International Relations and Diplomacy, Sept.-Oct. 2026, Vol. 14, No. 5, 227-245
doi: 10.17265/2328-2134/2026.05.001

The Policy Palindrome: Rhetorical Evolution and Policy Reversals in US Foreign Policy

Meheer Commuri
University of Cambridge, Cambridge, England

The phenomenon of high-profile policy reversals by political leaders, though not unprecedented, represents a complex area of study that demands rigorous academic scrutiny. While such reversals occur with notable frequency, the existing body of literature has yet to establish a comprehensive framework for understanding the patterns and the mechanisms that underlie these shifts. This paper seeks to address this gap by conducting a systematic analysis of policy reversals, with the aim of identifying recurrent patterns and elucidating the factors that precipitate these significant changes in direction. This paper analyzes four cases—Syria (Obama in 2013), North Korea (Bush in 2002-2006 and Trump in 2017-2019), and Afghanistan (Biden in 2021)—tracing how initial force evolved into conciliatory diplomacy. Examining sentiment shifts, lexical trends, and policy implications, this research aims to reveal the multifarious influences that inform leaders' decisions. This paper also intends to contribute to the broader discourse on leadership and governance, offering a nuanced perspective on the interplay between political agency, policy formulation, and temporal dynamics. The structure is as follows: The initial section presents a critical review of the extant literature on policy reversals. This is followed by a detailed exposition of the methodological framework employed in this study. The central portion of the paper comprises an exhaustive analysis of each case study, exploring the contexts, motivations, and ramifications of policy reversals. The concluding section discusses the implications of the findings, emphasizing their relevance for both academic research and policy practice, and proposes directions for future study.

Keywords: U.S. foreign policy, policy reversals, strategic communication, crisis diplomacy, credibility, reputation, signaling, process tracing

Introduction

The phrase "Taco trade" was recently coined to describe Donald Trump's newest wave of economic policy (Armstrong, 2025). Taco is an acronym for "Trump always chickens out". It refers to Trump's most recent practice of threatening to hike tariffs and then subsequently walking back his threats after negotiations. Canada, Mexico, and the European Union were all the subject of Trumpian threats of sky-high tariffs. In each case, Trump never followed through with the original threat, instead settling for much more modest tariff arrangements after negotiations with each (Armstrong, 2025). Even China did not have to bear its 145% tariffs for long after Trump quickly caved to market unrest.

Meheer Commuri, M.Phil candidate, Department of Politics and International Studies, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, England. An earlier version of this manuscript was presented at SPSA 2026.

It seems that Taco trade is not just a neat explanation for Trump's economic policy but suits to explain his foreign policy as well (Rachman, 2025). Across his two terms, whether it be with North Korea, Iran, the Taliban, and, most recently, Russia, Trump has always favorably disposed toward threating big and retaliating little. North Korea and Iran faced empty threats when both accelerated their nuclear weapons programs under the two Trump administrations. Trump also agreed to withdraw US troops from Afghanistan without any concessions from the Taliban (Rachman, 2025). And, most recently, Russia has faced not one of Trump's threats of military and economic retaliation as it continues to feel increasingly emboldened in Ukraine (Ravid, 2025).

Regarding a Taco foreign policy, one paper found that only two of Trump's 22 threats of force against international actors were followed through. The paper suggests that Trump is only likely to follow through with actual violence if those threatened actors are "much weaker" and have a very low risk of retaliation. In practice, this amounts to limited strikes against non-state actors like terrorist groups (Shapiro, 2025). The author writes that despite Trump's rhetoric, "he actually fears the use of force in any situation even vaguely resembling a fair fight… Actual violence only occurs against much weaker foes that have no hope of striking back" (Shapiro, 2025).

In this paper, I argue that Taco foreign policy is not a major departure from US foreign policy. Instead, Trump, through his hasty, tough-guy rhetoric, is merely accelerating and amplifying a dynamic that has always existed in US foreign policy and diplomatic rhetoric during geopolitical crises. Indeed, in might be more apt to say "apaco" or "all presidents always chicken out", as American administrations across both parties have always failed to follow through with their initial positions out of a weariness for war. Through process-tracing four cases, we show the rhetorical evolution of George W. Bush, Barah Obama, Joseph Biden, and Donald Trump and how they have all engaged with geopolitical crises by first using hardline rhetoric and then later shifting to conciliatory diplomatic positions.

Each case of rhetorical evolution in response to geopolitical crisis follows the same tripartite structure of (1) assertion, (2) softening, and (3) reversal. Initial US rhetoric skews strongly assertive, then softens toward diplomacy or justification as events unfold. Early official statements often feature high-assertion, high-certainty language—words like "consequences", "evil", "fire and fury", "will not tolerate", and "not inevitable"—reflecting confidence in US leverage or deterrence. Later statements, after circumstances change or policy pivots, adopt more conciliatory or nuanced language—words like "diplomacy", "opportunity", "working closely", "negotiated", and "regret". Finally, the rhetorical evolution often completes with a complete backtrack of the original position.

Literature Review

The role of credibility in international relations (IR) remains a cornerstone of deterrence theory, signaling, and foreign policy decision-making. Conventional wisdom suggests that states, particularly great powers, must uphold their commitments or risk reputational damage and credibility loss (Schelling, 1966; Fearon, 1994). However, recent scholarship questions this assumption, arguing that credibility is often situational rather than cumulative (Mercer, 1996; Press, 2005). This systematic literature review synthesizes theoretical and empirical research on rhetorical backtracking, credibility loss, and superpower resilience, evaluating gaps in the literature and proposing future research directions. The dominant theoretical framework in credibility studies asserts that states must uphold public commitments or risk credibility loss. This is particularly critical in deterrence theory, where a failure to act is perceived as a sign of weakness, leading adversaries to exploit the perceived lack of

resolve (Schelling, 1966; Jervis, 1976). Schelling (1966) conceptualized deterrence as fundamentally reliant on credibility, arguing that failing to uphold a threat invites future challenges. Similarly, Fearon (1994; 1997) introduced the audience costs theory, positing that leaders who fail to act on their public threats suffer domestic political backlash and international credibility loss. This assumption extends to alliance politics, where Snyder (1984) argued that unreliable commitments weaken security cooperation and incentivize adversaries to test the limits of deterrence.

Recent research has questioned the assumption that credibility loss is automatic following backtracking. Mercer (1996) challenged the notion that credibility accumulates over time, contending instead that states assess each crisis based on power and immediate strategic interests rather than past rhetoric. Press (2005) reinforced this perspective by demonstrating that adversaries prioritize material capabilities over verbal commitments, undermining the reputational damage thesis. Sartori (2002) further examined strategic communication, illustrating that leaders can mitigate credibility loss through carefully controlled narratives and alternative signaling mechanisms. The applicability of credibility loss to great powers remains debated. Some scholars argue that superpowers suffer less from credibility loss due to their extensive power resources (Goddard, 2018; Nexon & Wright, 2007). Their ability to shape international institutions, exert economic pressure, and maintain military superiority allows them to sustain influence even after policy reversals. However, others claim that global leadership requires consistent credibility enforcement. Jervis (1976) and Drezner (2011) argue that inconsistent foreign policy weakens credibility, particularly when allies and adversaries begin to discount verbal assurances. Goddard (2018) and Briant (2015) suggest that superpowers rely on institutional dominance rather than crisis-by-crisis credibility. Because of their structural position in world politics, they can absorb rhetorical inconsistencies without significantly altering their strategic posture. Similarly, Levendusky and Horowitz (2012) highlight the role of domestic political factors, showing that partisan dynamics affect audience costs, allowing U.S. leaders greater rhetorical flexibility. Tomz (2007) further finds that audience costs are not automatic, and leaders can reframe backtracking through strategic justification, minimizing domestic and international repercussions.

