TRUMP'S ADMINISTRATION AND DISCOURSES OF CLIMATE CHANGE.

Faheem Ahmed[*], **Dr. Inayat Kalim**[**]

1. International Relations Scholar, Department of Humanities, COMSATS University Islamabad.

2. Associate Professor, Department of Humanities, COMSATS University Islamabad.

Abstract. This study explores Trump's narrative on climate change and exposes how official discourses had an impact on the policy level change under the Trump administration. Firstly, this study shows that the Trump administration in its three-plus years proved to be the worst denier of climate scientific projections and deregulated almost all the domestic climate control laws and withdrew from the Paris agreement. Secondly, this study highlights the role of discourses in manufacturing favorable consent from the public to make national security decisions more legitimate. Moreover, the US is the second-largest and number-one historic carbon polluter in the world. President Trump ended the 'war on coal' and transformed the US energy generation towards fossil fuels such as coal, oil, and natural gas. In addition, such implementations by one of the biggest industrialized states in the world had disrupted the efforts of the international community to limit the potential threat to humanity and ecosystems.
Key Words: Environmentalism, Climate control, War on Coal, GHG emissions, Discourses, Ecosystem

1. Introduction

Climate change poses a threat to national, international, and human security and there is a growing awareness in the international community to tackle the climate crisis. Climate change poses threats to humans, societies, economies, infrastructure, and ecosystems and it should be addressed as a national security issue. The United States, the second-largest and number one historic carbon polluter in the world deregulated climate laws and withdrew from the Paris agreement back in Trump's administration. The impacts of climate change have already been affecting the infrastructure, economy, and human casualty rate of the US. For instance, in 2005 alone, Hurricane Katrina damaged $40-50 billion in monetary losses, killed almost 1800 people, and displaced 270,000 others (R.W. Kates, 2006). Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report says, "Human activities are estimated to have caused approximately 1.0°C of global warming above pre-industrial levels, with a likely range of 0.8°C to 1.2°C. Global warming is likely to reach 1.5°C between 2030 and 2052 if it continues to increase at the current rate". Impacts of global warming on the planet Earth have already been observed and challenged human life, and the dominant political, and economic order. The Working Group II (2007) report states that rising the above-mentioned average temperature up to 1.5°C will result in rising sea levels, changing ecosystems, reducing food security, a higher rate of diseases, heatwaves, worsening droughts, disputes on resources, affecting coral reefs, melting glaciers, flooding, and extreme weather events, which has the potential to affect millions of lives in the coming decades (Myles R. Allen, 2018). Trump administration's strategy of energy generation through fossil fuels and deregulation of almost all the domestic environmental laws and withdrawal from the key international agreement had disrupted the efforts of the international community of climate control and climate action.

The present study aims to uncover the role of discourses in building favorable consent to justify policy-level changes and conducts. This study is significant because the understanding of security issues like war and climate change has only been explained with causal methods. Post-positivist understanding of US foreign policy, in particular, the study of security issues considers the subjective role of power and discursive reproduction.

2. Theoretical Interpretations

Different theoretical accounts of international relations have explained the US foreign policy and in particular the security issues of the US. Traditional theories such as Realism, Liberalism, and Marxism have the state-centric approach and took the state as a unitary and rational actor. These theories argue that states have rational autonomy, and their foreign policy behavior is determined by the anarchic structure of the world, the struggle for material power, and ideological dominance. This research took a post-positivist perspective to explain the foreign policy behavior of the US.

The fourth debate in International Relations emerged in the 1980s. This debate is mainly between positivism and post-positivism. The ontological position of Positivism lies in the objective positioning of the social and political world like 'reality is out there' as an objective reality like rocks, free from 'human-making'. This account of science has empiricist epistemology based on the footings that only genuine knowledge can be acquired through facts that can be experienced by human senses and through empirical validation and systematic observation. While ontological positioning of post-positivists is subjective like social and political reality is mediated and a result of 'human making'. It believes that meaning, beliefs, ideas, and language are important factors in studying social processes and social life. This is known as an interpretive approach to uncovering the deep meanings which cannot be unfolded by observed reality. This is particularly in the cases of post-modernism, critical constructivism, and post-structuralism (Tim Dunne, 2013).

