

**A “SELF-INFLICTED MAJOR ECONOMIC WOUND” OR “THE BEST
CHANCE WE’VE HAD TO SAVE THE ONE PLANET”:**

Framing of the Paris Climate Accord by Presidents Trump and Obama

Bachelor’s Thesis

Helmi Möttönen

University of Jyväskylä

Department of Language and Communication Studies

English

April 2018

Tiedekunta – Faculty Humanistis-yhteiskuntatieteellinen tiedekunta	Laitos – Department Kieli- ja viestintätieteiden laitos
Tekijä – Author Helmi Möttönen	
Työn nimi – Title A “self-inflicted major economic wound” or “the best chance we’ve had to save the one planet”: Framing of the Paris Climate Accord by Presidents Trump and Obama	
Oppiaine – Subject Englannin kieli	Työn laji – Level Kandidaatintutkielma
Aika – Month and year Huhtikuu 2018	Sivumäärä – Number of pages 23 + 4 liitettä
Tiivistelmä – Abstract <p>Kieli on keskeinen osa ihmisten mielipiteiden ja maailmankuvien, sekä sosiaalisen ja materiaalisen todellisuuden rakentumisessa. Asioiden esitystavoilla ja rajauksilla sekä käytetyillä diskursseilla voidaan esittää haluttu kuva käsiteltävästä aiheesta, ja tämä kuva voi muuttaa kuulijoiden mielipidettä siitä jopa heidän huomaamattaan. Kielellä on siis paljon valtaa.</p> <p>Tämän tutkielman tavoitteena oli selvittää, miten Yhdysvaltain presidentit Trump ja Obama käsittelevät Pariisin ilmastopimusta valituissa virallisissa puheissaan. Analysoin yhtä puhetta kummaltakin presidentiltä ja tutkin heidän käyttämiään sanavalintoja, esitystapojen semanttisia eroja, asioiden esittämistä positiivisessa tai negatiivisessa valossa, ja käsittelytapojen ja rajausten luomaa kokonaiskuvaa Pariisin ilmastopimuksesta. Sovelsin analyysissä rajaamiseen liittyvää teoriaa (framing theory) ja kriittisen diskurssianalyysin työkaluja.</p> <p>Tutkimustulokseni osoittavat, että presidentit käyttävät monia erilaisia kielellisiä keinoja luodakseen halutunlaisen kuvan Pariisin ilmastopimuksesta. He lähestyvät aihetta vastakkaisista perspektiiveistä, mutta oman perspektiivin edistämiseen käytetyt keinot ovat osittain samoja. Presidentit esimerkiksi käyttävät kulttuurisesti merkityksellisiä sanoja ja esittävät oman ratkaisunsa olevan ainoa vaihtoehto, jättäen potentiaaliset muut perspektiivit esittelemättä.</p> <p>Tässä tutkimuksessa analysoidaan vain kahta puhetta, eikä sen laajuus riitä käsittelemään kaikkia kielellisiä, saati nonverbaalisia, elementtejä aineistossa. Myöskään kielellisten keinojen vaikuttavuustavoitteiden saavuttamista ei tässä kyetä tutkimaan, joten lisätutkimus on edelleen tarpeen. Siitä huolimatta tämän tutkimuksen huomiot presidenttien käyttämisestä kielellisistä keinoista toivottavasti auttavat yleisöä kiinnittämään vastaaviin asioihin huomiota jatkossa.</p>	
Asiasanat – Keywords framing, critical discourse analysis, president obama, president trump, paris climate accord	
Säilytyspaikka – Depository JYX	
Muita tietoja – Additional information	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION.....	3
2 BACKGROUND.....	5
2.1 Language and social constructivism	5
2.2 Framing theory	6
2.3 Discourses and critical discourse analysis	7
2.4 The influence of presidential speeches.....	9
3 THE PRESENT STUDY	11
3.1 Aim and research question	11
3.2 Data and the Paris Climate Accord	11
3.3 Tools of analysis.....	12
4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	14
4.1 Word choices and their cultural resonance and magnitude.....	14
4.2 Semantic framing	16
4.3 Valence framing and story framing.....	18
4.4 The presented frames	19
5 CONCLUSION	21
BIBLIOGRAPHY	22
APPENDICES.....	24

1 INTRODUCTION

Language can have significant impacts on people's worldview and thinking, and indeed on reality itself. The way something – for example a person, an opinion, a phenomenon – is represented in everyday discussions, the media, by politicians and so forth can strongly shape people's ideas about it. Perceptions, in turn, direct people's choices and actions around the issue in the physical world. In other words, language use causes changes to happen in both people and the material world (Fairclough 2003: 8). This implies that language can be used in order to manipulate people and reality and, even more importantly, it has been shown that people may not always be aware of this strong influence that language has on them (see, for example, Thibodeau and Boroditsky 2011).

In this context the study of language becomes very important because it can help reveal how people and reality are being influenced through covert linguistic means. Finding and being aware of the causal effects of texts helps people be more critical of the way language is used. That is why the present study is interested in how President Trump and President Obama frame the Paris Climate Accord in their official speeches. The Presidents have great power in terms of impacting people's thinking because they are high authorities, making their opinions important, and their speeches reach a large audience. Therefore pointing out how they use linguistic means to frame the Accord in a certain way is important, because audience members who are aware of these strategies can be more careful and critical listeners and also question the frame that is presented rather than accepting it immediately.

There is limited previous research on the climate frames or climate discourses of Presidents Trump and Obama. Brown and Sovacool (2017) studied the climate discourses of Donald Trump and three other Presidential Primary candidates in the 2016 elections, and Ritchie and Thomas (2015) studied Obama's climate metaphors in a major policy speech he gave in 2013. Further study and comparisons are needed and fruitful because it is important to be aware of the fact that political speeches often represent issues from certain perspectives without bringing forth alternative views, and understanding the linguistic strategies behind these representations promotes more careful listening and interpretation of such speeches.

The structure of the present study is as follows: in Chapter 2 I discuss relevant background literature and introduce the theories and concepts of social constructivism, framing, discourses and critical discourse analysis, as well as review some previous studies on presidential speeches, respectively. In Chapter 3 I discuss the present study and address its aims and research question, the data – also providing some background information on the Paris

Climate Accord – and the tools of analysis I use. In Chapter 4 I present the results of my analysis and in Chapter 5 I discuss my findings, the limitations of the present study, and some ideas for further research. The bibliography and appendices are included at the end.

2 BACKGROUND

In this chapter I introduce literature that is relevant to the present study and present central perspectives and concepts. I discuss the theories of social constructivism, framing, discourses and discourse analysis, and review some previous studies on presidential speeches, respectively.

2.1 Language and social constructivism

Language plays a very significant role in people's lives because it influences their perceptions on the world. It is not simply "a medium for expressing meanings that pre-exist linguistic formulation", instead it "constitutes meaningfulness in its own terms" (Locke 2004: 11). In other words, language does not only describe reality, it shapes reality. This happens via texts, where the term text is understood in a broad sense to include written and spoken sequences of language as well as related images and sounds. Fairclough (2003: 8) explains that texts can, for example, teach people something, influence people's identities, affect urban design or even start wars. He summarizes that "texts have causal effects upon, and contribute to changes in, people (beliefs, attitudes, etc.), actions, social relations, and the material world." However, it is important to note, as Fairclough emphasizes, that this causality is not mechanical or regular, meaning that the effects would be automatic or always the same. So, texts do have real causal effects but those cannot necessarily be predicted as they may vary depending on the context.