Despite claims of resilience, some scholars argue that credibility loss is still relevant for great powers under certain conditions. Drezner (2011) contends that inconsistent U.S. foreign policy has weakened its credibility in key regions, particularly in the Middle East. Cha (2016) demonstrates that allies of great powers react strongly to credibility shifts, influencing alliance stability and regional security dynamics. Additionally, Baum and Potter (2008) argue that media and public opinion shape credibility perceptions, increasing reputational risks for democratic superpowers where leaders are held accountable for policy shifts. Instead of treating rhetorical backtracking as a failure, recent studies indicate that leaders actively manage credibility through narrative framing (Baum & Potter, 2008; Briant, 2015). Empirical cases suggest that U.S. leaders utilize specific strategies to minimize credibility costs when shifting rhetoric. For instance, Obama's handling of the Syria chemical weapons crisis in 2013 involved framing the U.S.-Russia disarmament agreement as a diplomatic victory rather than a retreat. Similarly, Trump's rhetorical shift from "fire and fury" to direct diplomacy with North Korea in 2018 was rebranded as part of his strategic unpredictability. Biden's withdrawal from Afghanistan in 2021 illustrates another case of rhetorical adaptation, where responsibility was shifted to Afghan forces, and the withdrawal was framed as inevitable and responsible.

This study moves beyond the binary debate of whether credibility matters to exploring how superpowers maintain credibility through rhetorical adaptation. Unlike previous studies that treat credibility as either fragile

or resilient, this study introduces an empirical framework demonstrating that rhetorical backtracking follows predictable patterns to mitigate credibility costs. The existing literature does not sufficiently explain the mechanisms through which great powers sustain their influence despite repeated foreign policy reversals. This study contributes to closing that gap by systematically analyzing rhetorical strategies that allow superpowers to recalibrate their commitments without severe reputational damage.

Four Case of Rhetorical Evolution During Crisis

Bush's North Korean Nuclear Standoff

Assertion. In President George W. Bush's 2002 State of the Union, he famously labeled North Korea as part of an "axis of evil" that was "arming to threaten the peace of the world". He announced to the world that the US "will not permit the world's most dangerous regimes to threaten us with the world's most destructive weapons" (Bush, 2002). This rhetoric was hostile and alarmist, framing Pyongyang as an unequivocally grave menace to America's camp of the world. His tone was highly certain and uncompromising, effectively demonizing North Korea. Bush's language—"evil", "grave and growing danger", "will not wait"—signaled a confrontational, even preemptive stance. The sentiment was one of urgency and moral condemnation. In press briefings and National Security Council statements during this period, the administration reinforced this hard line, stressing North Korea's violations and America's resolve to counter their proliferation (Sorensen, 2003). The State Department also echoed the president's hard stance. With little nuance from the administration, diplomacy was on the back burner in their rhetoric.

Softening. As the crisis evolved, the Bush administration's tone moderated, especially during Bush's second term. By the 2005 State of the Union, Bush's public remarks on North Korea were notably brief and mild. He said only, "We are working closely with the governments in Asia to convince North Korea to abandon its nuclear ambitions", omitting any "axis of evil"-style language (Cazzaniga, 2005). This single line, delivered "with no hostile talk" of axes or evil, marked a softening of his rhetorical approach (Cazzaniga, 2005). The administration pivoted to multilateral talks (e.g., the Six-Party Talks), and official statements began emphasizing "diplomatic engagement" and "negotiation". For example, State Department releases in 2005-2006 spoke of "remaining committed to a peaceful diplomatic solution" and coordination with allies (South Korea, Japan, China, Russia) rather than regime change. The sentiment of US statements became more neutral and cautiously hopeful. Bush's tone was described as "moderate" and surprising to international observers accustomed to the harsher, assertive rhetoric of his first term (Cazzaniga, 2005). Key phrases shifted from moral denunciation to pragmatic negotiation: "convince North Korea to abandon" its program, talk of "frameworks" and "roadmaps", and eventually references to agreements (e.g. the September 2005 joint statement where Pyongyang agreed to disarm in exchange for aid) (Cooper & Sanger, 2006). By 2007-2008, as North Korea tentatively complied, Bush even offered incentives, such as easing sanctions and removing North Korea from the US terrorism sponsor list, accompanied by optimistic remarks about a "successful outcome" if North Korea verifiably disarmed (Bush, 2008).

Reversal. Between 2002 and 2006, Bush's rhetoric on North Korea backtracked from fiery to restrained. His early lexicon: "evil", "grave threat", "terror allies", etc., signaled confrontation. His later lexicon: "working with…", "convince North Korea", "talks", "progress", signaled hopeful engagement. The tone moved from aggressive to cooperative. Importantly, this change reflected internal policy adjustments: as analysts noted, "diplomatic and strategic considerations demanded a new rhetoric" and a "softer tone", even if the underlying

goal—denuclearization—remained the same (Cazzaniga, 2005). The State Department gained influence over the hawks in the Defense Department, shaping a more diplomatic public posture (Cazzaniga, 2005). North Korea's own actions (e.g., withdrawing from the Nonproliferation Treaty, missile tests) forced Washington to negotiate lest it wanted another costly direct intervention. Hence, US officials toned down public threats to keep Pyongyang at the negotiating table. The sentiment trend thus went from highly negative (2002) to cautiously positive (e.g. expressing "hope" for North Korean compliance by 2005-2007).

Obama's "Red Line" and Syria's Chemical Weapons

Assertion. At the outbreak of Syria's Civil War, the US and EU imposed one of the strictest sanctions regimes against the Syrian government, one that only seemed to increase in severity thereafter with each wave of government crackdowns. However, at this time the US stopped short of a direct military intervention. Already dealing with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization intervention that would overthrow Mummar Gaddafi in Libya, President Barack Obama was understandably weary about intervening again in Syria; especially because of precedent it might set for the rest of the Arab Spring movements. Instead of intervening at the outbreak, Obama drew a clear "red line" against Syrian chemical weapons use. The crossing of this red line, he said, would trigger a military intervention by the US. In an August 2012 press briefing, Obama warned that movement or use of Syria's chemical arsenal would trigger "enormous consequences" and "change my calculus" of status quo noninvolvement (Obama, 2012). This stark language—"red line" and "enormous consequences"—was assertive and threatening, clearly suggesting military action. The tone was resolute, with Obama explicitly noting he had not yet ordered force but was putting Assad on notice that use of weapons of mass destruction was unacceptable. The sentiment was urgent and grave, emphasizing a military response and the impossibility of diplomacy regarding chemical weapons.

Softening. Exactly one year later, in August 2013, some international observers along with the American government declared that Bashar al-Assad had used sarin-filled rockets in Ghouta, a suburb of Damascus. To the shock of the international community, including some within his own administration, Obama chose not to respond like he had promised (Power, 2019). Instead, Obama's rhetoric shifted toward a diplomatic resolution—something he had earlier postured to clearly not be an option regarding the use of chemical weapons (Taddonio, 2015). In a September 2013 address, while still condemning Assad's atrocity, for the first time Obama struck a more conciliatory tone. He highlighted a "deeply held preference for peaceful solutions" and welcomed Russia's proposal to disarm Syria's chemical weapons (Obama, 2013a). Just days later, the US and Russia reached a framework agreement. Obama heralded this as "an important, concrete step" to eliminate Syria's chemical arsenal "through diplomacy" (Obama, 2013b). The language here—"progress", "opportunity", "diplomacy", and "international control"—marked a significant softening in rhetoric. The tone turned cautiously optimistic and collaborative, focusing on international verification and cooperation rather than immediate punishment. Obama even asked Congress to postpone authorizing force to give diplomacy a chance.