This research is around the assumptions of poststructuralism. Post-structuralism emerged in IR in the 1980s with the work of Richard Ashley, James Der Derian, Michael Shapiro, and R.B.J Walker. Poststructuralism takes traditional IR theories as a form of social and political knowledge and is concerned about the normative concerns of such knowledge for scholars and researchers. Poststructuralism engages core areas of foreign policy such as war and climate as a socially and politically mediated form of discourse. Poststructuralism unlike traditional theories neither take such issues as given and natural form of realities nor given representations but rather seeks interpretive inquiry. Discourse means any issue at first is a manipulated construction through political and media speech acts. In other words, an issue becomes a security threat when it is undermined by other real issues. This means that the represented issues reflect the interests of powerful states such as the US. For instance, in Clinton's era, the issue of climate change was addressed as a national security threat while in the subsequent administrations, it has been marginalized. This way of understanding US foreign policy compels us to think about some very pertinent questions such as why the climate is not the core foreign policy agenda of the ruling elite in the US. (Griffiths, 2007) Moreover, this study asserts that the Trump administration desecuritized the issue of climate change through speech acts. (Beach 2012:93)

3. Method:

The ontological position of the present research is subjectivism/anti-foundationalism which states that social and political reality is our own making or human-mediated. The epistemological position is interpretivism which argues that the method of inquiry in social and political research is through interpretation and language. Text is a primary agent of the study, thus, the presidential statements of Trump regarding war and climate change have been selected. Speeches of trump which are available at www.usa.gov/ and http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/, http://www.millercenter.org were analyzed. The secondary data includes the relevant work provided in journals, articles, research papers, books, and statistics.

This study is applying the method of inquiry from critical discourse analysis (CDA). Critical discourse analysis assumes that discourse is a form of political action, also called social practices. Furthermore, CDA theorists claim that the function of discourse must be understood as a dialectical movement between text and conduct. In other words, CDA asks the question: of how contexts are constructed through text to achieve conduct. As Norman Fairclough suggests the following metatheoretical position of CDA to understand the role of discourses in foreign policymaking: context-text-conduct. (Heath, 2012)

CDA theorists take discourse as a social practice and social change, therefore, the study borrows the four steps of analysis (emergence, hegemony, recontextualization, and operationalization) provided by Norman Fairclough to examine the social change rendered by the identified discourses. This study adopts these four steps given by Norman Fairclough to conduct a textual analysis of Trump's narrative on climate change. The analysis aims to expose the textual strategies and highlight the impact of discourses on the policy level through which Trump successfully achieved the desecuritization of the climate threat and operationalized the anti-environmental policies in his administration. (Fairclough, 2000)

4.   Critical Analysis of Trump's Environmental policy:

The threat of climate change is the most contemporary challenge of international relations. The rapid and fast concentration of Greenhouse gases (GHGs) in the atmosphere is disrupting the global environment and climate change. The US is the second-largest and number-one historic carbon emitter in the world. Donald Trump has pursued anti-climate change policies and promoted a pro-business agenda with the argument that environmental rules and policies could limit or affect the economic progress of America. Furthermore, he was the worst denier of climate science and its projections. One study shows that the rollback of climate regulations will cause emissions of 1.8 billion extra carbon in the atmosphere between the Trump era and 2035 alone from the US. According to the Paris Agreement, the US must limit its greenhouse gas emissions by 25-30 % by 2035 but between 2018 and 2019, the US reduced its carbon emissions only by 2.9 % (Masson-Delmotte, 2019). Unfortunately, the US had also withdrawn from the Paris Agreement in the Trump administration. (Jan, 2019). IPCC reports and other scientific evidence have shown the projections that any failure to meet the targets and the rise of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases in the atmosphere can cause severe and life-threatening weather situations in the coming decades. Paris Agreement's goals are to stop these catastrophic climate changes. Besides this, Trump has also reregulated or removed other domestic laws and statutes like the National environmental policy act, the Clean air act, the clean water cut, and the endangered species act in his tenure. All this started before his presidential race when he explicitly denied climate science and scientific projections. (Oil & Natural Gas Contribution To U.S. Economy Fact Sheet, 2019).