This notion that language shapes reality is at the heart of the theory of social constructivism, which suggests that language and social action are intertwined and reality is indeed constructed in social interaction (Pietikäinen and Mäntynen 2009: 10). Further, Pietikäinen and Mäntynen point out that this implies that language can be modified and used in order to manipulate reality and bring about desired changes in the world; thus it is a central building block of reality. Fairclough (2003: 8-9), however, only partially agrees with this theory. He notes that construing reality in a certain way in a text does not automatically change reality, as the effect is context-dependent and issues such as who is producing the text or what is the construed reality like in the first place may impact the outcome. As discussed above, the causality between texts and reality is not mechanical or regular and so context has to be taken into account. Language is not the only factor shaping reality but it certainly is one of them, and not an insignificant one.

2.2 Framing theory

One strategy for constructing a certain kind of social reality and influencing people with a text is to frame issues in a certain way. The concept of framing has various meanings in the literature and so it does not have a concise definition, but the present study accepts the definition offered by Entman (2004: 5): “[framing is] selecting and highlighting some facets of events or issues, and making connections among them so as to promote a particular interpretation, evaluation and/or solution.” In other words, the process of framing includes selecting certain aspects of reality and making them more salient in a text (Entman 1993: 52), or emphasizing, including and excluding certain information on the subject (Hallahan 1999: 207), and the purpose is to direct the audience towards a desired interpretation of reality (Entman 2004: 26). According to Hallahan (1999: 209), the lack of a concise definition can also be seen as the strength of the framing concept. In his view, the concept is a flexible idea of putting “emphasis on *providing context* within which information is presented and processed”, and as such can be applied in the analysis of many kinds of communication situations. Similarly Entman (1993: 51) states that “Whatever its specific use, the concept of framing consistently offers a way to describe the power of a communicating text.”

Frames are built and function in various ways. Hallahan (1999: 207-208) makes distinctions between valence framing, which means showing a piece of information in a positive or negative light; semantic framing, which means phrasing information so as to promote a certain interpretation; and the more complex story framing, which uses narrative techniques to support the message. He also explains that framing functions via at least two mechanisms: contextual cues and priming. Contextual cues direct the audience’s decisions and interpretations of the message: for example, presenting something as a risky issue may promote a negative reaction towards it; and priming means activating associations between the message and certain pieces of information or memories in the audience’s minds (Hallahan 1999: 208-209). As will be discussed in Chapter 4 below, an example of priming could be mentioning the 9/11 attacks to an American audience, thus connecting the current message with thoughts on terrorism and giving it negative connotations. Additionally, according to Van Gorp (2007: 73), if such framing devices in a single text are in line with the society’s broader cultural frames, they will seem familiar and resonate with the audience. This means that the frame of the text may remain unnoticed (and thus unquestioned) by the audience, and further that the communicative situation is not only an interaction of the producer of the text and the audience, but also an interaction with the larger society and its social reality.

The purpose of framing is to promote to the audience a certain kind of view on reality, for example, an issue, event or actor. Meriläinen and Vos (2013: 6) explain that the selection of descriptions and arguments in a text depend on the author's interests on the issue, and the aim is to invite people to "see the situation in a particular light, which may affect their views on the issue." Entman (2004: 5-6) identifies four different basic functions for framing, at least two of which are performed when covering political questions. These are "defining effects or conditions as problematic; identifying causes; conveying moral judgment; and endorsing remedies or improvements." Further, problem definition and remedy are the most important functions, because the former usually predetermines the entire frame, and the latter is used to directly support or oppose current public policy. I use this framework in my analysis of the speeches of President Trump and President Obama, see Chapters 3 and 4 for further discussion.

Framing can have significant impacts on the audience of a text. Hallahan (1999: 207) emphasizes the strong influence that framing has in constructing the social reality, as it is a way of shaping people's perspectives on the world. According to Entman (1993: 54) "the frame determines whether most people notice and how they understand and remember a problem, as well as how they evaluate and choose to act upon it." However, Entman acknowledges that the effects of the frame are not likely to be the same for the entire audience (similarly to what was noted above on the causal effects of texts). Nevertheless, there are important effects, and Entman (2004: 6, 170) suggests that the influence of the words (and images) employed by the frame can be measured by their cultural resonance and magnitude. Words that are highly salient and resonant in the culture, for example emotionally charged or memorable, are more likely to promote widespread political support (or opposition) to the issue in question. Magnitude, then, means how prominent and repeated the words are. Some highly resonant words do not require much repetition, but in general repeating resonating words leads to greater impact on larger portions of the audience.

2.3 Discourses and critical discourse analysis

The term 'discourse' is used in many different fields of research, and thus it covers various meanings. Hyland and Paltridge (2011: 1) explain that "Discourse, in fact, can be seen to spread between two poles, giving more-or-less emphasis to concrete texts or to institutional practices, to either particular cases of talk or to how social structures are formed by it." The present study leans towards the latter pole and understands the term as defined by Fairclough (2003: 17): "A discourse is a particular way of representing some part of the (physical, social, psychological) world." Wodak (2011: 39-40) further notes that these representations have ideological power,

as they may, for example, maintain power relationships in society. Therefore also the relationship between discourses and reality is reciprocal: reality shapes discourses and discourses, for their part, constitute reality.

Defining discourses this way implies that there can be many different discourses around the same issue – in other words, many perspectives from which to represent something (Fairclough 2003: 17, 124). The differences between discourses have to do with the ways in which, for example, the actors in a given situation and their relative relationships are represented, how the situation itself is represented, and what is included or excluded (Fairclough 2003: 17). The differences are realized through lexical, semantic and grammatical choices (Fairclough 2003: 129, 133). Moreover, Fairclough (2003: 124) points out that although discourses may represent the world as it is actually perceived to be from different perspectives, they may also represent the producer's hopes and thoughts on what the world should or could be like. As discourses can thus be used and produced selectively in order to help maintain or constitute a desired reality, they are seen as a central part of frames in the present study.

Discourse analysis, then, investigates how discourses are used to build meanings in texts. Central questions are, for example, how something is represented, what kinds of meanings are attached to it and which are missing, how linguistic resources are used, what kinds of narratives are present, and how the text is connected to its wider context (Pietikäinen and Mäntynen 2009). Critical discourse analysis (CDA) further connects discourses in individual texts with socio-cultural practices and power structures in society in order to make visible how a text is producing, maintaining or transforming them (see, for example, Fairclough 1995 and 2003; Locke 2004; Blommaert 2005; Wodak 2011). Additionally, what makes the analysis 'critical' is that these relations are not only uncovered but also evaluated both morally and politically (Blommaert 2005: 25). Issues such as whose voice is heard in a text and whose is not are at the heart of CDA, as it sees discourses as power instruments and by studying and evaluating them is committed to empower powerless groups of people and create societal change (Blommaert 2005: 25-26). As for the actual analytical methods, perhaps the most notable work is Fairclough's (1995) operationalization of CDA as a "three-dimensional framework" that combines the analyses of the language, form and organization of texts; discourse practices, or how texts are produced, distributed, and consumed; and the relations between texts and sociocultural practices such as power structures.

