RESEARCH ARTICLE

the rest: journal of politics and development
2026 | 16(3) Special Issue | 471-481
www.therestjournal.com

© The Author(s) 2026

Centre for Strategic Research and Analysis | CESRAN International

Trump's Rhetorical and Economic Warfare Against BRICS: Framing Geoeconomics in Obstructive Foreign Policy Terms

Greg Simons
Department of Journalism, Media & Communication, Daffodil International University, Dhaka, Bangladesh, gregmons@yahoo.com, 0000-0002-6111-5325

Meherun Nahar
Department of Journalism, Media & Communication, Daffodil International University, Dhaka, Bangladesh, meherunnaharmoury@gmail.com, 0000-0002-7784-3271

KEYWORDS

Trump
BRICS
Framing Geoeconomics
Obstructive Foreign Policy
Economic Warfare

Received January 15, 2026
Revised July 5, 2026
Accepted October 24, 2026

ABSTRACT

In his second term in office, President Donald Trump has waged an all-out rhetorical and economic war on subjects of international relations of the Global South. The apparent intention is to render them servile objects in international relations, as the Global North's network of vassal and client states to the United States. This situation is not without logic or reason given the global context of the US's relative decline and the rise of the Global South through newly established and independent international institutions such as BRICS. It concerns US global hegemony through maintaining and imposing its geostrategic imperatives. These imperatives keep client states protected and pliant, keep vassal states dependent and pliant, and prevent the rise of powers and blocs of powers that can challenge the US. Trump has been launching an unpredictable rhetorical tirade from his Truth Social account, outlining the vague goals of US strategy for its resurrection as a global hegemon once more, denouncing the world for 'victimising' the US and not being grateful. This paper uses a framing lens to understand the logic of identifying the problem and moving toward a solution. This is complemented by the rhetoric applied to the text of those tirades, where the logic and emotion in the language are intended to complement and overpower the audience's cognitive will to resist. Rhetoric and economic warfare complement and compound each other by using the information realm to create effects in the cognitive realm of the Global South, and BRICS in particular. This is the means; the apparent ends are to create the operational environment that supports obstructive foreign policy. In this case, other countries cease to be subjects of international relations and become objects; they lose the ability to realise their foreign policy goals, national interests, and security. In a context of relative decline, the US has lost its absolute hegemony but tries to exercise a relative hegemony by obstructing the rise of other powers, such as BRICS.

1. Introduction

Framing the identity and culture of a global actor in the chaos of 21st-century international relations is revealing in terms of how that actor seeks to rally their domestic audience around a concept or ideal and how they project their intentions to the other actors populating the global system of states (Kowert, 2016; Hayes, 2017). This is particularly pertinent as a global geopolitical transformation is underway, in which the US-led Global North is in relative decline yet still seeks to retain hegemony (Kissinger, 2015; Biden, 2020). Such a volatile and complex physical environment means that tools

of interpretation and representation of foreign policy, geopolitics, and geo-economics are far from being merely academic constructs remote from the realities of practice and policymaking.

This article seeks to explore the digital environment, which is one of the primary locations of global efforts to win the hearts and minds of global audiences, where attempts to justify and legitimise US foreign policy under the Trump 2.0 administration are made using the risky tool of economic warfare against BRICS to regain its hegemony. Geo-economics is playing a key role in attempting to reshape and engineer a favourable geopolitical outcome for the US (Simons, 2024a). It is a defensive posture that seeks to interrupt and disrupt other countries' foreign policy goals and opportunities by obstructing their foreign policy aims and objectives. By examining and analysing the rhetoric used by Trump 2.0 on his private Truth Social account, it is hoped to reveal his means of attempting to telegraph justification and legitimacy to his domestic base and to signal intentions to foreign audiences. This leads to posing the following research question for this paper. How does Trump 2.0 shape his rhetorical approach to economic warfare within the context of geo-economic ambition, using demagogic appeals to his domestic base while simultaneously trying to coerce compliance from foreign actors?