5.   Trump administration and Mediated Discourses

The rollback of climate policies, deregulation of laws, and anti-climate change agenda cannot be achieved without the acceptance of the public. To manufacture favorable public consent and opinion, political leaders ought to generate discourses that give legitimacy and meaning to their policy practices and institutions. In the case of the Trump administration, official discourses by President Trump successfully moved the climate threat from environmental security emergency to the realm of a normal problem. In other words, Trump desecuritized the issue of climate change in favor of the US domestic economy by denying climate science at first, then manufacturing public opinion against climate change multilateralism through discourses. Textual analysis can highlight the role of discourse in producing meaning concerning its context. Therefore, discourse analysis is interpretive because it assumes that the public acts on the beliefs and meanings they have associated with their actions. To understand the broader social and political change, discourse analysis helps to analyze those meanings which are discursively constructed; therefore, it is also constructivist.

This section is conducting the critical discourse analysis (CDA) of climate discourses under the Trump administration. The aim of critical discourse analysis in the present framework of this study is to show the impact of discourses on climate policy which shows power; the deregulations of climate change laws and agreements while manufacturing the favorable consent of the public about climate that it is against ideology, economy, and hegemony of the US. Thus, CDA seeks to expose the relationship between language, power, and ideology. This study borrows the following meta-theoretical position of CDA suggested by Norman Fairclough to understand the role of discourses in social and policy change in US environmental politics and foreign policy:

Context-text-conduct. The current study is applying four steps of analysis (emergence, recontextualization, hegemony, and operationalization) to examine the social and policy change under Trump's administration rendered by the identified discourses (Heath, 2012).

Norman Fairclough argues that discourse has a definite impact on society because discourses enact a reformation of social life and power domination. In the present context, the above-mentioned four steps will construct an account that how discourses of climate change operate to render social and policy change in the US. In the first step of **emergence**, the previous concepts about reality or truth are articulated in the current set of discourses by linking the previous identities with new emerging discourses. For example, the meaning and example of fake are already present in the regime of language then articulating this word with climate change to build its identity as a fake phenomenon or a fake projection by the scientists or other rival states is the emergence of discourse. The second step is **hegemony**; this step is achieved in social change when there is a start of acceptance of this emerging discourse through repetitive use by political leaders and the media has generated debate on it. For instance, if the discourse of climate change has emerged that it is fake or a true phenomenon. The hegemony of discourse is achieved when people start believing the projected nature of the issue whether it is true or fake. The third step is **recontextualization**; this step depicts the possibility of discourse spreading into other institutions and the use of the same discourses to make sense in other contexts. The last step is **operationalization**; in this step, the discourse function on the material level such as an action is now required to be taken through the policy on the ground level. For instance, if a discourse about climate change is gone through all three-level and the identity of climate change has been built that it is a fake projection by scientists or any other rival state then the policy against climate change or deregulations of climate-related laws would be operationalized (Fairclough, 2000).

Main Argument: Trump has denied climate science and projected it as a fake phenomenon or fake projection by scientists or rival states such as China. Besides this, he took climate multilateralism as a constraint on the US economic competitiveness and progress. Therefore, deregulated hundreds of domestic climate laws, withdrew from the Paris agreement, and begin the fossil fuel economy by ending the war on coal which is the biggest source of carbon dioxide emission. To achieve this, Trump constructed discourses against climate change and discursively projected an anti-climate change narrative.

Context: Denial of climate change
Text: Climate change as a 'hoax' and 'fake'
Conduct: Deregulations of domestic and multilateral environmental policies.