Reversal. The next year, Obama's public messaging shifted from a highly assertive, ultimatum-like stance to a more diplomatic, problem-solving stance. Early phrases like "we cannot have a situation where chemical weapons fall into the wrong hands" and "enormous consequences" gave way to phrases like "achieve our objectives through diplomacy" (Obama, 2012; 2013b). The sentiment moved from strongly negative (threatening military action) to more neutral and positive (hopeful about a negotiated outcome). Notably, the State Department and White House echoed this shift: Initial White House statements in 2012 emphasized consequences and red

lines, whereas later State Department communications (e.g. Secretary John Kerry's remarks) floated the idea that Assad "could turn over every single bit of his chemical weapons … and it [intervention] would be averted", an off-hand comment that opened the door to the Russia-brokered deal (Gordon & Myers, 2013). The lexical field changed from words of punishment (red line, consequences, military force) to words of compliance and verification (framework, international control, destroy, diplomacy).

Trump, Kim Jong Un, Fire, and Fury

Assertion. President Donald Trump began his North Korea policy with incendiary rhetoric. In 2017, as North Korea accelerated missile and nuclear tests, Trump famously warned that Pyongyang would be met with "fire and fury like the world has never seen" if it threatened the US (Sen, 2018). He publicly belittled Kim Jong Un as a "Little Rocket Man" on Twitter and in speeches, and said negotiating with Kim was a waste of time (Sen, 2018). In a UN address, Trump even threatened to "totally destroy North Korea" if forced to defend the US or its allies (Borger, 2017a). This unprecedentedly harsh and assertive tone was also belligerent and personal. The sentiment was extremely negative, evoking ridicule and fear. Trump's word choices—"fire and fury", "Rocket Man", and "destroy"—broke with diplomatic norms, employing schoolyard taunts and vivid threats of war. At this time, the State Department and National Security Council were sidelined. In fact, Trump at one point tweeted that Secretary of State Rex Tillerson was "wasting his time" trying to use diplomacy (Baker & Sanger, 2017). This initial rhetoric created a crisis atmosphere. Globally, allies like South Korea and Japan grew anxious about whether Trump would provoke escalation, as North Korea responded with equally vivid threats: boasting of a "nuclear button" on Kim's desk (Sen, 2018).

Softening. In a remarkable turn, by early 2018 Trump shifted to personal diplomacy with Kim. The US agreed to unprecedented bilateral summits with the North Korean regime, and Trump's rhetoric softened dramatically. After the Singapore Summit in June 2018, Trump praised Kim Jong Un, calling him "very talented" and someone who "loves his country very much" (Graham, 2018). He spoke this time about the "honor" of meeting Kim and referred to him as "Chairman Kim", respectfully. During this period, official White House statements highlighted the "productive conversations" and the goal of "peace" on the Korean Peninsula (BBC News, 2018). Trump even produced effusive tweets about his "excellent relationship" with Kim (Haas, 2018). The tone here was almost friendly, a complete reversal from months prior. The sentiment of Trump's language turned positive when describing Kim (using words like "honor", "very worthy negotiator", and "smart" (Graham, 2018). However, when talks collapsed later in 2019 at the Hanoi Summit, Trump's rhetoric oscillated again. Though never reaching back to the 2017 level of menace, he did at times revive the "Rocket Man" reference in jest at his rallies. Overall, the dominant late-2018 narrative remained optimistic about diplomacy. This was echoed by the State Department, which in late 2017 (even before the first summit) subtly began opening the door to a diplomatic posture. In December of that year, Secretary Tillerson offered talks "without preconditions", signaling a diplomatic path even as Trump maintained maximum pressure (Borger, 2017b). By 2018, US messaging focused on negotiation, using phrases like "verified denuclearization" and "peace regime".

Reversal. Trump, through his hasty, tough-guy rhetoric, accelerated and amplified the process of rhetorical evolution compared to other presidents facing geopolitical crisis. This means that the tripartite model for Trump is much more condensed, with a heightened assertion period and a shorter softening period that quickly shifts into another heightened reversal. Trump's case is a stark example of volatile rhetoric: from hyper-aggressive to conciliatory in a short time span. Early language was threatening ("fire and fury", "military options", "destroy")

while later language was conciliatory or even praiseful ("peace", "talented leader", "great friendship"). The sentiment trajectory shot from extremely negative to extremely positive. Importantly, Trump personalized both phases; he used hyperbolic, informal language throughout (first with insults then with flattery), which was a departure from more measured diplomatic phrasing typical of previous administrations. This personalization made the shifts more dramatic: For instance, Trump went from mocking Kim as a "madman" to complimenting his "great personality" (Graham, 2018). The shift was so pronounced that it drew global attention: Allies were simultaneously relieved at the easing of war threats yet uneasy about the US conceding too much stature to Kim. Additionally, this caving to Kim did little to signal America's resolve to defend its allies in the Indo-Pacific. Domestically, the thematic focus turned to diplomatic showmanship: Trump cast the potential deal as an "Art of the Deal" moment, emphasizing diplomacy through personal rapport, a tactic long employed by many populists (Özdamar & Yanik, 2024). Meanwhile, for their part, the North Korean state media could regard Trump's reversal as a victory for themselves, highlighting Trump's newfound respect for their great leader, which legitimized the regime.

Biden's Withdrawal from Afghanistan

Assertion. In some sense, the Biden administration started out with the least amount of wiggle room out of any of the cases. This is because the previous administration, Trump's first term, had already agreed to pull US troops out of Afghanistan. Nevertheless, President Joeseph Biden began with a resolute yet reassuring tone. In April 2021, Biden announced the end of the 20-year Afghanistan War, pledging a "safe and orderly" withdrawal by September 11. "We will not conduct a hasty rush to the exit. We'll do it responsibly, deliberately, and safely", Biden promised (Biden, 2021b). He expressed confidence in the Afghan government and army, repeatedly noting that the US had "trained and equipped… 300,000 Afghan personnel" who "will continue to fight valiantly". Phrases like "time to end the forever war" and "responsible withdrawal" were emphasized (Biden, 2021b). The tone was optimistic, confident, and affirmative. Biden sought to convey control and competence, suggesting a seamless handoff. Even as Taliban advances in the summer of 2021 raised alarms, Biden's public statements remained largely steady: In early July, he stated that a Taliban takeover was "highly unlikely", rejecting comparisons by reporters to the Fall of Saigon (C-SPAN.org, 2021). The messaging from the White House and National Security Council during this period stressed commitment fulfillment and "honoring our promises to Afghan partners", trying to preempt concerns (Handy, 2021). The sentiment was positive and focused on trust in Afghan forces and in the decision to end the war itself.

Softening. The chaotic collapse of Kabul on August 15, 2021 forced a stark rhetoric adjustment. In an address on August 16, after the Afghan government fell, Biden defended his decision but struck a new tone, this time defensive and somber. "I do not regret my decision to end America's warfighting in Afghanistan", he insisted (Biden, 2021a). However, his new language now acknowledged turmoil: "The truth is: this did unfold more quickly than we had anticipated… Afghan political leaders gave up and fled… the Afghan military collapsed". He shifted blame to the Afghan authorities for the ensuing chaos and emphasized that staying longer would not have changed the outcome. The uplifting talk of "fighting valiantly" had now vanished. Instead, Biden spoke of "pain", "sadness", but also framed the outcome as validation: "If anything, the developments of the past week reinforced that ending US military involvement now was the right decision" (Biden, 2021a). The tone had turned rueful and justificatory, still firm that the decision was correct, but now also acknowledging failure in execution. In subsequent days, US officials used more measured, passive language about "evacuations",

"humanitarian responsibility", and promised "lessons learned". The State Department's rhetoric shifted to crisis management, focusing on diplomacy to extract Americans and Afghans (e.g. negotiating with the Taliban for airport security, an ironic twist given their 20 years of war). Biden's own sentiment in speeches hovered between defensiveness (highlighting that allies also wanted out, and that staying indefinitely was futile) and sympathy (honoring the troops and victims of attacks during evacuation).