This article has four sections. The first section details how geo-economics and geopolitics interact and influence each other in the volatile and chaotic environment of 21st-century international relations. The second section elaborates on the paper's theoretical and conceptual framework, along with the geopolitical context. The third section motivates and justifies the paper's methodology, explaining how and where the data are drawn from (and why), namely the rhetoric of Trump 2.0's Truth Social posts on the BRICS countries. Section four then introduces the case studied in this article, Trump's rhetorical war against BRICS countries, exploring the communicational aspects of justification and legitimacy seeking. A discussion section follows, linking, analysing, and interpreting the primary data through the paper's theoretical and conceptual tools.

2. Geo-Economics and its Relations to Geopolitics

Geo-economics is subordinated to the actor's geopolitical priorities and imperatives; it is intended to help realise those ambitions within the geopolitical programme (Simons, 2024a). In terms of its relationships, geo-economics concerns the interactions and effects of geography and economic activity (Baracuhy, 2018). The contemporary global system of trade and economic activity is asymmetric, with embedded vulnerabilities and dependencies that can convert economic power and advantage into an effective means of pursuing strategic objectives (Scholvin & Wigell, 2018a, p. 81). Furthermore, geo-economics is seen as complex and multifaceted in the world of international power and influence projection.

It is suggested that we understand geo-economics as both a foreign policy practice (aimed at achieving strategic objectives) and an analytical concept (within the tradition of IR Realism) (Scholvin & Wigell, 2018b, p. 1). This passage refers to the use of geo-economics in a potential hard-power configuration as a means of converting economic assets and value into geopolitical advantage over other actors. The chosen path of geo-economic action to support geopolitical goals and ambitions depends on the actor's interests and priorities. Where geopolitics can be understood as a means of acquiring territory to accumulate wealth, geo-economics reverses the process, aiming directly to accumulate wealth through market control. The acquisition or control of territory is not irrelevant, but a tactical option rather than a strategic necessity (Cowen & Smith 2009, p. 42).

Power and influence are derived from the ability to control the acquisition and the distribution of economic resources and assets, which denies the ability of competitors to do so and thus potentially renders them as an object rather than a subject of international relations. This brings us to geopolitics in terms of its scientific definition and its pragmatic purpose and intent. At its most basic and banal level, geopolitics concerns the study of the interactions and effects of geography and politics (Hagan, 1942; Mamadouh & Müller, 2023). Geopolitics has an interpretative aspect: a means of understanding events, trends, and processes in international relations to increase understanding

and predictability in the political environment. But geopolitics also involves representation: projecting a subjective perception and reputation onto an actor or event that benefits the communicator (Simons & Chifu, 2025). Furthermore, geopolitics has an informational dimension, where perception and façade reign; it is used to accumulate political capital by attempting to justify and legitimise foreign policy (which may objectively lack a basis for justification or legitimacy) (Flint, 2021). How do these aspects come together, and what kind of result is produced in the context of an evolving global order?

3. Evolving Global Order, Fifth Dimension of Strategy and Obstructive Foreign Policy

Brzezinski (2010) noted bitterly that the growing global turmoil on the eve of the 21st century was created by unprecedented challenges to US hegemony and threatened the promise of continued US dominance. Observers increasingly agree that the 21st century is witnessing an evolution of the global geopolitical order, away from the Western-centric, US-led unipolar order (the Global North) toward a non-Western-centric multipolar order (the Global South) (Denisenko, 2025; Chaudhuri, 2026). However, the US is challenging this evolution of the global order as it faces a decision in the second decade of the 21st century: whether to accept and manage its relative decline or reject it and challenge it. The latter has been publicly chosen by President Biden (Biden, 2020) and continued (accelerated even more) under President Trump. Given that the US is increasingly depicted as in decline and seeks to challenge the current trend and trajectory of the global order, it must carefully choose the appropriate dimension of strategic tools to project power and influence and achieve its geopolitical goal of continued global hegemony.