Norman Fairclough, Teun Van Dijk, and other discourse analysts argue that to understand the demonstrative effect of discourses, the text must be put into a relative context. Context, text, and conduct are in the communicative process in such a way that context is constituting text, but the text also shapes the context and the text in that specific context leads toward the conduct. Text is communicative for both context and conduct. As the text is forming the context and directed towards conduct, one must put the text in the relevant context. In the present case, context is the denial of climate change which is formed by the texts like climate change is a hoax, fake, or projected. Text shapes the context; now this text that 'climate change is projected or fake' leads towards the conduct on it such as removal of climate-related laws and withdrawal from the international agreements because a context was developed that there is a need to act on that. Text constituted that context, and it is the text which legitimizes its operationalization of it. In the above-mentioned context, statements by President Trump will be analyzed with four steps analysis to highlight the role of language in making context than to show the operationalization as conduct (dijk).

6. Emergence and Recontextualization

The scientific reports and projections from the IPCC necessitated climate action through legislative laws on the domestic level and agreements such as Paris, and Kyoto, and their mechanisms on the foreign policy front. Planet Earth had already observed the impacts of climate change such as sea-level rise, hurricanes, droughts, acid rains, and many other extreme weather situations throughout the world. The regulations, mitigation, and adaptation cost are ill-suited for Trump's business agenda as they wanted to put 'America first and put the rest of the world in extreme danger. Soon after joining the office, President Trump started to use fake rhetoric to change the perception of the American people about climate change to make his actions more legal and legitimate in the subsequent years. The following statements will show the emergence of climate discourse by Trump and illustrate how right from the beginning he has used Climate discourse to build a favorable narrative. These statements were taken from the Washington post's editorial board where Donald trump Sat down for an interview on March 21, 2016.

Trump: "So, Obama's talking about all of this with the global warming and the—a lot of it's a hoax, it's a hoax. I mean, it's a money-making industry, okay? It's a hoax, a lot of it".

Trump: "I think there's a change in the weather. I am not a great believer in man-made climate change. I'm not a great believer. There is certainly a change in weather that goes on – if you look, they had global cooling in the 1920s and now they have global warming, although now they don't know if they have global warming. They call it all sorts of different things; now they're using "extreme weather" I guess more than any other phrase. I am not – I know it hurts me with this room, and I know it's probably a killer with this room – but I am not a believer. Perhaps there's a minor effect, but I'm not a big believer in man-made climate change".

On June 29, 2017, President Trump gave a speech at the Unleashing American Energy Event in the White House.

Trump: "Americans were told that our nation could only solve this energy crisis by imposing draconian restrictions on energy production. But we now know that was all a big, beautiful myth. It was fake. Don't we love the term, "fake"? What we've learned about fake over the last little while—fake news, CNN. Fake. (Laughter and Applause.) Whoops, their camera just went off. (Laughter.) Okay, you can come back. I won't say—I promise I won't say anything more about you. I see that red light go off, I say, whoa. The truth is that we have near-limitless supplies of energy in our country. Powered by innovation and technology, we are now on the cusp of a true energy revolution".

Textual Analysis: In the first statement Trump used the word 'hoax', he has associated identity with climate change as it is something more like deceit or fraud. Trump has used the word 'hoax' on Twitter more than 100 times and on Fox News, he used this word more than 1000 times. The analysis of those statements shows that Trump referred to the word 'hoax' as a malign plan or devilish agency against the US economy and ideology. In the light of intertextual analysis, he articulated the properties and meaning of one text to another; 'hoax' has a literal meaning in the regime of language which is deception, and he articulated this meaning to climate change to alter its identity. The people have previously associated the identity of climate change as a 'threat' because it was communicated to them or they have read IPCC reports or progress on Climate change. In short, they had a perception of climate change that it is a threat to all humans across the globe. But there comes an influential political leader who is talking about the climate differently and associated a new identity with climate change. It must have a great impact on the perception of American citizens because they have elected him and consider him a credible source. Trump had changed the interpretation of climate change and a new discourse about climate has emerged. In the third statement, Trump used the word 'fake' and 'myth' in discourse emergence to fix meanings to become common sense and naturalized. To achieve public-level acceptance, he has also associated CNN as a fake source because it was publishing a critical point of view on the new discourse of Trump. Along with political statements, media is also a major source of perception

building for the citizens. Moreover, the energy restrictions posed by the Paris agreement and previous domestic US regulations on energy generation were articulated as fake in the third statement. This is the recontextualization of discourse where the previous text of climate change as a fake is recontextualized in a new context where energy restrictions were also declared fake.