2.4 The influence of presidential speeches

The President of the United States is an authority whose communication reaches a large audience and so has great potential to impact the social reality, and therefore the frames and discourses used by the President are important objects of critical study. For instance, Entman (2004) discusses President Bush's communication strategy after the events of September 11, 2001 and finds that his frame defined the problem to be an 'act of war' against the U.S., the cause of which was an 'evil' enemy. This frame was effective in the immediate aftermath of the events, particularly since the media supported it, and so it succeeded in uniting much of the nation behind the president, against the terrorists. In doing so, it clearly had an impact on the social reality. This case also demonstrates how media support or opposition can play a part in spreading the impact of the presidential frame: support from the media secured the success of President Bush's frame. Entman (2004) notes that if the media provides a counterframe, an alternative point of view, it will affect how the original frame is received and if it is questioned or not. However, media analysis is beyond the scope of the present study.

As for President Obama, whose speech is one of the objects in the present study, Ritchie and Thomas (2015) analysed his use of contrasting metaphors in a speech on climate change. They found that he framed the issue in a way which "fails to acknowledge – and implicitly discredits – possible alternative frames." The impact of such framing may be further polarization between different sides of the discussion, as those who agree with the presented frame are satisfied, but those whose perspective is left unacknowledged feel distanced. This can prevent mutual understanding and constructive discussion from developing.

On the other hand, Brown and Sovacool (2017) compared the climate discourses of four Presidential Primary candidates in 2016: Donald Trump, Ted Cruz, Hillary Clinton and Bernie Sanders. When it comes to Trump, they found that he mentioned climate change least often and when he did, he framed it in either economic or national security terms rather than, for example, environmental terms. Ted Cruz's climate communication was also minimal, as Republican stakeholders and voters were not so interested in the issue as to demand discussion about it. This shows that the audience also influences what politicians talk about and how, particularly during campaign season.

Moreover, the study of (presidential) language is important because audience members may be unaware of the impact that language has on them, and so studying it and pointing the influence out may help people be more critical listeners. For example, Thibodeau and Boroditsky (2011) studied metaphors and found that they strongly influenced people's thoughts on and reasoning about a complex issue, as well as the way they searched for more information

about it. Importantly, this happened without the people being aware of the metaphors influencing them, so the influence was covert. Thus pointing such issues out is important, and in the next chapter I will describe how they are studied in the present study.

3 THE PRESENT STUDY

In this section I will discuss the particulars of the present study. First, I discuss its aim and research question. Second, I introduce the data, justify why I chose to analyse these particular speeches, and, in order to ensure that the discussion of the results is understandable, provide some background information on the Paris Climate Accord. Lastly, I discuss the tools of analysis I use.

3.1 Aim and research question

As has been discussed above, language has important causal effects on people's thoughts as well as the material world. Thus text producers and communicators have great power, and that power is particularly significant when the communicator is the President of the United States. Further, as audience members may not be aware of the impact that the language of a text may have on them, it is important to point that out by studying the issue. An audience member who acknowledges the potential impact of language and recognizes linguistic choices that have been made for particular influential purposes can be a more careful and critical listener. This is important because questioning dominant discourses and frames is necessary for societal change – improvements – to occur.

With the present study I strive to answer the following research question: "How is the Paris Climate Accord framed in official speeches by Presidents Trump and Obama?" I assume them to frame the accord differently because of their different perspectives on climate change and opposite policy decisions regarding the accord: President Obama ratified it whereas President Trump declared that the U.S. would withdraw from it. By identifying the framing strategies they use I hope to show how each of them is trying to influence their audience and gain support for their policy.

3.2 Data and the Paris Climate Accord

I have selected one speech from each President for analysis. President Obama gave his speech on December 12, 2015 when an agreement was reached on the terms of the Paris Climate Accord. The statement was delivered in the Cabinet Room. President Trump gave his on June 1, 2017 as he announced that the U.S. will withdraw from the Accord. His statement was delivered in the Rose Garden (see Appendices for the full transcripts). I narrowed the number of speeches down to two due to the limited scope of the present study. These particular speeches were selected because I believe they represent the Presidents' official views on the Accord,

which is the interest of the present study. Additionally, since official presidential speeches are presumably carefully written, the language that is used in them can be analysed in a meaningful way. I acknowledge the fact that the Presidents themselves may have participated in the actual writing of the speeches to a varying degree, but for reasons of clarity I refer to the texts as theirs. I refer to the Presidents either as President Trump/Obama, or simply Trump/Obama, with all due respect.

The Paris Climate Accord, which is the topic of the Presidents' speeches, is an international agreement that aims at mitigating climate change and improving countries' ability to cope with its impacts. Its purpose is to promote strong global climate action that would keep the global temperature rise below 2 degrees Celsius, compared with pre-industrial levels. The agreement was made under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, or the UNFCCC, in a conference held in Paris, France, in 2015. 197 countries are parties to the UNFCCC, and 175 of them have ratified the Accord so far.

Under the agreement countries are required to outline, maintain and report on their own nationally determined contributions (NDCs), that is, their domestic emissions reductions. The NDCs are established considering the circumstances and ability of each country to contribute. Additionally, the Green Climate Fund which was originally created in a UNFCCC conference in 2010 to fund various climate-related activities in developing countries, was adopted as a part of the Paris Accord to ensure that developing nations have access to financial resources they need to implement climate action (see United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change 2014 for additional information).

3.3 Tools of analysis

I analyse the speeches using framing theory and its tools as my main framework, in addition to which I draw from the tools of critical discourse analysis (CDA). I make use of framing concepts such as valence framing, semantic framing, and story framing, as well as Entman's (2004: 24) framework on the functions and objects of frames (see Table 1 below). Entman uses the framework for political news analysis, but it is helpful and suitable for political speech analysis as well. In addition, I use Entman's tools of estimating the cultural resonance and magnitude of words to predict the influence of the frame.

Table 1: Frame functions and objects (Entman 2004: 24)

<i>Function of Frame</i>	<i>Focus of Frame</i>		
	<i>Issues</i>	<i>Events</i>	<i>Political Actors (Individuals, Groups, Nations)</i>
Defining problematic effects/conditions			
Identifying cause/agent			
Endorsing remedy			
Conveying moral judgment			

As the scope of the present study is fairly limited, preventing detailed critical analysis of the discursal and sociocultural practices around the data, I cannot take a full CDA approach. However, I draw from CDA the close attention to linguistic details as well as the approach that the discourses (re)produced in the speeches, particularly since they are produced by such high authorities, should be an object of critical study and evaluation.

An issue that should be noted when performing qualitative linguistic analysis is objectivity. Fairclough (2003: 14-15) states that “There is no such thing as an ‘objective’ analysis of a text, if by that we mean an analysis which simply describes what is ‘there’ in the text without being ‘biased’ by the ‘subjectivity’ of the analyst.” However, he does not see this as a problem, because it is inevitable that the analyst’s knowledge is limited and the questions that are posed arise from certain motivations. In the present study, the motivation is interest in political communication, the Paris Accord, and climate change, which the analyst sees as a major problem. However, every effort is made in order to produce impartial analysis.

4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this section I will present my findings regarding the framing techniques that the Presidents use in their speeches. The discussion begins with smaller details in the texts and progresses towards broader notions and the frames in their entirety. In Section 4.1 I discuss each President's word choices and the cultural resonance and magnitude of those choices separately. In Section 4.2 I compare their semantic framings, or alternative ways in which they have phrased the same concepts. In Section 4.3 I look into their valence framing – presenting information in a positive or negative light – and story framing techniques. Finally, in Section 4.3 I discuss and compare the frames in their entirety and the contexts of the speeches. In this last section I also make use of Entman's (2004) framework of frame functions and objects.