It should be noted that not all scholars and analysts agree with the 'inevitable' and 'imminent' decline of US global power and hegemony. For example, Brooks & Wohlforth (2016) acknowledged the relative decline of US global power and influence yet argue that, with good leadership and policies, it can be reversed. Ikenberry (2018; 2020) expressed similar thoughts about the Global South's challenge to the Global North but noted that the greatest threats to the Global North came from fractures and splits within.

As a means of representing and projecting power and influence in the physical environment of international relations, information and knowledge are critical tools for shaping audience perception and consent. Powers can exploit five dimensions of strategy to project power and influence in international relations. Four of these dimensions of strategy are tangible (physical), and one is intangible (informational-cognitive). The dimensions of strategy are in chronological order: 1) land (continental power), 2) water (maritime power), 3) air (aerial power), and 4) space power, all of which are tangible. The fifth dimension of power is knowledge and information, which is intangible, but it affects an actor's perception of and reaction to events in the physical human environment (Lonsdale, 1999; Simons, 2024b). This can be used to misdirect or coerce consensus among international actors toward a policy line they might not otherwise accept without duress, where implied economic and/or military coercion can be used in the negotiation process. But they try not to cross the threshold that would prompt the targeted actor to use military force to assert its sovereignty.

But what is the point of undertaking such seemingly risky and reckless approaches to international relations? This is partly due to two radically different ways of viewing and interacting with the various actors in this evolving global system. The Global North, where the US seeks to retain its hegemony, is highly transactional and ideologically messianic, resulting in a zero-sum game. Whereas the Global South is more relational in its international relations, pragmatically pursuing its national interests with a win-win outcome. In effect, the Global North attempts to subvert and coerce international actors to be reduced to being objects of international relations, rather than subjects (Simons, 2024c). The Global South relies on this strategy to mitigate differences and the Global North's coercion. Kim (2019) noted that the US has begun employing geo-economic strategy in a more militarised and coercive configuration in the 21st century, rather than using it as a means of attraction, such as the Marshall Plan in Europe at the end of the Second World War.

The Global South seeks to facilitate its rise through cooperation and collaboration, pursuing its foreign policy goals. The US-led Global North, by contrast, seeks to halt its relative decline in the global geopolitical marketplace not through soft power and the attraction of its positive offerings, but by attempting to obstruct the rise of the Global South. It seeks to do this through obstructive foreign policy, by denying the Global South its foreign policy goals and objectives and thereby slowing or halting its relative decline (Simons, 2022). This is visualised in US attempts to rally allies and neutrals, but it does so by rendering them objects rather than subjects, against the rise of the Global South. This has different implications in the short term versus the long term. "The 'America First' turn will seriously challenge Global South States in the shorter term but provides some longer-term opportunities. Washington's decentring of allies gives an opening for some middle powers". (Shidore, 2025, p. 122). This is attempted first and foremost through the fifth dimension of strategy, the weaponisation of information and knowledge through the information realm to engineer cognitive outcomes favourable to the US.

4. Method

Language gives life and definition to the human world; it makes sense of physical surroundings and shapes how we perceive and respond to them through interpretation and sense-making. One established linguistic tool for making and conveying sense of the physical environment, dating back to the classical ages, is rhetoric. Rhetoric uses language to persuade. "Rhetoric becomes primarily the process whereby a community comes to share a symbolic discourse – or whereby a communally shared discourse creates consubstantiality, subliminally persuades individuals to identify with the community, even to sacrifice their lives for their country and flag (and what it stands for)" (Coe, 1990, p. 49). This can be adapted and applied to the contemporary volatile environment of contested power and influence in international relations.

In this article, I will use rhetoric to interpret and analyse political speech with pragmatic intentions. This is best expressed in the selected text below, which designates a discipline for examining pragmatic communication.

That rhetorical study we call "analysis" is the diachronic examination of instances of pragmatic communication. It is diachronic in that it pursues its subject – pragmatic or rhetorical communication – as it exists through time. Its two major divisions are (a) historical analysis, such as is conducted by Neo-Aristotelian historians of public address, and (b) critical analysis, which is concerned with interpreting, reacting to, or appraising pragmatic communication using standards and methods in addition to the historical (McNally, 1970, p. 80).