Factual analysis: Fossil fuels fed around 80% of American energy and the American oil and coal industry supports 10.3 million jobs in the US. According to the national mining association, coal's contribution to the US economy is 26 billion dollars in sales and paid support in 13 billion dollars in direct wages in 2016 (Oil & Natural Gas Contribution To U.S. Economy Fact Sheet, 2019). The IPCC report 'Global warming of 1.5°C' states that coal and oil burning is the major cause of global warming because it generates GHGs such as carbon dioxide. According to the same report, coal is the biggest contributor to anthropogenic climate change where coal burning is responsible for 46% of CO2 emissions. In light of the above Trump statement and these facts given by the IPCC report, it can be analyzed that Trump is generating the discourse of 'draconian restrictions' to only save its economy where billions of dollars are generated through the coal industry. Despite moving towards renewables, he declared the energy restriction as a fake or one-sided agenda, but it is in the favor of the US economy. The basic discourse of 'fake' is recontextualized in a new institution or organization to construct a commonsensical way of public perception at a new scale; climate change is a hoax and fake projection so ultimately, the restrictions are also fake or not necessary (Gehrke, 2019). But on the ground level, the protection of the energy sector is secured through the generation of these discourse practices. In the second statement, Trump said "I think there's a change in weather. I am not a great believer in man-made climate change". Here, he is now accepting that there is a change in weather, but he is rejecting that it is man-made which means he did not accept that coal, oil, and gas are the major source of carbon dioxide emissions which are key sources of global warming. He is also denying that there is not such a thing as global warming. Whereas, NASA published a report of IPCC on the website http://climate.nasa.gov/evidence/ where it states "The current warming trend is of particular significance because most of it is extremely likely (greater than 95% probability) to be the result of human activity since the mid-20th century and proceeding at a rate that is unprecedented over decades to millennia". The mid-20th century means that it is because of rapid industrialization and huge coal and oil extraction for energy generation. Considering the above discussion, it is concluded that trump's text of fake and hoaxes built the context of denial of climate change. The reason for building such a discourse was given to the fact that he did that for the protection of its domestic coal and oil industry (Sullivan, 2017).

7. Hegemony

After successful articulation and representation of a discourse, the projected meanings must go through the process of naturalization and acceptance. When discourse becomes naturalized then it is going toward hegemony. The public level acceptance is to be achieved through interpellation and it is the process when political elites and leaders expressed the urgency of taking the action.

President Trump gave remarks on the National Security Strategy on December 28, 2017

Trump: "We have withdrawn the United States from job-killing deals such as the Trans-Pacific Partnership and the very expensive and unfair Paris Climate Accord. And on our trip to Asia last month, I announced that we will no longer tolerate trading abuse".

President Donald Trump spoke at the conservative Heritage Foundation's annual President Club's Meeting on October 17, 2017

Trump: "We have taken action to repeal the EPA's so-called 'Clean Power Plan' and we have ended, finally, the war on clean, beautiful coal".

The first statement shows the hegemony of climate discourse in such a way that the public has accepted the discourse. Now manufacturing of consent is under process to legitimize the action against the climate laws and key agreements. Here, trump uses three major rhetoric: "job-killing deal", 'unfair climate accord' and 'trading abuse'. The first text depicts the protection of the energy industry as the US economy is running on it. That carbon-emitting industry will disrupt the climate which will create a threat to the whole world. The latter text contradicts the facts. President Trump built a perception about climate change that it is 'unfair'. The COP 25 in 2019 marked the US as the second-largest carbon polluter and number one in the history of the world. Trump argues that there is a differentiation of responsibilities between the developed and developing world. From the industrial revolution till the 21st century, developing states were not even industrialized. Mechanisms of the Kyoto Protocol and the Paris Agreement were designed to address such a situation and economic burden-sharing for developed and underdeveloped worlds. Trump set the narrative against it to get out of these agreements and protocols. The third rhetoric is 'trading abuse'. Here, Trump has built an identity of the Paris agreement to achieve operationalization. The second statement must be put in the context of denial of climate change to understand its significance. Context has been developed successfully that there is no such phenomenon as climate change, and it has been hegemonized the trump administration removed the clean power plan of America. If there is no such phenomenon as climate change then energy can be produced with coal combustion because there is no role of GHGs in changing the weather patterns. Considering the second statement, the policy change in the Trump administration portrays such a perception of the public, planted by the discourses of climate.

