a web of culture: The case of the war on terror. In P. D'Angelo & J. A. Kuypers (Eds.), *Doing news framing analysis: Empirical and theoretical perspectives* (pp. 17-42). Routledge.

Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2009). The discourse-historical approach (DHA). In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods for critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed., pp. 87–121). SAGE.

Restad, H. E. (2019). "America First" and the return of isolationism in U.S. foreign policy. *Journal of International Politics*, 56(4), 245-264.

Saikal, A. (2020). *The Afghanistan peace process: A critical perspective*. Routledge.



The Heritage Foundation. (2020, February 19). A historical perspective on the war in Afghanistan. *The Heritage Foundation*. Retrieved from <https://www.heritage.org>

The Washington Post. (2019, October 27). Trump announces death of ISIS leader Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <https://www.washingtonpost.com>

Time. (2020, February 15). The costs of America's longest war in Afghanistan. *Time*. Retrieved from <https://www.time.com>

U.S. Department of Defense. (2017, May 19). Accelerated operations against ISIS under President Trump's leadership. *U.S. Department of Defense*. Retrieved from <https://www.defense.gov>

van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and power*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Wodak, R. (2015). *The politics of fear: What right-wing populist discourses mean*. SAGE.

Wright, L. (2020). The end of the forever war? Understanding the U.S. withdrawal from Afghanistan. *Foreign Affairs*, 99(3), 45-58.