Reversal. Biden's Afghanistan messaging went from confident assurance to damage control. Early language included "responsible", "safely", "no rush", "success", and relying on "Afghan capability". Later language included "collapse", "chaos", "I stand by my decision", and blaming Afghan authorities. The sentiment swung from positive (confident in a stable exit) to negative (shocked by rapid collapse, assigning blame). One notable lexical shift was from active voice "we will do X" to more passive or abstract descriptions of events "X unfolded more quickly than expected" as Afghanistan collapsed—a subtle deflection of agency. Initial communications painted a picture of an orderly transition. After the fall, however, Biden's rhetoric acknowledged reality and sought to justify the policy despite the "messy" execution. Across White House and defense officials, there was a pivot to emphasizing the evacuation's scale as an achievement, as an effort to cast some positive light. Biden and his Secretaries also repeatedly asserted that "there was no way to leave without chaos", framing the outcome as inevitable. Under this logic, delaying America's exit would only worsen the pain. If a Band-Aid must come off, it is better to rip it off quickly. This was a significant backtrack from earlier claims that the withdrawal would not resemble the Fall of Saigon. The administration's credibility came under fire, and Biden's tone in interviews grew somewhat combative when pressed—e.g., insisting that "no allies are questioning our credibility" (a claim disputed by media reports) and that it was "the right decision" regardless. Thus, the rhetoric shifted to mitigate reputational damage and shore up the rationale post facto.

Tone Trajectories During Geopolitical Crisis

In all four cases, assertiveness gave way to caution and sometimes outright reversal in tone. Bush shifted from hostile (labeling North Korea as "evil") to restrained (no more incendiary language, focusing instead on talks). The emotional charge of his language declined significantly—the 2002 rhetoric was fear-inducing and moralistic, while the 2005-2006 rhetoric was dry and procedural. His assertiveness was also dialed down to keep negotiations on track, reflecting a clear softening in tone. Obama similarly went from tough (threatening military force) to conciliatory (pursuing a negotiated disarmament) when faced with the Assad regime's use of chemical weapons. His assertive 2012 warning carried a negative, even ominous tone, whereas by 2013, his tone was hopeful and diplomatic. Sentiment analysis of key phrases underscores this drop in aggression—e.g., the negative-loaded "enormous consequences" vs. the neutral and positive "important progress… through diplomacy".

Trump experienced the most dramatic whiplash—from belligerent and insulting to warm and praising in a very short time span. Sentiment swung from extreme negative to surprisingly positive. The intensity of tone remained high—due to Trump's unique, personalist style—but its polarity flipped. This case shows an overt tone reversal: Threats of war turned into flattery and personal warmth, an extraordinary diplomatic about-face. In comparison, Biden moved from confident and optimistic to defensive and somber. Unlike other presidents, his initial tone was not bellicose while the later tone was not exactly friendly diplomacy but a defensive rationalization. Still, it represents a decline in positive sentiment, from hopeful ("we will succeed") to bleak and shoring up post facto rationale ("events went wrong, but I stand by it").

Table 1

Summary of Rhetorical Evolution

Language	Assured	Soft
Qualities	Force-related, coercive, bilateral	Diplomacy-related, conciliatory, multilateral
Bush	"Evil" "Grave danger" "Will not allow"	"Talks" "Framework" "Agreements" "Multilateral" "Verifiable denuclearization"
Obama	"Red line" "Military action" "Consequences"	"Brokered deal" "International community" "Destroy chemical weapons" "Diplomatic path"
Trump	"Fire and fury" "Destroy" "US nuclear arsenal"	"Summit" "Negotiations" "Mutual respect" "Peace" "Friendship"
Biden	Though about withdrawal, still about assuring security: "Responsibly" "Deliberately" "Safely"	"Evacuation" "Engage diplomatically" "Humanitarian" (and in defending policy: "longest war" "no military solution")

The tone of voice in press briefings also changed accordingly. Transcripts show more frequent use of conditional and hopeful phrases in the latter stages—e.g., "if diplomacy fails, we remain prepared to act" (Obama hedging in 2013) (Obama, 2013b), or "there's every reason for the North to resume talks" (Bush's team in 2005)—versus absolute assertions in early stages—e.g., "We cannot have a situation where… weapons… fall into the wrong hands" (Obama), "will not permit… most destructive weapons" (Bush) or, "fire and fury" threat with no caveats (Trump).

This dataset highlights the sentiment shift (e.g., from "hostile" to "restrained" for Bush, "belligerent" to "positive" for Trump, etc.) and the keywords reflecting these thematic changes (e.g., "red line" → "diplomacy"; "axis of evil" → "working closely"; "fire and fury" → "honor to meet"; "responsibly" → "regret"). Each pair of rows shows the rhetorical shift from an initial strong stance to a later softened and diplomatic stance. In each case, the initial rhetorical posture was assertive and maximalist, while the eventual posture was more conciliatory and pragmatic. Tone and sentiment are characterized qualitatively. Sources are official statements (White House, State Dept, Presidential Remarks) as previously cited.

Table 2

Structured Dataset of Rhetorical Shifts

Case	Date	Representative statement	Tone & sentiment	Thematic focus
Bush and North Korea—Initial	Jan. 2002	"States like these [NK, Iran, Iraq] and their terrorist allies constitute an axis of evil, arming to threaten the peace of the world… We will not permit the world's most dangerous regimes to threaten us with the world's most destructive weapons".	Hostile, confrontational—very negative sentiment, moralistic condemnation and implied forceful prevention.	Confrontation & Isolation—branding NK as evil regime; framing crisis in War on Terror context, hinting at preemptive action.

Table 2 to be continued

Bush and North Korea—After	Feb. 2005	"We are working closely with the governments in Asia to convince North Korea to abandon its nuclear ambitions". No "axis of evil" mention.	Restrained, diplomatic—neutral to mildly positive tone, emphasizing collaboration and persuasion.	Multilateral Engagement—Six-Party Talks diplomacy; focus on negotiation and regional cooperation (toning down inflammatory rhetoric).
Obama's Red Line—Initial	Aug. 2012	"That's a red line for us… there would be enormous consequences if we start seeing movement on the chemical weapons front or the use of chemical weapons. That would change my calculations significantly".	Assertive, threat-laden—strong negative sentiment, warning of military action.	Deterrence Ultimatum—drawing a red line; emphasis on punitive action for WMD use.
Obama's Red Line—After	Sept. 2013	"We now have the opportunity to achieve our objectives through diplomacy… This framework could end the threat… If diplomacy fails, the US remains prepared to act. In part because of the credible threat of U.S. force, we have the opportunity to do this peacefully".	Hopeful, diplomatic—preference to taking a diplomatic route to resolve the crisis	Multilateral engagement—Possible russian-brokered deal, international verification of disarmament
Trump and North Korea—Initial	Aug. 2017	"North Korea best not make any more threats to the U.S. They will be met with fire and fury like the world has never seen". Also ridiculed Kim as "Little Rocket Man" and said negotiating was useless.	Belligerent, inflammatory—extremely negative sentiment, threatening nuclear war and using personal insults.	Coercion & Intimidation—maximum pressure campaign with threats of force; goal to intimidate NK into compliance via fear.
Trump and North Korea—After	June 2018	"It was an honor to meet Chairman Kim… I learned that he's a very talented man who loves his country very much. He's a worthy negotiator and we have developed a special bond".	Positive, laudatory—surprising warm sentiment, praise and personal respect for former adversary.	Personal Diplomacy—leader-to-leader engagement; focus on relationship-building and optimistic peace overtures (away from threats).
Biden's Withdrawal—Initial	April 2021	"We will not conduct a hasty rush to the exit. We'll do it responsibly, deliberately, and safely… We have trained and equipped a force of over 300,000 Afghan troops, and they'll continue to fight valiantly".	Confident, resolute—positive/assured sentiment, implying control and trust in planned outcome.	Orderly Exit & Trust—commit to responsible withdrawal; emphasis on planning, stability, and confidence in Afghan partners' capability.
Biden's Withdrawal—After	Aug. 2021	"I do not regret my decision… The truth is: this did unfold more quickly than we anticipated. Afghan leaders gave up and fled; the military collapsed… If anything, the past week reinforced that ending U.S. military involvement now was the right decision".	Defensive, justificatory—mixed sentiment (negative about collapse, yet defensive pride in decision), apologetic in tone without apologizing for choice.	Damage Control—explain chaotic outcome, assign blame to Afghans, but reaffirm U.S. strategic choice; focus on justification over initial promises.