8. Operationalization

Approval of discourses and their inculcation in new identities, perceptions, and new ways of beings as a hegemonized description of reality led to the materialization on the policy level is operationalization or conduct. Policy level change and action are now becoming legitimized because the public has accepted the new reality and developed a favorable perception and consent to take even an extraordinary level of activity. In the present case, the threat of climate change has been desecuritized and deregulations must be started as the conduct.

Remarks by President Trump on Restoring Energy dominance in the Permian Basin | Midland, TX on July 29, 2020

Trump: "I withdrew from the one-sided, energy-destroying Paris Climate Accord. It was a disaster. (Applause.) It cost us billions of dollars, and it would have made us a noncompetitive nation".

Trump: "We opened up ANWR in Alaska to energy exploration, ended the moratorium on coal leasing on federal lands, and reopened public lands and offshore areas to oil and gas exploration. That's where David Bernhardt has done such a great job".

Trump: "For the first time in nearly 70 years, we have become a net energy exporter. (Applause.) And the United States is now the number one producer of oil and natural gas on the face of the Earth".

President Trump gave remarks in his Presidential Proclamation on National Energy Awareness Month, 2019. Remarks were given to President Trump on September 30, 2019

Trump: "Since my inauguration, our country has experienced an energy revolution. American crude oil production grew by nearly 20 percent last year, and the United States is now the largest crude oil producer in the world. For the first time in six decades, we are also a net exporter of natural gas, and in 2018, we supplied liquefied natural gas to more than 36 countries on 5 different continents. Since 2016, annual coal exports have

increased more than 90 percent, and by next year, we are set to become a net energy exporter for the first time since 1953. My Administration will continue to build on our country's energy dominance by pursuing policies that fully unleash America's vast energy resources and capabilities while promoting responsible stewardship of the environment".

The first statement depicts the operationalization of discourse where Trump said that he withdrew from the Paris agreement which means a discourse emerged and became hegemonized against climate action and now policy-level operationalization was made. United Nations Foundation published a report "7 reasons the United States needs the Paris Climate agreement". Several important justifiable reasons have been given to the US to remain in the Paris agreement. The report argued that to keep global warming to well below 2ºC, countries like America must shift away from fossil fuels to renewables (Sullivan, 2017). The fourth statement clearly states that trump's agenda for an energy revolution in the US and Trump is running towards its fossil fuel and 'carboniferous' economy to an unprecedented level of growth through policy change. Some of these favorable policies were shown in the second statement. Besides this, the Trump administration is reversing the 100 environmental laws and regulations. Deregulations of 72 rule reversals are completed now and 27 are in progress. Trump builds the narrative that the Paris agreement can hurt the US job and 'economic competitiveness' but it seems like fake rhetoric. The same United Nations foundations state "while some may try to argue that this will 'destroy American jobs,' the opposite is true: Solar and wind jobs in the U.S are growing at a rate about 12 times faster than the rest of the economy. Jobs in the U.S. solar grew 25% last year to include more than 260,000 workers. Meanwhile, the fossil fuel industry employed about 76,000 people in 2014- about as many as were employed by the U.S. bowling industry. If you're looking for an industry that is surging, an industry with enormous potential to create and grow U.S jobs, renewable energy is the answer – and the future – for a strong U.S job market". (Sullivan, 2017)