4.1 Word choices and their cultural resonance and magnitude

In President Obama's speech, central terms and ideas are climate change as a threat; the planet; future and future generations or children; American leadership; global co-operation; and the economy. Obama uses words such as 'combating' and 'fighting' climate change in order to pose it as a serious problem, 'a threat'. These words also promote the concreteness of climate change: it may seem like an abstract concept since it cannot be seen just by looking out the window, but Obama assures the audience that it is real and physical enough to be fought, which also implies it can be beaten. Obama also uses the common environmental phrase 'protecting the planet' instead of discussing environmental protection in the U.S. only, which may help make the audience feel that this is a globally shared issue and that everyone is responsible for saving "the one planet that we've got." Moreover, that feeling is strengthened by repeatedly referring to 'our children' and 'future generations.' These words are likely to resonate strongly with the audience, because even if audience members did not find protecting the planet important as such, many of them are likely to be parents and they will care about their children's future.

Obama creates a sense of accomplishment and promotes patriotism by repeatedly mentioning American leadership and that Americans should be proud of their efforts in combating climate change: "Today, the American people can be proud – because this historic agreement is a tribute to American leadership." These words seem likely to encourage strong positive feelings in the audience, as they create a sense of belonging and shared accomplishment – everyone is invited to feel proud and distinguished Americans although they were not a part of the negotiations. This helps create an atmosphere where climate efforts are appreciated and

not opposed, since the audience is proud to be at the forefront of the battle. However, Obama also emphasizes co-operation and other nations doing their part, thus alleviating concerns that only Americans are contributing to saving the shared planet, and bridging the divide between Americans and others: “I also want to thank the people of nearly 200 nations – large and small, developed and developing – for working together to confront a threat to the people of all nations. Together, we’ve shown what’s possible when the world stands as one.”

Obama also addresses the economy, an important concern. He states that the U.S. has already taken ‘historic’ environmental action, which has not ‘killed jobs’, but created them. He emphasizes that the U.S. economic output is now at ‘all-time highs’, and that the agreement can potentially “unleash investment and innovation” at a never-before seen scale. These words imply that the U.S. is setting records and being a leading country, which again makes the audience feel proud and alleviates concerns that the agreement would be bad for the economy. Further, ‘unleash’ is a powerful term that suggests that the actions taken so far, as significant as they are, have only been the beginning and in the future the economy is going to grow like never before. Lastly, Obama states at the end of his speech that thanks to this agreement the world will be, among other things, ‘more free’ in the future. Freedom is a strong concept in the American culture, and a promise of more freedom in the future cannot be ignored. That is why the word is very important in securing the audience’s support for the agreement and, as it is mentioned at the end of the speech, leaving them with a positive feeling.

Moving on to President Trump’s speech, his central terms and ideas are fairness and unfairness; the American people; America’s sovereignty and the Constitution; the economy and growth; and a divide between America and the rest of the world, particularly China. Trump uses the word ‘fair’ often, and states that the agreement is unacceptable because it is “very unfair, at the highest level, to the United States.” The repetition of this term is likely to promote opposition towards the agreement, because the concept of fairness is familiar to everyone since childhood, and it seems only very reasonable to demand a fair agreement. The word ‘(un)fair’ assures the audience that withdrawing is in the best interest of the U.S. since the current agreement does not treat the country justly. Trump emphasizes that his primary concern are the American people, citizens, workers, taxpayers or families, whom he cares for and ‘loves’: “As President, I can put no other consideration before the wellbeing of American citizens.” These words and their frequency in the speech pose Trump as a president of the people and assure the audience that they would ‘suffer’ if the U.S. stayed in the agreement. This kind of rhetoric is likely to gain support for the decision to exit the agreement because the audience will feel that their lives and welfare are the foremost concern.

Trump uses two ideas that have very strong cultural resonance in America: the Constitution and the country's sovereignty. He states that he is 'protecting' the Constitution and strengthening America's sovereignty with this decision. These words make the agreement seem like a threat to the nation, and evoke patriotic feelings and a need to protect America within the audience. This feeling is further supported by making a clear distinction between America and the rest of the world, particularly China and India, with statements such as: "They [China] can do whatever they want for 13 years. Not us" and "We don't want other leaders and other countries laughing at us anymore. And they won't be. They won't be." Additionally, Trump repeats the word 'foreign': foreign leaders, lobbyists and countries should have no say in a sovereign nation's economy. Thus he effectively denies the benefits of global negotiations and positions America as an independent nation that does not look for partners abroad. Lastly he states that "It is time to make America great again", a phrase that became familiar to the people during his campaign for president, and because of that is likely to have significant resonance.

Trump's main argument is the economy and securing economic growth. He repeats phrases such as 'lost jobs' and 'billions and billions and billions of dollars,' which make it clear that the agreement is very expensive to the nation. He also mentions that the previous administration 'raided' funds for The Green Fund from the budget on 'the war against terrorism.' Mentioning terrorism is an example of priming, meant to arise memories of previous terrorist attack in the minds of the audience and make them disapprove taking money from that budget for other purposes. As for the environment, Trump promises that the U.S. will "continue to be the cleanest and most environmentally friendly country on Earth." He does not mention climate change or pollution caused by Americans, but rather refers to "the world's leading polluters" as other nations who are not doing their part in reducing emissions. Thus he suggests that every nation should take care of its own environmental politics and pollution rather than co-operating in order to have a clean planet.

4.2 Semantic framing

There are great differences in the semantic frames of Trump and Obama; in other words, they often represent the same issues in very different ways. This is due to the fact that their perspectives on the Paris Climate Accord are somewhat opposite. Whereas Obama phrases the Accord to be "the strong agreement the world needed", and an "enduring agreement that reduces global carbon pollution and sets the world on a course to a low-carbon future", Trump states that "This agreement is less about the climate and more about other countries gaining a financial advantage over the United States", and calls it "this self-inflicted major economic

wound.” Obama’s perspective is on what the world needs at this moment and how this agreement affects the environment, whereas Trump looks at the agreement from the perspective of the United States and its economy. Obama further states that “this agreement represents the best chance we’ve had to save the one planet that we’ve got,” while Trump declares that it “fails to serve America’s interests.” They highlight very different aspects of the agreement with their phrasings, as Obama emphasizes saving the planet and Trump emphasizes protecting America’s interests. Additionally, these perspectives are also apparent in the way the presidents present the Green Climate Fund, a central part of the agreement. Trump frames it as “yet another scheme to redistribute wealth out of the United States,” whereas Obama frames it as “a broader commitment to support the most vulnerable countries as they pursue cleaner economic growth.”

Obama views industries and energy production through the frames of “building a clean energy economy” and “historic investments in growing industries like wind and solar”, whereas Trump states that “We have among the most abundant energy reserves on the planet [...] yet, under this agreement, we are effectively putting these reserves under lock and key, taking away the great wealth of our nation,” and “the agreement doesn’t eliminate coal jobs, it just transfers those jobs out of America and the United States, and ships them to foreign countries.” In this Obama seems to be oriented towards innovation and new methods of energy production that would not pollute the environment. Trump, then, suggests continuing to use the methods that have already long been used, not seeing any reason to stop using existing resources. Further, what Obama calls “first-ever nationwide standards to limit the amount of carbon pollution power plants can dump into the air our children breathe”, Trump names “job-killing regulations.” Again, it would seem that Obama focuses more on the environmental effects of energy sources, and Trump discusses the U.S. economy. Obama refers to the future and the need to do things differently in order to build a better world, and Trump emphasizes the value of traditional sources of energy and argues that since developing nations are using them, the U.S. has the right to do so too.