This article seeks to apply the second division of rhetorical study, which is related to the critical analysis of pragmatic political speech within the context of the evolving global order where the speech is being used to support the geostrategic goal of hegemonic maintenance of the US-led Global North. Using Aristotle's delineation of rhetorical appeals, of which there are three in total: 1) *logos* (the use of logic, including false logic), 2) *ethos* (using the credibility of the speaker and ethical appeal), and 3) *pathos* (the use of emotions, positive and negative) to persuade and influence the audience (Braet, 1992; Wróbel, 2015; Voci, 2022). Rhetoric is widely used in international relations. This includes the use of rhetoric to convey to the intended audience(s) moral or legal imperatives (Goldsmith & Posner, 2002; Richards, 2012) as well as pragmatism (Hellmann, 2009) and the projection of state power and influence.

There is a need to locate the most likely site to find primary material to interpret and analyse with the aid of rhetorical theory, which is connected to the research question involving pragmatic communication. These communications are about the use of geo-economic tactics in international relations as a means of attempting to re-secure US global hegemony by the current US President, Trump, through his social media account, Truth Social.[1] Trump's private Truth Social account has

[1] https://truthsocial.com/@realDonaldTrump

become one of his primary means of communicating with domestic and foreign audiences; other digital channels are noticeably declining in volume during his presidency (Simons & Hossain, 2025). The period under investigation runs from his inauguration for his second term on 20 January 2025 to 31 December 2025. His social media posts were manually checked for references to BRICS, the Trump administration's geo-economic policy towards the group, and, in particular, the use of economic warfare against BRICS (sanctions, tariffs, and so forth). Therefore, keywords and phrases such as BRICS, sanctions, tariffs, US economic interests, US dollar, international trade, and Anti-American were focused upon. These were checked manually by scrolling through Trump's Truth Social timeline in the specified time period; posts also needed to use Trump's words and not be reposts of others' content. A total of 21 posts were identified, interpreted and analysed; posts with qualitative similarity in text were not duplicated.

5. Trump 2.0 and the Rhetorical War Against BRICS

Donald Trump won the November 2024 US presidential elections for a second time, and the presidency of Trump 2.0 officially began on inauguration day on the 20th of January 2025. He ran on a platform as a peace president, pledging not to start new wars and to end existing ones (such as the Ukraine conflict). Furthermore, he renewed his 2016 campaign slogan and pledge of Making America Great Again (MAGA), though he offered no specifics on how he would achieve it. However, since taking office, his rhetoric and his actions have become increasingly belligerent. While still maintaining the rhetoric of MAGA, he has initiated several wars (for example, Iran and Venezuela), threatened to annex countries and territories (Panama Canal, Greenland and Canada), threatened other countries with military force (Cuba, Mexico and Colombia) and threatened the world with economic warfare (tariffs in particular) on the rhetorical basis that the US was being taken advantage of by friend and foe alike.

For this article, economic warfare is understood as "economic warfare as a continuum of policies aiming to weaken the economic base of the adversary's power" (Førland, 1991, p. 191). A further and more elaborate definition argues that "economic warfare is the use of economic tools, strategies, and resources, as both complement and substitute for kinetic violence, towards the attainment of objectives within a broader adversarial agenda" (Chohan, 2024, p. 3). Trump 2.0's comments on BRICS, drawn from his Truth Social posts (original texts by Trump, not forwarded posts or commentaries on posts), were collected and collated in chronological order, beginning with the oldest posts first (from 20 January 2025 forward).

In this chronological order, the first post on BRICS appeared on 31 January 2025, about 11 days after the inauguration. The text's tone was framed in geo-economic terms and carried geopolitical implications.