Lexical and Thematic Trends

Examining the language more closely, certain recurring lexical patterns emerge in these rhetoric shifts:

Threat vs. diplomatic lexicon: Early-stage US rhetoric in crises relies on a threat lexicon: "red line", "consequences", "will not tolerate", "evil", "fire and fury", "grave danger". These words convey

uncompromising stances and often foreshadow punitive action such as military strikes and sanctions. In later stages, a diplomatic lexicon becomes prominent: "talks", "negotiations", "agreement", "framework", "international community", "peaceful solution". Even when no formal agreement materializes (e.g., with North Korea or in Afghanistan), the lexicon shifts to explanation and mitigation (e.g., "right decision", "lessons learned"). The frequency of words like "diplomacy", "talks", and "negotiated" clearly increases in official communications after an initial hardline phase. Conversely, words like "military action" and "strike" that appeared earlier during this phase either disappear or are heavily qualified ("remains an option if diplomacy fails").

Emotional vs. technical language: Initial crisis rhetoric often has an emotional charge or grand moral framing, such as calling regimes evil, citing historic dangers, evoking shock—"the world has never seen" such fury. Later rhetoric becomes more technical or procedural, including talk of frameworks, timelines, verification, and conditions. For instance, Obama's later Syria remarks delved into the Chemical Weapons Convention and UN Security Council resolutions, a stark change from the emotive "children foaming at the mouth" imagery he used to justify US action initially. In Bush's case, early language was ideological (evil, terror); later language was process-oriented (Six-Party, step-by-step disarmament). This suggests a shift from rallying public support (often by using strong, emotive language) to managing policy details (requiring calmer, precise language).

Use of personal pronouns and subjects: Notably, agency in language sometimes shifts. Early statements often put the onus on adversaries ("Assad will face consequences…", "North Korea must not…") while later statements may shift to first-person or passive constructions, reflecting either shared responsibility or inevitability ("We have made progress…", "an agreement was reached…"). In Biden's case, the pronoun "we" in "we will do X safely" shifted to a more passive construction like "this unfolded" or "we had anticipated", softening direct responsibility. This linguistic shift can diffuse blame or highlight multilateral effort. Similarly, Trump's transition saw "I" and "we" used first to issue threats, then "we" in "we signed an agreement" and "we have a great relationship". The thematic subject changed from US power projection to mutual partnership.

Cross-agency messaging: Within the US government, different entities emphasize different themes, but all follow the general trajectory. The White House (the President's own words) often sets the initial hard tone (e.g., Obama's "red line" was a spontaneous comment during a press conference; most of Bush's strong postures on North Korea were made during his State of the Union addresses; Trump's threats often came via his impromptu speeches or tweets; and Biden's assurances came in formal addresses). After these high-level, declarative statements fail, the State Department and its diplomats typically amplify diplomacy during the softening period. For example, it was Secretary Kerry's off-the-cuff remark about Assad handing over weapons that catalyzed the Syria deal; the State Department's Six-Party Talks effort under Bush with careful words about "meeting obligations"; Trump's State Department under Pompeo post-2018 talked about "final fully verified denuclearization"—cautious, technical phrasing to codify Trump's broad "great deal" rhetoric. Additionally, the National Security Council and its advisors tend to provide consistency or behind-the-scenes nuance. In Obama's case, once the red line was crossed, the National Security Council and military briefings began using phrases like "limited strike" and "not seeking regime change", which tempered the tone. Under Trump in 2017, some NSC officials tried to downplay the likelihood of war even as Trump amped up his rhetoric. Under Biden, the Pentagon and NSC communications in 2021 stressed contingency planning and later highlighted the success of the airlift (the reframing exercise, discussed previously). This interplay between the White House, State Department, and NSC can sometimes show mixed messaging, but generally, once the President shifts stance, the rest follow.

Another thematic trend is that initial messages are often single-voiced and clear (by the leader), while later messages involve multiple voices (President, State, Defense) converging on a more complex narrative.

Keyword frequency changes: A simplified analysis of keyword frequency before vs. after is illustrative. For instance, in Obama's Syria case, the word "military" appeared frequently in early statements (when he focused on the threat of military action) but in later 2013 statements "military" appeared mostly in the context of "credible threat" (past tense) or "if diplomacy fails", whereas the words "diplomatic" "diplomacy" shot up in usage. In Bush's North Korea case, "evil" appears countless times in 2002 speeches and remarks. However, by 2005-2006, the word appears virtually zero times in speeches, replaced by terms like "talks" (which went from zero to numerous references). Under Trump, derogatory nicknames for Kim were prevalent in 2017 speeches statements and then disappeared entirely in 2018 official remarks, replaced by honorifics like "Chairman Kim" and highly positive descriptors. In Biden's speeches, words like "secure", "safety", and "orderly" were common pre-withdrawal, while post-collapse, words like "regret" (or denying regret) and "collapse" replaced them in the lexicon. This flip in keyword frequency underscores the pivot in narrative: from confrontation to negotiation, from confidence to explanation.

Cross-Administration Patterns in Backtracking

Despite differences in style, the administrations of these cases show common patterns in how strong stances evolve. Early tough rhetoric often serves as an attempt at deterrence. Obama's "red line" was meant to deter Assad (and reassure allies like Israel and Turkey) that the US would act if WMD were used. Bush's "axis of evil" speech signaled a post-9/11 doctrine of preemption, aiming to scare proliferators through an assertion of US hegemony. Trump's fire-and-fury was a gamble that extreme pressure would threaten Kim Jong Un and force him to negotiate from a weaker position. Biden's confident withdrawal pronouncements were intended to show resolve in ending a war while conveying that the situation would remain stable. In all four cases, the administration set a maximal goal or red line—a nuclear-armed North Korea is intolerable, the use of chemical weapons is unacceptable, North Korea must denuclearize, the Afghan government must hold until US leaves—using rhetoric as a tool to shape the environment.

When that initial posture either fails to achieve its immediate aim or circumstances change, policy pragmatism kicks in, and the rhetoric adapts accordingly. Bush realized that if he delt with North Korea the same way he did with Iraq, he would fail. He could not simply oust the North Korean regime as he did with Sadam Hussein. Thus, he quietly dropped regime-charged rhetoric and instead let China coax Pyongyang into talks. Similarly, when push came to shove, Obama did not enforce his "red line" with strikes—instead, facing Congressional reluctance and a UK Parliamentary rejection of action, he turned to a diplomatic out. His rhetoric then had to justify why not striking was acceptable, hence the new, heavy emphasis on the success of the Russian-backed weapons deal (Obama, 2013b). Trump, after edging toward conflict in 2017, and seeing North Korea still rapidly advancing its arsenal, made a snap decision that personal engagement was worth the risk—leading to a shocking rhetorical about-face to facilitate dialogue. Biden's plans collided with the Afghan Army's collapse. To manage that fallout, his rhetoric shifted to defending the decision to leave rather than the earlier focus on the execution of his plans. A pattern that emerges is that initial rhetoric often oversimplifies (good vs. evil, success vs. failure, etc.), whereas later rhetoric acknowledges complexity ("we achieved some objectives, but…", "diplomacy is difficult but worthwhile", "things didn't go as planned, however…"). This reflects an adaptive narrative within the rhetorical evolution: from idealistic and hardline to pragmatic and conciliatory.