As for climate change and global co-operation, Trump states that he is “fighting every day for the great people of this country”, and that “It is time to put Youngstown, Ohio, Detroit, Michigan, and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania – along with many, many other locations within our great country – before Paris, France.” Obama, then, sees that “no nation, not even one as powerful as ours, can solve this challenge alone”, and that “this moment can be a turning point for the world.” Again, Trump’s perspective is on America and Americans, who stand alone, and Obama argues for working together and states that the world needs everyone to participate.

4.3 Valence framing and story framing

The Presidents' valence framing strategies are also somewhat opposite, meaning that they show the Paris Accord in very different lights. Obama shows it in a positive light: "In short, this agreement will mean less of the carbon pollution that threatens our planet, and more of the jobs and economic growth driven by low-carbon investment." Trump, using an opposite frame, presents the Paris Accord and, to some extent, the previous administration in a negative light by stating that the agreement imposes "draconian financial and economic burdens" on America, and that "no responsible leader" can accept their country to be put at such a disadvantage.

Obama acknowledges that the agreement is not 'perfect' with the following statement:

"Even if all the initial targets set in Paris are met, we'll only be part of the way there when it comes to reducing carbon from the atmosphere. So we cannot be complacent because of today's agreement. The problem is not solved because of this accord. But make no mistake, the Paris agreement establishes the enduring framework the world needs to solve the climate crisis."

Thus he notes that the work to protect the planet is not over yet, as the agreement itself is not enough to solve the problem, but assures the audience that the agreement is essential in the process anyway. He does not suggest any alternative remedies; instead, the agreement is presented as "the best chance we've had to save the one planet that we've got." By making it clear that the problem is a serious threat and presenting no other possible remedies, the audience is invited to support the agreement. From a different perspective, Trump's take on this issue is the following:

"Even if the Paris Agreement were implemented in full, with total compliance from all nations, it is estimated it would only produce a two-tenths of one degree — think of that; this much — Celsius reduction in global temperature by the year 2100. Tiny, tiny amount."

Thus Trump argues that the agreement is not good enough to actually make a difference and presents it as unimportant and not a viable solution, inviting the audience to ignore it as an option. He does not provide information on what the change in temperature is estimated to be if the Accord is *not* implemented, addressing only one side of the debate.

Moreover, there seem to be some contradictions in Trump's representation of the Accord. As described above, he states that the agreement does not actually protect the environment properly. Yet he also states that "these agreements only tend to become more and more ambitious over time", acknowledging that the emissions reduction goals are likely to rise. This could be seen as a positive fact for the environment, but Trump presents it as an attack on the sovereignty of the United States: "exiting the agreement protects the United States from

future intrusions on the United States' sovereignty and massive future legal liability." Trump has also mentioned that the agreement is non-binding, yet he assures that "we have massive legal liability if we stay in." These statements seem to be contradictory, which may affect the credibility of the speech.

When it comes to story framing, which means making use of narrative techniques to present a theme in a text, Trump does not use it at all. His strategy to appeal to the audience's emotions is based on culturally resonating words, which have been discussed above. Obama, however, uses story framing at the end of his speech:

"I imagine taking my grandkids, if I'm lucky enough to have some, to the park someday, and holding their hands, and hearing their laughter, and watching a quiet sunset, all the while knowing that our work today prevented an alternate future that could have been grim; that our work, here and now, gave future generations cleaner air, and cleaner water, and a more sustainable planet. And what could be more important than that?"

A story like this, a dream of a better future, is relatable and easy to support: who would not wish to enjoy a day in the park with their grandchildren, or worse, who would be so irresponsible as to prevent their grandchildren such a future? Therefore it is a powerful tool in influencing the audience.

4.4 The presented frames

When Obama's frame on the Paris Climate Accord is looked at in its entirety, it seems that its central function is to pose climate change as a serious problem, and the Paris Climate Accord as the desired remedy to it (see Appendix 3: Functions and objects of Obama's frame). The problem, Obama argues, is the result of the world not taking sufficient action to mitigate climate change, which in turn is due to lack of leadership and will. This lack of action is judged to be irresponsible as the world is morally obligated to save the planet for future generations. However, as a remedy has now been agreed upon and the global agreement has been made, Americans ought to be proud of their strong leadership, which has helped the world come together – that means that anything can be achieved.

The central function of Trump's frame, then, is to present the Paris Accord as an unfair agreement that disadvantages the U.S., and promote the view that withdrawing from it – and perhaps later renegotiating it – is the only remedy to the situation (see Appendix 4: Functions and objects of Trump's frame). The main problem is the unfairness of the Accord, which results from other nations' wish to put America at an economic disadvantage. Thus other nations are

judged to be greedy. Additionally, the previous administration did not “put America first” as it entered into such an agreement. This means that the previous administration did not care about the American people as much as the Trump administration, which loves them, does. The only solution for the problem is to reassert America’s sovereignty and exit the agreement, otherwise the American people will suffer and other nations will benefit at America’s expense.

The linguistic, semantic, and other means the presidents use to present their ideas are somewhat similar. As is shown above, they both make use of culturally resonating, patriotic ideas, although the individual words they use are different. They also both focus on their own perspective without taking all sides of the debate into consideration. For example, Obama fails to mention that, due to the agreement, jobs will be lost in some sectors such as coal production. Trump, on the other hand, ignores the new jobs that would be created on clean energy sectors if there were more investments on them.

Although the broader context of the speeches is nearly the same – they are both given by the President of the United States to the people of the United States, and only a little over eighteen months of time passes between them – the Presidents emphasize different aspects of and power structures within that context. Trump highlights the greatness of the U.S. and the importance of its sovereignty and keeping competing nations behind it. He also implies that his administration is better than the Obama administration was, as they follow through on their commitments and he cares deeply for the American people, families and poor. Obama, then, establishes that America is a powerful nation, and that that power should be used in order to lead the world towards a better future. His primary concerns are the environment, future generations and all the people of the world rather than only Americans.

5 CONCLUSION

The objective of the present study was to find out how Presidents Trump and Obama frame the Paris Climate Accord in selected official speeches. This was considered an important topic for research, because the U.S. Presidents may have great influence on the social reality with the language they use. The speeches were analysed using the tools of framing theory and critical discourse analysis (CDA). Central topics of analysis were the Presidents' word choices, as well as the cultural resonance and magnitude of those words; their semantic frames; their valence framing and story framing techniques; and the frames in their entirety.

The findings show that the Presidents use various strategies in order to frame the Accord from their own perspectives and create a social reality where their policies are supported. This is in line with the literature: for example, framing theory states that descriptions and arguments are selected based on the author's interests, and the aim is to show the situation in a certain light in order to influence the audience's views on it (Meriläinen and Vos 2013: 6). That is why it is understandable that the Presidents use opposing frames, as they are trying to gain support for their opposing policies. This also explains why they do not discuss all sides of the debate in their speeches, as they wish to promote their own perspective instead of providing alternatives.