"The idea that the BRICS Countries are trying to move away from the Dollar, while we stand by and watch, is OVER. We will require a commitment from these seemingly hostile Countries that they will neither create a new BRICS Currency, nor back any other Currency to replace the mighty U.S. dollar, nor face 100% Tariffs and expect to say goodbye to selling into the wonderful U.S. Economy. They can go find another sucker Nation. There is no chance that BRICS will replace the U.S. Dollar in International Trade, or anywhere else, and any Country that tries should say hello to Tariffs, and goodbye to America!" (Trump, 2025a).

Logos is used to establish the concept and perception of a threat in the US audience, where ethos depicts BRICS countries as having a nefarious plan against the so-called hero of this story, the US. The threat is de-dollarisation, a geo-economic imperative to weaken US global geopolitical hegemony. Using ethos and pathos of fear and patriotism, Trump is the person to finally stop the relative decline, threatening the use of economic warfare. This text hints at what Cowen & Smith (2009, p. 42) suggest: Trump is attempting to intimidate and coerce BRICS and halt their rise by accumulating wealth through market control of international trade. Many posts by Trump 2.0 did not mention BRICS as an organisation, but often targeted individual BRICS countries in a bilateral

format.

Geo-economics was seen as Trump's master plan for US imperial revival; the much-needed injection of funds was not sought through fair and equal trade practices, but through economic warfare, with tariffs as the preferred tactic. But geo-economics is seen as the key to reviving Pax Americana, which is described as being on life support.

"Our Nation is staging one of the greatest and fastest comebacks in history. In just 4 short months, we are respected again, respected like never before, and just wait, with many Trillions of Dollars of Investment in Plants and Factories, until you see the numbers on GROWTH. This is, indeed, THE GOLDEN AGE OF AMERICA!!!" (Trump, 2025b).

There is a minor element of logos, which may not be true, in the imperative logic of imperial revival. The text also uses heavy hyperbole and symbolic shouting through all-caps words, intended to reinforce the pathos focus of priming Trump's domestic political base with promises of respect, glory, and wealth. This uses the fifth dimension of strategy (knowledge and information) to prime and mobilise domestic political support by marketing and overselling his so-called art of the deal in exchange for justification and legitimacy for his risky geo-economic policy. The Trump 2.0 administration had in its sights not only BRICS countries, given the geo-economic threat and geopolitical challenge they represent, but also sovereign countries that chose to trade with BRICS countries.

"Any Country aligning itself with the Anti-American policies of BRICS will be charged an additional 10% Tariff. There will be no exceptions to this policy. Thank you for your attention to this matter!" (Trump, 2025c).

Trump 2.0 tries to narrate the US as the victim in this scenario and only acting in 'self-defence' with the false logic (logos) that the mere act of a country being a subject of international relations is in fact an "Anti-American" act. The use of hyperbole constructs a world of extreme actions bound by the ethos of moral judgement. Pathos is evident in the use of caps lock in the threat of economic warfare through tariff wars, rendering non-BRICS countries objects of international relations to obstruct BRICS' foreign-policy aspirations and goals by discouraging free international trade with countries outside the grouping.

The US victimhood frame is often invoked, which is narrated in a highly emotional tone that is given in the binary context of the priming and mobilising of his domestic political support base with a current sense of deep injustice that needs to be rectified through bringing about 'justice' for the US as a country and as a people. The text sample below illustrates this rhetorical approach to justifying his geo-economic strategy of economic warfare and building legitimacy for his policies and himself.

"The United States of America has been ripped off on trade (and military!), by friend and foe, alike, for decades. It has come at a cost of trillions of dollars, and it is just not sustainable any longer - And never was! Countries should sit back and say, "Thank you for the many years' long free ride, but we know you now have to do what's right for America." We should respond, "Thank you for understanding the situation we are in. Greatly appreciated!" (Trump, 2025d).

No distinction is made between friend and foe of the US. This aligns with an expression associated with US geopolitical expert Henry Kissinger; to paraphrase what he once stated, the US has no permanent friends or permanent foes, only permanent interests. The permanent US interests are the continuation of its global hegemony; whether it comes at the expense of friend or foe does not matter; the result only matters. There is a strong and emotionally laden depiction of US victimhood (pathos), which serves as a call for a political response to this 'injustice' that is wrapped in the ethos of justified moral judgement on the 'righteousness' of this goal.