Each backtrack also came with attempts to manage US credibility, especially among allies. Administrations often downplayed the significance of their rhetorical shift even as they made them. Bush's team insisted East Asian partners that although the tone softened, his goals are still the same and that the new diplomatic language was a tool, not a concession to North Korea (Cazzaniga, 2005). Obama officials argued that the threat itself of force against Syria led to the diplomatic victory, implying consistency in their position, even though it was basically a retreat from the brink of striking. Trump never admitted his position and tone toward Kim a 180. Instead, he framed it as having taken necessary strong measures that now allowed him to be friendly, essentially crediting his own toughness for opening Kim to talks, whether or not that is true. He also tended to oscillate rather than explicitly backtrack, which in his narrative is not a change but part of a strategy of unpredictability—which he would therefore not consider an error. Finally, Biden maintained that ending the war was the right thing and that no timeframe would have avoided the inevitable chaos, effectively arguing there was no reversal in US resolve—just in circumstances (Gomez, 2021). He also claimed "no question of our credibility from allies", despite ally criticism, showing an effort to deny any loss of face (Valverde, 2021).

Table 3

Shared Patterns in Backtracking

Element	Bush	Obama	Trump	Biden
Emphasizing what was achieved instead of what stance was abandoned	Beijing-led deal and framework	Reducing the chemical stockpile	Opening dialogue and stopping tests	Ripping the Band-Aid off the "futile war" (Goldberg, 2021) and evacuating 120,000 people
Arguing that US strength or values were upheld despite the shift	World peace was protected, and evil was unable to proliferate	International norms were upheld through the deal, not diminished	Trump's personal strength won Kim's and the world's respect	America's strength lies in its core interests, not others' wars
Learning, adaption, and flexibility are all positives	Listening to US regional allies and adjusting the tone was smart statecraft	Thoughtful decision-making calculus when choosing to strike or not	N/A	Adapted to new facts: argued any delay would only postpone the inevitable
Reinforcing commitments after reversing to mitigate ally concerns	Show of force (exercises, intercepting illicit shipments) to show options for if diplomacy fails	Increased rebel support and affirmed security guarantees to Israel and Turkey	Kept sanctions largely in place, signaling that words did not equal a policy concession	Doubled down on commitments to NATO in other areas

Other countries are always scrutinizing US rhetoric, especially during crisis. So as one might expect, both allies and adversaries pick up on these nuances when administrations backtrack. Since US allies often use American foreign policy to inform their own foreign policy calculus, these allies express private or public dismay during abrupt changes. A notable example was in 2013 when France was prepared to join US strikes in Syria and felt blindsided when the backed out at the last minute to pivot to a deal. Allies in the region such as Turkey, Israel, and the Gulf states were concerned that not enforcing the red line diminished US credibility in future deterrence (Lund, 2017). However, many allies also welcomed the removal of Syria's chemical arsenal without war. In Bush's North Korea pivot, Japan and South Korea, the two primary US allies in the region, largely approved the attempts for multilateral diplomacy, though some in Japan worried that the US might accept a solution that was satisfactory for themselves but would harm the region. China (a US adversary and partner in Bush's North Korea talks talks) was pleased to see the US drop the harsher rhetoric and engage in Beijing-led negotiations. In Trump's case, South Korea's government under President Moon Jae-in strongly supported the shift to diplomacy as it

aligned with their own reconciliation efforts, whereas Japan's leadership was more skeptical, fearing Trump might make a deal that would harm Japan's position. US allies were also nervous about the unpredictability of Trump's swings: one day threatening war, the next day proclaiming a love for Kim (Sang-Hun, 2018). Some appreciated the de-escalation efforts, but others worried about lack of coordination (e.g. Trump agreeing to pause military exercises without consulting Seoul or Tokyo) (Gaouette, Starr, & Browne, 2018).

For adversaries, a US rhetorical softening can be seen as an opening. Assad's regime in Syria took advantage of Obama's hesitance to strike by delaying and dragging out the disarmament process and was later accused of continuing low-level chemical attacks. Putin's Russia, which brokered the first Syria deal, likely saw the US backtrack as an opportunity to increase Russian influence in the Middle East (Russia would innerve militarily in Syria in 2015, partly calculating US reluctance to use force, and would quickly become one of the most salient actors in the conflict). North Korea under Kim Jong-un saw Trump's eagerness for a summit as a chance to gain international legitimacy and sanctions relief. Kim played along with talks, but ultimately held onto his nuclear arsenal—some analysts even argue Kim "got the better of Trump at the negotiating table" by extracting the international legitimacy prestige and of meetings with the US president while actually conceding little (Graham, 2018). In Afghanistan, the Taliban certainly perceived the US desire to leave as confirmation that they just needed to wait out America, and the backtracking from "responsible withdrawal" to a frantic evacuation likely emboldened them and other US adversaries, who might conclude that US domestic pressure can force abrupt policy shifts, even at the very last minute.

There has a debate as to whether such rhetorical backtracking significantly damages American credibility, especially among allies, or merely demonstrates a pragmatic realpolitik. Bush's shift on North Korea arguably showed pragmatism—he could not fight every "evil" at once, and by engaging diplomatically he at least froze North Korea's plutonium program for a time. While critics argue that North Korea benefited from these pauses and eventually broke away, going on to successfully test their nuclear weapons in 2006, Bush still managed to maintain ally support, and the US credibility in Asia was not crushed. Indeed, the US was seen as responsibly involving regional powers. Obama's failure to strike in Syria is cited as a blow to credibility ("Obama's red line fiasco"), but some argue that it had little long-term damage to US reputation or power (Larison, 2023). US allies still cooperated in other areas in the Civil War, while adversaries already inclined to test the limits did so regardless. In fact, eliminating a large portion of Syria's chemical stockpile through diplomacy could be seen as a successful outcome, albeit achieved by climbing down from a threat.

Trump's case is unique: His credibility was tied to his unpredictable character. Globally, however, constant oscillation created uncertainty about US commitments. However, the absence of war in 2017-2018 and the apparent rapport in 2019 may have averted immediate catastrophe (catastrophe that was largely self-imposed, to be sure). Some allies worried this eroded the normative credibility of US threats—if "fire and fury" was just a bluff, would U. threats be taken seriously by others, like Iran or China? Yet, Trump's supporters argued his tough talk followed by diplomacy actually improved credibility by showing that the US could bring even a hostile leader to negotiations. It is worth noting that Kim made no real concessions to Trump during their negotiations and after Trump left office, North Korea maintained a hardline. The long-term impact on credibility here is inconclusive.

Finally, Biden's Afghanistan pivot did raise acute questions among allies about US reliability. NATO members complained about a lack of consultation and many in Europe feared this move signaled US retrenchment. On the other side, US rivals like China and Russia eagerly pointed to the chaotic withdrawal as evidence of a

declining American resolve to be involved in the world (Douthat, 2021). However, by rhetorically focusing on the decision to leave, which allies had known was coming, Biden tried to separate the botched execution from the overall policy position. Whether US credibility was "severely damaged" or not is still debated—allies have continued to work with the US on other issues (e.g., in Ukraine), suggesting that while the episode was a stain, it has not fully undermined faith in US commitments where interests align (Kim, Byun, & Ko, 2024).

Historical and Policy Implications

The repeated pattern of rhetorical evolution, strong rhetoric softening into diplomacy, reveals much about the US foreign policy process and the balance between credibility and realpolitik. Traditionally, diplomats worry that failing to follow through on threats erodes a country's credibility—adversaries might doubt future warnings, and allies might doubt security guarantees. Indeed, each of these cases provoked such concerns. Critics of Obama say not enforcing the red line emboldened both Assad and Putin. Critics of Trump argue that after "fire and fury" proved to be largely bluff, countries like Iran or North Korea itself may take future US ultimatums less seriously. The Afghanistan episode led to charged discussions about US credibility as a partner—the UK Parliament held an emergency debate, and some in called the withdrawal a shameful abandonment and argued that allied trust would be shaken after this (James & Piper, 2021). Taiwan's leaders nervously pondered what the Afghan withdrawal signaled about US resolve in East Asia, especially against China. In the short term, credibility does clearly take a hit when a bold line is drawn and seemingly walked back on.