9. Analysis and Inference

When the emerged discourse of climate change was hegemonized within the context then three major narratives have been dominated under the Trump administration. First is the denial of climate science by declaring it as a fake phenomenon or projection of rival states such as China or others to harm the economy of the US. Second is the awareness of the use of fossil fuels to increase energy exports to create American economic dominance and hegemony in the world. The third is the urgency of policy-level action on the deregulation of environmental domestic policies and removal of international agreements under the rhetoric of 'draconian restrictions', 'unfair agreement', and 'trade abusing'. While the facts and figures on the ground contradict the statements of President Trump which were briefly mentioned and discussed in the above analysis (Pavone, 2018). These narratives have been set up through discourses to implement the effective level of favorable policies and deregulations of laws that challenged the broader economic agenda. The above analysis shows the role of language and discourses in the enaction of desecuritization of climate threat from the national security issue under the Trump administration by implanting new hegemonized discourse of climate change. US political culture legitimizes the spread of neo-liberal ideology and the US hegemony in the world through the US grand strategy and economic supremacy. The desecuritization of climate threats and deregulations of climate laws and policies successfully gave economic benefits to the US economy under the Trump administration (EPA Further weakens Coal ash protection, 2020). There are few dominant perspectives in the discipline of international relations that give accounts to understanding foreign policy issues and in particular the understanding of security issues. This study recommends that interpretive research should be entertained in the understanding of security issues such as 'war and other security threats. Social power abuse, inequality, and dominance are enacted through the control of discourses and planted information by key social and political leaders. Such literature should be generated that exposes the aims and objectives of the political elites behind the fake rhetoric. The United States should move towards renewables for energy generation. The reports

of United Nation foundations were included in the research which shows the economic benefits of moving towards renewables for the US economy.

References

Bromley, S. (1991). *American Hegemony and World OIl.* pennsylvania: Cambridge University press.

Campbell, D. (2010). Poststrucuralism. In M. K. Tim Dunne, *Theories of International Relations* (pp. 225-223). Oxford University Press.

dijk, T. A. (n.d.). text, context and knowledge. *Discourse.org*, 1-25.

(2020). *EPA Further weakens Coal ash protection.* Columbia: Sabin Center for Climate change law.

Fairclough, N. (2000). *Analysing Discourse.* Routledge.

Falkner, R. (2008). *Business Power and Conflict in International Environmental Politics.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Gehrke, G. (2019). *DOI Further Restricts Access to Climate Change Web Pages.* Environmental data and governance initiative .

Griffiths, M. (2007). *International relations theory for the Twenty-First Century.* New york: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.

Griffiths, M. (2007). *International Relations Theory for the Twenty-First Century An Introduction.* Oxon: Routledge.

Harris, P. G. (2001). *The Environment, International Relations, and U.S. Foreign Policy.* Washington: George Town University press.

Heath, S. H. (2012). *Political Research (Methods and Practical Skills).* Oxford.

Jan, S. (2019). The Trump presidency, climate change, and the prospect of a . *Susexx Research online*, 1-38.

John Flowerdew, J. E. (2018). *The Routledge handbook of Critical discourse studies.* Routledge .

klare, M. T. (2004). *Blood and oil : the dangers and consequences of America's growing petroleum dependency.* New York: New York : Metropolitan Books/Henry Holt & Co.

Masson-Delmotte, V. (2019). *Global warming of 1.5 degree C.* IPCC.

(2019). *Oil & Natural Gas Contribution To U.S. Economy Fact Sheet.* American Petroleum Institute.

ovadio, T. D. (2016). *Energy, Capitalism and World Order.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Pavone, I. R. (2018). The Paris Agreement and the Trump. *Journal of international studies*, 1-16.

Sullivan, J. (2017). *7 Reasons the United States needs the Paris agreement .* United Nation's foundation.

Tim Dunne, M. K. (2013). *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity .* Oxford University Press.

AUTHORS

First Author – Faheem Ahmed, MS in International Relations, COMSATS University Islamabad

Second Author – Dr. Inayat Kalim, Ph.D., Associate Professor at COMSATS University Islamabad.

Correspondence Author – Faheem Ahmed,