6. Discussion

The end goal and objective of Trump 2.0's rhetoric on the geo-economic topic align with the

geopolitical imperative of maintaining U.S. global hegemony in the 21st century. In terms of end goals, there is no substantive change from the three geostrategic imperatives Brzezinski (1997) identified in The Grand Chessboard at the birth of the US unipolar moment, in the wake of the collapse of the Soviet Union and the bipolar global order. Brzezinski (1997) noted that, based on historical experience, three geostrategic imperatives must be satisfied to maintain or expand empire. These are: 1) to keep client states protected and pliant; 2) to keep vassal states dependent and pliant; and 3) to prevent the rise of powers or blocs of powers that can challenge US hegemony. The geo-economic imperatives and priorities of the Trump 2.0 administration, with an emphasis on economic warfare and coercion, support Simons's (2022) observation that geo-economics plays a subordinate yet supporting role in the US's geopolitical priorities and ambitions. This means obstructing other actors' foreign policy goals and objectives in international relations during a period of global geopolitical transformation.

Therefore, in the context of this article's case, the geo-economics of Trump 2.0 is a foreign policy practice aimed at achieving strategic objectives, as Scholvin & Wignell (2018b, p. 1) note. It also relates to realism in international relations, which aims to accumulate power and influence by pursuing self-interest in a chaotic, unpredictable physical and cognitive environment shaped by the transforming global geopolitics of the 21st century. When one pierces the bizarre and superficial theatrics of Trump's rhetoric, a pattern emerges that supports the observation by Cowen & Smith (2009, p. 42) that geo-economics is being operationalised by aiming directly at the accumulation of wealth via controlling the market of international trade and the control of strategic assets (such as oil and rare earths). Trump's rhetoric also hints at another angle: not achieving specific national goals and interests for the US, but a personal, performative function. This performative function is intended to solidify Trump's personal brand, reputation, and legacy, along the lines of a great global leader and the master of the art of the deal.

The use of rhetoric fits with the informational aspects of geopolitics that are outlined by Flint (2021) on the need to use information and knowledge as the fifth dimension of strategy, as outlined by Lonsdale (1999), to influence the tangible dimensions of strategy. The intention is rhetoric as a mechanism to generate and accumulate a sense of justification and legitimacy for Trump 2.0's aggressive foreign policy aimed at restoring Pax Americana. The point is that there is no divergence in the geopolitical end goal of global hegemony; differences and divergence lie in the ways and means of achieving this end state. Trump clearly attempts to use rhetoric as an intangible resource of power and influence, backed by a mixture of bluff and bluster (implying he has "the cards"), with the implied operational use of tangible power through military or economic coercion.

The attraction of the US and its ability and intention to seek soft power is over, owing to increasingly restrictive financial constraints on the US empire. Their ideology of Western liberal democracy is faltering and faces a lack of legitimacy or attraction in the eyes of the Global South. Thus, the US global offer is no longer competitive or attractive to the Global South, which seeks to be a subject, rather than a US object of international relations. This has created the US's choice: rather than being a competitive option for other countries to copy and engage with, it seeks to force and coerce other countries into 'consensus.' The intention is to obstruct the foreign policy of BRICS blocs and countries to preserve what remains of the relative US hegemony that was close to absolute at the end of the Cold War. Trump's rhetoric is aimed at shoring up his domestic political legitimacy and appeal, through the façade of demagogic rhetoric that attempts to engineer the illusion that he is the global deal maker, the all-powerful broker on which everything depends. Thus, the rhetoric is intended to appeal to domestic emotions and create a sense of awe and reverence in foreign audiences.