However, the long-term effects are more complex. Long-term US credibility depends on many factors, including capabilities, interests, and consistency across issues. In Syria, while the manner of backtracking was certainly embarrassing, the US did enforce the international norm against chemical weapons via a deal—arguably upholding credibility on the issue in a different way. Also, some argue that had Obama struck militarily, it might have entangled the US in Syria with dubious results, especially given America's history of intervention in the Middle East. By avoiding that, he preserved resources and credibility for other commitments. In North Korea's case, the US demonstrated flexibility—today, it is understood that diplomacy backed by pressure is the only viable way to handle Pyongyang. Bush's temporary backtrack set a precedent that even hawkish administrations like Trump's ended up following, as Trump ultimately pursued talks, and even the Biden administration has again offered talks without preconditions to the North Koreas. Thus, what might seem like weakening credibility can also be seen as strategic recalibration. As one commentator of Bush's rhetorical shift noted, "a softer tone does not however mean a softer policy"—it became a different tool for an unchanged goal (Cazzaniga, 2005). Credibility can be maintained so long as the policy goal remains firm, even if the rhetorical approach shifts.

In each case, the US pivoted because realpolitik considerations such as feasibility, cost, and risk demanded it. This reflects a pragmatic streak in US foreign policy: Ideals and hardline positions are often moderated by practical limits. Allies generally prefer the US be pragmatic rather than reckless. For example, European allies were quietly relieved that Obama sought Congress's approval and then embraced the chemical weapons deal as these steps averted another war. South Korea certainly favored Trump's dialogue with Kim over the former's previous war threats, as their capital was in the crosshairs. While NATO allies were unhappy with how Afghanistan was handled, many agreed with the overall policy that the war had to end. Thus, while public credibility often suffers in the short-term, in private, partners often understand the reasoning behind backtracking. Realpolitik can even strengthen long-term credibility if it leads to better outcomes. However, this would require deft communication to ensure allies and adversaries still believe the US will stand firm on truly vital interests.

Conclusion

While allies prefer consistency, they also value results. Notably, Obama's red line backtrack was partly driven by lack of domestic support for strikes, something allies recognized and also faced among their domestic populations. Adversaries probe for weakness but also calibrate their own actions to avoid pushing the US into a corner. For instance, after the 2013 Syria deal, Assad did curtail large-scale chemical attacks for a period, indicating he still feared a US response if he blatantly violated the deal, especially immediately. North Korea, after Trump's outreach, maintained a moratorium on nuclear and long-range missile tests for about a year in 2018, suggesting that even rhetorical engagement can yield tactical calm. Over the long run, though, adversaries may also seek to exploit perceived US hesitation: Russia's 2014 annexation of Crimea came a year after Syria's red line incident and some analysts drew a relationship between the two, arguing that Putin sensed US reluctance for global intervention. Similarly, the Taliban's final offensive likely accelerated once they assessed that Washington was committed to leaving regardless of their advances. In short, each rhetorical retreat can create second-order challenges if adversaries interpret them as signs of wavering resolve.

A key policy less from these cases is the importance of calibrating initial rhetoric to realistic policy options. Over-promising (or over-threatening) sets the stage for visible backtracking. Future policymakers might take heed to avoid very absolute language unless they are also absolutely prepared to follow through. If they do draw "red lines", they should also privately prepare diplomatic off-ramps to save face, rather than appearing caught off guard without them. Effective statecraft should involve constructive ambiguity—leaving room in rhetoric for diplomatic solutions from the start. In these four cases, once the US foreign policy position had shifted to diplomacy, the rhetoric had to be almost completely rewritten. Perhaps a more consistent through-line could preserve credibility. One example might be stating early: "if X happens, we will respond decisively, preferably with the international community"—a phrasing that allows either the use of force or a force-backed deal.

Ultimately, these episodes show that US rhetorical flexibility is a double-edged sword: It can avert conflict and open diplomatic doors, but it can also generate perceptions of unreliability and incredibility. The policy implication is not that the US should never change course—indeed, adaptability is crucial—but that it should manage its messaging tightly when it does decide to shift. Transparency with allies, setting achievable red lines, and clearly linking any change in rhetoric to concrete policy outcomes can help mitigate credibility loss.

The evolution of US diplomatic rhetoric in these crises reflects a pattern of initial maximalist posturing giving way to moderated, pragmatic engagement. While each situation had unique drivers, US leaders across administrations found it necessary to backtrack from all-or-nothing positions toward solutions grounded in diplomacy or strategic recalibration. This underscores a fundamental tension in foreign policy rhetoric: the need to project strength and resolve versus the need to adjust to changing on-the-ground realities. Successfully navigating that tension—maintaining credibility while embracing pragmatism—remains a challenge for leaders and policymakers. The cases of Syria, North Korea, and Afghanistan demonstrate that words must be matched with wise strategy, and, when that strategy shifts, words must follow suit. The United States' global leadership thus depends not just on its military might or economic power, but also on its ability to communicate intentions and red lines judiciously, and when those lines move, to explain and execute the change in a way that sustains trust among allies and fear and respect among adversaries.

References

Baker, P., & Sanger, D. E. (October 1, 2017). Trump says Tillerson is "wasting his time" on North Korea. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2017/10/01/us/politics/trump-tillerson-north-korea.html

Baum, M. A., & Potter, P. B. K. (2008). The relationships between mass media, public opinion, and foreign policy: Toward a theoretical synthesis. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 11, 39–65. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.11.060406.214132

BBC News. (May 26, 2018). *Trump says "productive" talks held on reinstating N Korea summit*. Retrieved from https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-44263045

Biden, J. R. (August 16, 2021). *Remarks by President Biden on Afghanistan*. The White House Office of the Press Secretary. Retrieved from https://bidenwhitehouse.archives.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2021/08/16/remarks-by-president-biden-on-afghanistan/

Biden, J. R. (April 14, 2021). *Remarks on United States military operations in Afghanistan*. The American Presidency Project. Retrieved from https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/remarks-united-states-military-operations-afghanistan

Borger, J. (September 19, 2017). Donald Trump threatens to "totally destroy" North Korea in UN speech. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/sep/19/donald-trump-threatens-totally-destroy-north-korea-un-speech

Borger, J. (December 12, 2017). US ready for talks with North Korea "without preconditions", Tillerson says. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/dec/12/us-ready-for-talks-with-north-korea-without-preconditions-tillerson-says

Briant, E. L. (2015). Allies and audiences: Evolving strategies in defense and intelligence propaganda. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, *20*(2), 145–165. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/1940161214552031

Bush, G. W. (January 29, 2002). *President delivers State of the Union address*. The White House Office of the Press Secretary. Retrieved from https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2002/01/20020129-11.html

Bush, G. W. (June 26, 2008). *President Bush discusses North Korea*. The White House Office of the Press Secretary. Retrieved from https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2008/06/20080626-9.html

Cazzaniga, P. (February 7, 2005). *Bush's softer tone towards the Pyongyang regime*. PIME Onlus—AsiaNews. Retrieved from https://www.asianews.it/news-en/Bushs-softer-tone-towards-the-Pyongyang-regime-2521.html

Cha, V. D. (2016). *Powerplay: The origins of the American alliance system in Asia*. Princeton University Press. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvc778dz

Cooper, H., & Sanger, D. E. (November 19, 2006). U.S. signals new incentives for North Korea. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2006/11/19/world/asia/19prexy.html