The findings can be helpful when listening to further political speeches and debates, as being informed of the various linguistic strategies that speakers make use of for promoting their view may help listeners consider what is being said and left unsaid more carefully. Critical listening and questioning of the presented perspective are tools that help audience members consider the motivations behind the speech and whether all of it should be believed. If enough people question dominant frames and discourses, societal change may be brought about.

There are some limitations to the present study due to its restricted scope. Only two speeches were analysed, and not all aspects of them could be included in the analysis due to the limited space. Further results could have been attained if, for example, grammatical forms or nonverbal communication were also included in the analysis. Nevertheless, since language has considerable power, pointing out even some of the Presidents' strategies for influencing their audiences is important as it helps the audience become aware of the issue and listen more carefully. Interesting future research considerations would be analysing the media reactions to speeches such as these, and studying which of the opposing frames has more actual influence on the audience. Hopefully the present study can, for its part, promote more careful and critical listening and analysis of presidential speeches and other powerful texts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse. A critical introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, G. and Sovacool, B.K. (2017): The presidential politics of climate discourse: Energy frames, policy, and political tactics from the 2016 Primaries in the United States. *Energy Policy*, 111, 127-136. doi: 10.1016/j.enpol.2017.09.019
- Entman, R.M. (1993). Framing: toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51-58.
- Entman, R.M. (2004). *Projections of power. Framing news, public opinion, and U.S. foreign policy*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis. The critical study of language*. New York: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse. Textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.
- Hallahan, K. (1999). Seven models of framing: implications for public relations. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 11(3), 205-242. doi: 10.1207/s1532754xjpr1103_02
- Hyland, K. and Paltridge, B. (Eds.) (2011). *Continuum companion to discourse analysis*. London: Continuum.
- Locke, T. (2004). *Critical discourse analysis*. London: Continuum.
- Meriläinen, N., and Vos, M. (2013). Framing issues in the public debate: the case of human rights. *Corporate Communications, an International Journal*, 18 (1), 119-134. doi:10.1108/13563281311294164
- Pietikäinen, S. and Mäntynen, A. (2009). *Kurssi kohti diskurssia*. Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Ritchie, L.D. and Thomas, M. (2015). A "bright blue ball", "brushed with clouds" or "parched, scorched, and washed away"? *Metaphor & the Social World*, 5(1), 1-19. doi:10.1075/msw.5.1.01rit
- Thibodeau, P.H. and Boroditsky, L. (2011). Metaphors we think with: the role of metaphor in reasoning. *PLoS ONE* 6(2): e16782. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0016782
- United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (2014). Paris Agreement. <http://unfccc.int/2860.php> (15 March, 2018).
- Van Gorp, B. (2007). The constructionist approach to framing: bringing culture back in. *Journal of Communication*, 57(1), 60-78. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2006.00329.x
- Wodak, R. (2011). Critical discourse analysis. In Hyland, K. and Paltridge, B. (Eds.),

Continuum companion to discourse analysis. London: Continuum, 38-53.

Appendix 1: Statement by the President on the Paris Climate Agreement

Issued on: December 12, 2015

5:30 P.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: In my first inaugural address, I committed this country to the tireless task of combating climate change and protecting this planet for future generations.

Two weeks ago, in Paris, I said before the world that we needed a strong global agreement to accomplish this goal -- an enduring agreement that reduces global carbon pollution and sets the world on a course to a low-carbon future.

A few hours ago, we succeeded. We came together around the strong agreement the world needed. We met the moment.

I want to commend President Hollande and Secretary General Ban for their leadership and for hosting such a successful summit, and French Foreign Minister Laurent Fabius for presiding with patience and resolve. And I want to give a special thanks to Secretary John Kerry, my Senior Advisor Brian Deese, our chief negotiator Todd Stern, and everyone on their teams for their outstanding work and for making America proud.

I also want to thank the people of nearly 200 nations -- large and small, developed and developing -- for working together to confront a threat to the people of all nations. Together, we've shown what's possible when the world stands as one.

Today, the American people can be proud -- because this historic agreement is a tribute to American leadership. Over the past seven years, we've transformed the United States into the global leader in fighting climate change. In 2009, we helped salvage a chaotic Copenhagen Summit and established the principle that all countries had a role to play in combating climate change. We then led by example, with historic investments in growing industries like wind and solar, creating a new and steady stream of middle-class jobs. We've set the first-ever nationwide standards to limit the amount of carbon pollution power plants can dump into the air our children breathe. From Alaska to the Gulf Coast to the Great Plains, we've partnered with local leaders who are working to help their communities protect themselves from some of the most immediate impacts of a changing climate.

Now, skeptics said these actions would kill jobs. Instead, we've seen the longest streak of private-sector job creation in our history. We've driven our economic output to all-time highs while driving our carbon pollution down to its lowest level in nearly two decades. And then, with our historic joint announcement with China last year, we showed it was possible to bridge the old divides between developed and developing nations that had stymied global progress for so long. That accomplishment encouraged dozens and dozens of other nations to set their own ambitious climate targets. And that was the foundation for success in Paris. Because no nation, not even one as powerful as ours, can solve this challenge alone. And no country, no matter how small, can sit on the sidelines. All of us had to solve it together.

Now, no agreement is perfect, including this one. Negotiations that involve nearly 200 nations are always challenging. Even if all the initial targets set in Paris are met, we'll only be part of the way there when it comes to reducing carbon from the atmosphere. So we cannot be complacent because of today's agreement. The problem is not solved because of this accord. But make no mistake, the Paris agreement establishes the enduring framework the world needs to solve the climate crisis. It creates the mechanism, the architecture, for us to continually tackle this problem in an effective way.

This agreement is ambitious, with every nation setting and committing to their own specific targets, even as we take into account differences among nations. We'll have a strong system of transparency, including periodic reviews and independent assessments, to help hold every country accountable for meeting its commitments. As technology advances, this agreement allows progress to pave the way for even more ambitious targets over time. And we have secured a broader commitment to support the most vulnerable countries as they pursue cleaner economic growth.

In short, this agreement will mean less of the carbon pollution that threatens our planet, and more of the jobs and economic growth driven by low-carbon investment. Full implementation of this agreement will help delay or avoid some of the worst consequences of climate change, and will pave the way for even more progress, in successive stages, over the coming years.

Moreover, this agreement sends a powerful signal that the world is firmly committed to a low-carbon future. And that has the potential to unleash investment and innovation in clean energy

at a scale we have never seen before. The targets we've set are bold. And by empowering businesses, scientists, engineers, workers, and the private sector -- investors -- to work together, this agreement represents the best chance we've had to save the one planet that we've got.

So I believe this moment can be a turning point for the world. We've shown that the world has both the will and the ability to take on this challenge. It won't be easy. Progress won't always come quick. We cannot be complacent. While our generation will see some of the benefits of building a clean energy economy -- jobs created and money saved -- we may not live to see the full realization of our achievement. But that's okay. What matters is that today we can be more confident that this planet is going to be in better shape for the next generation. And that's what I care about. I imagine taking my grandkids, if I'm lucky enough to have some, to the park someday, and holding their hands, and hearing their laughter, and watching a quiet sunset, all the while knowing that our work today prevented an alternate future that could have been grim; that our work, here and now, gave future generations cleaner air, and cleaner water, and a more sustainable planet. And what could be more important than that?

Today, thanks to strong, principled, American leadership, that's the world that we'll leave to our children -- a world that is safer and more secure, more prosperous, and more free. And that is our most important mission in our short time here on this Earth.

Thanks.

(Retrieved March 16, 2018 from <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2015/12/12/statement-president-paris-climate-agreement>.)

Appendix 2: Statement by President Trump on the Paris Climate Accord

Issued on: June 1, 2017

3:32 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. (Applause.) Thank you. I would like to begin by addressing the terrorist attack in Manila. We're closely monitoring the situation, and I will continue to give updates if anything happens during this period of time. But it is really very sad as to what's going on throughout the world with terror. Our thoughts and our prayers are with all of those affected.

Before we discuss the Paris Accord, I'd like to begin with an update on our tremendous — absolutely tremendous — economic progress since Election Day on November 8th. The economy is starting to come back, and very, very rapidly. We've added \$3.3 trillion in stock market value to our economy, and more than a million private sector jobs.

I have just returned from a trip overseas where we concluded nearly \$350 billion of military and economic development for the United States, creating hundreds of thousands of jobs. It was a very, very successful trip, believe me. (Applause.) Thank you. Thank you.

In my meetings at the G7, we have taken historic steps to demand fair and reciprocal trade that gives Americans a level playing field against other nations. We're also working very hard for peace in the Middle East, and perhaps even peace between the Israelis and the Palestinians.

Our attacks on terrorism are greatly stepped up — and you see that, you see it all over — from the previous administration, including getting many other countries to make major contributions to the fight against terror. Big, big contributions are being made by countries that weren't doing so much in the form of contribution.

One by one, we are keeping the promises I made to the American people during my campaign for President — whether it's cutting job-killing regulations; appointing and confirming a tremendous Supreme Court justice; putting in place tough new ethics rules; achieving a record reduction in illegal immigration on our southern border; or bringing jobs, plants, and factories back into the United States at numbers which no one until this point thought even possible. And believe me, we've just begun. The fruits of our labor will be seen very shortly even more so.

On these issues and so many more, we're following through on our commitments. And I don't want anything to get in our way. I am fighting every day for the great people of this country. Therefore, in order to fulfill my solemn duty to protect America and its citizens, the United States will withdraw from the Paris Climate Accord — (applause) — thank you, thank you — but begin negotiations to reenter either the Paris Accord or a really entirely new transaction on terms that are fair to the United States, its businesses, its workers, its people, its taxpayers. So we're getting out. But we will start to negotiate, and we will see if we can make a deal that's fair. And if we can, that's great. And if we can't, that's fine. (Applause.)

As President, I can put no other consideration before the wellbeing of American citizens. The Paris Climate Accord is simply the latest example of Washington entering into an agreement that disadvantages the United States to the exclusive benefit of other countries, leaving American workers — who I love — and taxpayers to absorb the cost in terms of lost jobs, lower wages, shuttered factories, and vastly diminished economic production.

Thus, as of today, the United States will cease all implementation of the non-binding Paris Accord and the draconian financial and economic burdens the agreement imposes on our country. This includes ending the implementation of the nationally determined contribution and, very importantly, the Green Climate Fund which is costing the United States a vast fortune. Compliance with the terms of the Paris Accord and the onerous energy restrictions it has placed on the United States could cost America as much as 2.7 million lost jobs by 2025 according to the National Economic Research Associates. This includes 440,000 fewer manufacturing jobs — not what we need — believe me, this is not what we need — including automobile jobs, and the further decimation of vital American industries on which countless communities rely. They rely for so much, and we would be giving them so little.

According to this same study, by 2040, compliance with the commitments put into place by the previous administration would cut production for the following sectors: paper down 12 percent; cement down 23 percent; iron and steel down 38 percent; coal — and I happen to love the coal miners — down 86 percent; natural gas down 31 percent. The cost to the economy at this time would be close to \$3 trillion in lost GDP and 6.5 million industrial jobs, while households would have \$7,000 less income and, in many cases, much worse than that.

Not only does this deal subject our citizens to harsh economic restrictions, it fails to live up to our environmental ideals. As someone who cares deeply about the environment, which I do, I cannot in good conscience support a deal that punishes the United States — which is what it does — the world's leader in environmental protection, while imposing no meaningful obligations on the world's leading polluters.

For example, under the agreement, China will be able to increase these emissions by a staggering number of years — 13. They can do whatever they want for 13 years. Not us. India makes its participation contingent on receiving billions and billions and billions of dollars in

foreign aid from developed countries. There are many other examples. But the bottom line is that the Paris Accord is very unfair, at the highest level, to the United States.

Further, while the current agreement effectively blocks the development of clean coal in America — which it does, and the mines are starting to open up. We're having a big opening in two weeks. Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia, so many places. A big opening of a brand-new mine. It's unheard of. For many, many years, that hasn't happened. They asked me if I'd go. I'm going to try.

China will be allowed to build hundreds of additional coal plants. So we can't build the plants, but they can, according to this agreement. India will be allowed to double its coal production by 2020. Think of it: India can double their coal production. We're supposed to get rid of ours. Even Europe is allowed to continue construction of coal plants.

In short, the agreement doesn't eliminate coal jobs, it just transfers those jobs out of America and the United States, and ships them to foreign countries.

This agreement is less about the climate and more about other countries gaining a financial advantage over the United States. The rest of the world applauded when we signed the Paris Agreement — they went wild; they were so happy — for the simple reason that it put our country, the United States of America, which we all love, at a very, very big economic disadvantage. A cynic would say the obvious reason for economic competitors and their wish to see us remain in the agreement is so that we continue to suffer this self-inflicted major economic wound. We would find it very hard to compete with other countries from other parts of the world.

We have among the most abundant energy reserves on the planet, sufficient to lift millions of America's poorest workers out of poverty. Yet, under this agreement, we are effectively putting these reserves under lock and key, taking away the great wealth of our nation — it's great wealth, it's phenomenal wealth; not so long ago, we had no idea we had such wealth — and leaving millions and millions of families trapped in poverty and joblessness.

The agreement is a massive redistribution of United States wealth to other countries. At 1 percent growth, renewable sources of energy can meet some of our domestic demand, but at 3 or 4 percent growth, which I expect, we need all forms of available American energy, or our

country — (applause) — will be at grave risk of brownouts and blackouts, our businesses will come to a halt in many cases, and the American family will suffer the consequences in the form of lost jobs and a very diminished quality of life.

Even if the Paris Agreement were implemented in full, with total compliance from all nations, it is estimated it would only produce a two-tenths of one degree — think of that; this much — Celsius reduction in global temperature by the year 2100. Tiny, tiny amount. In fact, 14 days of carbon emissions from China alone would wipe out the gains from America — and this is an incredible statistic — would totally wipe out the gains from America’s expected reductions in the year 2030, after we have had to spend billions and billions of dollars, lost jobs, closed factories, and suffered much higher energy costs for our businesses and for our homes.

As the Wall Street Journal wrote this morning: “The reality is that withdrawing is in America’s economic interest and won’t matter much to the climate.” The United States, under the Trump administration, will continue to be the cleanest and most environmentally friendly country on Earth. We’ll be the cleanest. We’re going to have the cleanest air. We’re going to have the cleanest water. We will be environmentally friendly, but we’re not going to put our businesses out of work and we’re not going to lose our jobs. We’re going to grow; we’re going to grow rapidly. (Applause.)