C-SPAN. (2021). *President Biden on Afghanistan withdrawal*. Retrieved from https://www.c-span.org/program/white-house-event/president-biden-on-afghanistan-withdrawal/595872

Douthat, R. (September 4, 2021). The American empire in retreat. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2021/09/04/opinion/afghanistan-withdrawal-america.html

Drezner, D. W. (2011). Does Obama have a grand strategy? Why we need doctrines in uncertain times. *Foreign Affairs*, *90*(4), 57–68. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/23039606

Fearon, J. D. (1994). Domestic political audiences and the escalation of international disputes. *American Political Science Review*, *88*(3), 577–592. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.2307/2944796

Fearon, J. D. (1997). Signaling foreign policy interests: Tying hands versus sinking costs. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, *41*(1), 68–90. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/0022002797041001004

Gaouette, N., Starr, B., & Browne, R. (June 12, 2018). *Trump's pledge to stop "provocative" military exercises provokes alarm and confusion*. CNN. Retrieved from https://www.cnn.com/2018/06/12/politics/trump-north-korea-military-exercises

Goddard, S. E. (2018). Embedded revisionism: Networks, institutions, and challenges to world order. *International Organization*, *72*(4), 763–797. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818318000206

Goldberg, M. (August 24, 2021). The Afghanistan war was lost before Biden ended it. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2021/08/23/opinion/afghanistan-biden.html

Gomez, J. (August 21, 2021). *Fact-checking President Biden's claims on current Afghanistan crisis*. ABC News. Retrieved from https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/fact-checking-president-bidens-claims-current-afghanistan-crisis/story?id=79565706

Gordon, M. R., & Myers, S. L. (September 9, 2013). Obama calls Russia offer on Syria possible "breakthrough". *The New York Times*. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/10/world/middleeast/kerry-says-syria-should-hand-over-all-chemical-arms.html

Graham, D. A. (June 12, 2018). Trump's effusive, unsettling flattery of Kim Jong Un. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2018/06/trumps-effusive-unsettling-flattery-of-kim-jong-un/562619/

Haas, B. (June 12, 2018). A meeting of equals: What we learned from the Trump and Kim handshake. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/jun/12/a-meeting-of-equals-what-we-learned-from-the-trump-and-kim-handshake

Handy, M. (September 2, 2021). *Congress displays bipartisan support for Afghan allies*. U.S. Global Leadership Coalition. Retrieved from https://www.usglc.org/blog/congress-displays-bipartisan-support-for-afghan-allies/

James, W., & Piper, E. (August 19, 2021). *UK lawmakers condemn PM Johnson and U.S. President Biden over Afghanistan*. Reuters. Retrieved from https://www.reuters.com/world/uk/pm-johnson-says-britain-will-do-all-it-can-prevent-afghan-crisis-2021-08-18/

Jervis, R. (1976). *Perception and misperception in international politics*. Princeton University Press. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvc77bx3

Kim, D. G., Byun, J., & Ko, J. (September 6, 2023). *U.S. alliance credibility after the 2021 Afghanistan withdrawal*. Contemporary Security Policy Blog. http://contemporarysecuritypolicy.org/u-s-alliance-credibility-after-the-2021-afghanistan-withdrawal/

Kim, D. G., Byun, J., & Ko, J. (2024). Remember Kabul? Reputation, strategic contexts, and American credibility after the Afghanistan withdrawal. *Contemporary Security Policy*, *45*(2), 265–297. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1080/13523260.2023.2253406

Larison, D. (August 28, 2023). *10 years after Obama's embarrassing "red line" retreat*. Quincy Institute for Responsible Statecraft. Retrieved from https://responsiblestatecraft.org/2023/08/28/what-obamas-red-line-in-syria-taught-us-about-us-credibility/

Levendusky, M. S., & Horowitz, M. C. (2012). When backing down is the right decision: Partisanship, new information, and audience costs. *The Journal of Politics*, *74*(2), 323–338. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1017/S002238161100154X

Lund, A. (February 3, 2017). *Red line redux: How Putin tore up Obama's 2013 Syria deal*. The Century Foundation. Retrieved from https://tcf.org/content/report/red-line-redux-putin-tore-obamas-2013-syria-deal/

Mercer, J. (1996). *Reputation and international politics*. Cornell University Press. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7591/j.ctv5rf1n9

Nexon, D. H., & Wright, T. (2007). What's at stake in the American empire debate. *American Political Science Review*, *101*(2), 253–271. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055407070220

Obama, B. (August 20, 2012). *Remarks by the president to the White House Press Corps*. The White House Office of the Press Secretary. Retrieved from https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2012/08/20/remarks-president-white-house-press-corps

Obama, B. (September 10, 2013). *Remarks by the president in address to the nation on Syria*. The White House Office of the Press Secretary. Retrieved from https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2013/09/10/remarks-president-address-nation-syria

Obama, B. (September 14, 2013). *Statement by the president on U.S.-Russian agreement on framework for elimination of Syrian chemical weapons*. The White House Office of the Press Secretary. Retrieved from https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2013/09/14/statement-president-us-russian-agreement-framework-elimination-syrian-ch

Özdamar, Ö., & Yanik, L. K. (2024). Populist hyperpersonalization and politicization of foreign policy institutions. *International Affairs*, *100*(5), 1835–1856. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iiae181

Power, S. (2019). *The education of an idealist: A memoir*. Dey Street Books.

Press, D. G. (2005). *Calculating credibility: How leaders assess military threats*. Cornell University Press.

Rachman, G. (June 2, 2025). Trump always chickens out on foreign policy too. *Financial Times*. Retrieved from https://www.ft.com/content/714c1096-eb17-40b0-a570-8a051406bc75

Ravid, B. (April 26, 2025). *Trump threatens Putin with new sanctions after meeting with Zelensky*. Axios. Retrieved from https://www.axios.com/2025/04/26/trump-zelensky-pope-funeral-meeting

Sang-Hun, C. (August 30, 2018). Pause in military drills, ordered by Trump, leaves South Koreans uneasy. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2018/08/30/world/asia/south-korea-trump-military-drills.html

Sartori, A. E. (2002). The might of the pen: A reputational theory of communication in international disputes. *International Organization*, *56*(1), 121–149. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1162/002081802753485151

Schelling, T. C. (1966). *Arms and influence*. Yale University Press. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt5vm52s

Sen, A. (March 9, 2018). *Trump and North Korea: From "fire and fury" to diplomacy*. New Atlanticist. Retrieved from https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/new-atlanticist/trump-and-north-korea-from-fire-and-fury-to-diplomacy/

Shapiro, J. (May 8, 2025). *The bully's pulpit: Finding patterns in Trump's use of military force*. European Council on Foreign Relations. Retrieved from https://ecfr.eu/article/the-bullys-pulpit-finding-patterns-in-trumps-use-of-military-force/

Snyder, G. H. (1984). The security dilemma in alliance politics. *World Politics*, *36*(4), 461–495. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.2307/2010183

Sorensen, C. (April 6, 2003). *The Bush administration and North Korea's nuclear program*. Jackson School of International Studies. Retrieved from https://faculty.washington.edu/sangok/The%20Bush%20Administration%20and%20North%20Korea.htm

Taddonio, P. (May 25, 2015). *"The president blinked": Why Obama changed course on the "red line" in Syria*. Frontline. Retrieved from https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/frontline/article/the-president-blinked-why-obama-changed-course-on-the-red-line-in-syria/

Tomz, M. (2007). Domestic audience costs in international relations: An experimental approach. *International Organization, 61*(4), 821–840. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818307070282

Valverde, M. (August 26, 2021). *Fact-checking Joe Biden on U.S. credibility as military withdraws from Afghanistan*. PolitiFact. Retrieved from https://politifact.com/factchecks/2021/aug/26/joe-biden/fact-checking-joe-biden-us-credibility-military-wi/