And I think you just read — it just came out minutes ago, the small business report — small businesses as of just now are booming, hiring people. One of the best reports they’ve seen in many years.

I’m willing to immediately work with Democratic leaders to either negotiate our way back into Paris, under the terms that are fair to the United States and its workers, or to negotiate a new deal that protects our country and its taxpayers. (Applause.)

So if the obstructionists want to get together with me, let’s make them non-obstructionists. We will all sit down, and we will get back into the deal. And we’ll make it good, and we won’t be closing up our factories, and we won’t be losing our jobs. And we’ll sit down with the Democrats and all of the people that represent either the Paris Accord or something that we can do that’s much better than the Paris Accord. And I think the people of our country will be

thrilled, and I think then the people of the world will be thrilled. But until we do that, we're out of the agreement.

I will work to ensure that America remains the world's leader on environmental issues, but under a framework that is fair and where the burdens and responsibilities are equally shared among the many nations all around the world.

No responsible leader can put the workers — and the people — of their country at this debilitating and tremendous disadvantage. The fact that the Paris deal hamstring the United States, while empowering some of the world's top polluting countries, should dispel any doubt as to the real reason why foreign lobbyists wish to keep our magnificent country tied up and bound down by this agreement: It's to give their country an economic edge over the United States. That's not going to happen while I'm President. I'm sorry. (Applause.)

My job as President is to do everything within my power to give America a level playing field and to create the economic, regulatory and tax structures that make America the most prosperous and productive country on Earth, and with the highest standard of living and the highest standard of environmental protection.

Our tax bill is moving along in Congress, and I believe it's doing very well. I think a lot of people will be very pleasantly surprised. The Republicans are working very, very hard. We'd love to have support from the Democrats, but we may have to go it alone. But it's going very well.

The Paris Agreement handicaps the United States economy in order to win praise from the very foreign capitals and global activists that have long sought to gain wealth at our country's expense. They don't put America first. I do, and I always will. (Applause.)

The same nations asking us to stay in the agreement are the countries that have collectively cost America trillions of dollars through tough trade practices and, in many cases, lax contributions to our critical military alliance. You see what's happening. It's pretty obvious to those that want to keep an open mind.

At what point does America get demeaned? At what point do they start laughing at us as a country? We want fair treatment for its citizens, and we want fair treatment for our taxpayers.

We don't want other leaders and other countries laughing at us anymore. And they won't be. They won't be.

I was elected to represent the citizens of Pittsburgh, not Paris. (Applause.) I promised I would exit or renegotiate any deal which fails to serve America's interests. Many trade deals will soon be under renegotiation. Very rarely do we have a deal that works for this country, but they'll soon be under renegotiation. The process has begun from day one. But now we're down to business.

Beyond the severe energy restrictions inflicted by the Paris Accord, it includes yet another scheme to redistribute wealth out of the United States through the so-called Green Climate Fund — nice name — which calls for developed countries to send \$100 billion to developing countries all on top of America's existing and massive foreign aid payments. So we're going to be paying billions and billions and billions of dollars, and we're already way ahead of anybody else. Many of the other countries haven't spent anything, and many of them will never pay one dime.

The Green Fund would likely obligate the United States to commit potentially tens of billions of dollars of which the United States has already handed over \$1 billion — nobody else is even close; most of them haven't even paid anything — including funds raided out of America's budget for the war against terrorism. That's where they came. Believe me, they didn't come from me. They came just before I came into office. Not good. And not good the way they took the money.

In 2015, the United Nation's departing top climate officials reportedly described the \$100 billion per year as “peanuts,” and stated that “the \$100 billion is the tail that wags the dog.” In 2015, the Green Climate Fund's executive director reportedly stated that estimated funding needed would increase to \$450 billion per year after 2020. And nobody even knows where the money is going to. Nobody has been able to say, where is it going to?

Of course, the world's top polluters have no affirmative obligations under the Green Fund, which we terminated. America is \$20 trillion in debt. Cash-strapped cities cannot hire enough police officers or fix vital infrastructure. Millions of our citizens are out of work. And yet, under the Paris Accord, billions of dollars that ought to be invested right here in America will

be sent to the very countries that have taken our factories and our jobs away from us. So think of that.

There are serious legal and constitutional issues as well. Foreign leaders in Europe, Asia, and across the world should not have more to say with respect to the U.S. economy than our own citizens and their elected representatives. Thus, our withdrawal from the agreement represents a reassertion of America's sovereignty. (Applause.) Our Constitution is unique among all the nations of the world, and it is my highest obligation and greatest honor to protect it. And I will. Staying in the agreement could also pose serious obstacles for the United States as we begin the process of unlocking the restrictions on America's abundant energy reserves, which we have started very strongly. It would once have been unthinkable that an international agreement could prevent the United States from conducting its own domestic economic affairs, but this is the new reality we face if we do not leave the agreement or if we do not negotiate a far better deal.

The risks grow as historically these agreements only tend to become more and more ambitious over time. In other words, the Paris framework is a starting point — as bad as it is — not an end point. And exiting the agreement protects the United States from future intrusions on the United States' sovereignty and massive future legal liability. Believe me, we have massive legal liability if we stay in.

As President, I have one obligation, and that obligation is to the American people. The Paris Accord would undermine our economy, hamstring our workers, weaken our sovereignty, impose unacceptable legal risks, and put us at a permanent disadvantage to the other countries of the world. It is time to exit the Paris Accord — (applause) — and time to pursue a new deal that protects the environment, our companies, our citizens, and our country.

It is time to put Youngstown, Ohio, Detroit, Michigan, and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania — along with many, many other locations within our great country — before Paris, France. It is time to make America great again. (Applause.) Thank you. Thank you. Thank you very much.

Thank you very much. Very important. I'd like to ask Scott Pruitt, who most of you know and respect, as I do, just to say a few words.

Scott, please. (Applause.)

(Retrieved March 16, 2018 from <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/statement-president-trump-paris-climate-agreement/>.)

Appendix 3: Functions and objects of Obama’s frame (table adapted from Entman 2004: 24).

	<i>Focus of Frame</i>	
<i>Function of Frame</i>	<i>Issues</i>	<i>Political Actors (Individuals, Groups, Nations)</i>
Defining problematic effects/conditions	Climate change is a serious problem for the planet.	The world is not co-operating.
Identifying cause/agent	The world has not taken enough action to mitigate it.	Lack of leadership and will to tackle climate change.
Endorsing remedy	The Paris Accord and its implementation.	Global co-operation through The Paris Accord and its implementation.
Conveying moral judgment	People have moral responsibility to save the planet.	America is a good, strong leader, and when all nations are led to co-operate anything is possible.

Appendix 4: Functions and objects of Trump’s frame (table adapted from Entman 2004: 24).

	<i>Focus of Frame</i>	
<i>Function of Frame</i>	<i>Issues</i>	<i>Political Actors (Individuals, Groups, Nations)</i>
Defining problematic effects/conditions	The Paris Accord is unfair to the U.S.	The previous administration was wrong to enter into such an agreement.
Identifying cause/agent	Other nations wish America to be at an economic disadvantage.	The previous administration did not “put America first”.
Endorsing remedy	Withdrawing from the Accord, perhaps negotiating a better one.	Withdrawing from the Accord, better administration.
Conveying moral judgment	Other nations are greedy and wish ill for the U.S.	The Trump administration cares more about the American people than the previous one did.