7. Conclusion

In the introduction, a research question was posed that has informed and shaped this article's approach. How does Trump 2.0 shape his rhetorical approach to economic warfare within the context of geo-economic ambition, using demagoguery to his domestic base while simultaneously trying to coerce compliance from foreign actors? Trump 2.0's rhetorical approach shows that he

applies tactics in the fifth dimension of strategy, but he lacks a clear strategy to achieve the geopolitical end goals of US global hegemony. Trump 2.0's tactics demonstrate the continued relevance of Brzezinski's three geostrategic imperatives for imperial maintenance. However, Trump also relies heavily on a performative façade, as if he were still on the stage of his reality TV show, The Apprentice, the alpha everyone must come to for favours; they need to ingratiate themselves with him. It consists of a mixture of bluff and bluster, where the performance is at times seemingly devoid of clear and concise strategy beyond the publicity that is intended to make Trump 2.0 look good on the international stage.

The story shaped by Trump 2.0's rhetoric circulates strongly emotional myths that are intended to prime and mobilise his domestic support base. These include the myth of US benevolence to the world (justice) and the world taking advantage of the US's goodwill and good nature (injustice). There is an engineered reality of binary opposing realities of justice being met with injustice, which 'demands' the application of restorative justice to 'right the wrongs' allegedly done to the US by an 'ungrateful' world. The world is not divided into friend versus foe, but winners versus losers, where Trump 2.0 attempts to project the US nation and people as eventual winners in this struggle with injustice, with the 'right' (read: correct) leader. This underpins the logos aspects of Trump's rhetoric: the logical explanation and basis for the policy and posture proposals that follow, grounded in the US's geo-economic priorities and intentions.

In terms of ethos, this is strongly imbued with moral and ethical judgment, favouring the US and opposing the rest (including BRICS). Trump also casts himself as the 'right' leader at the right time, given his alleged knowledge, skills, and expertise. BRICS is rhetorically painted as being anti-US and potentially turning the world against the US-led Global North. This is done on an almost messianic ideological basis, where one is asked (demanded) to give freely and trust Trump 2.0's self-narrative about his managerial abilities and supposed morals. BRICS are the 'bad guys' in this rhetorical equation and need to be punished; anyone who trades with them needs to be punished as well, even if this contradicts established international law and norms.

Pathos is widely and freely operationalised and applied in Trump's rhetorical appeals to his audience. The use and abuse of raw emotions, such as patriotism and contempt (disgust), prime and mobilise his domestic support base by casting his calls for economic warfare as a magic bullet to cure the imperial misfortune and financial woes of Pax Americana. Economic warfare is presented as the necessary means to restore justice to the global financial system that has been dominated by the US in the wake of the Second World War and the Bretton Woods conference that saw the sunset of Pax Britannica and the sunrise of Pax Americana.

The rhetorical means of logos, ethos, and pathos should not be seen or interpreted in separation from each other, but rather as working in conjunction. It aims to boost Trump 2.0's political speech to appeal to his domestic support base, embolden them in support of his legitimacy, and cognitively (psychologically) intimidate the BRICS countries and the international order with fear and force submission. Logos is the basis for the logic, ethos provides the basis for Trump's personal legitimacy and the supposed morality of what he proposes to do, and pathos is to create an emotional environment that emboldens his domestic support base, justifies and legitimises Trump and his actions and is a means of operation to influence BRICS decision makers into making decisions against their interests and in the interests of Trump's attempt at the revival of Pax Americana.

A brief discussion of the study's limitations and suggestions for future research is necessary. This work's main limitation is that it draws on a single source from a single person to generate the data set; it offers an indicative result. Rhetoric plays an increasingly influential role in global geopolitics and geo-economics, driven by rising competition and conflict stemming from the global power transformation, to engineer justification, legitimacy, and audience consent for policies. Future research should take these aspects into account: the communicational functions of geopolitics and geo-economics in the current global environment. A broader set of cases, as well as more comprehensive data sets, is needed to test and challenge this work's indicative premises.

References

Baracuhy, B. (2018). Geo-economics: Past, present, and future. *CEBRI Dossiê*, (2), 61–79.

Biden, J. R. (2020). Why America must lead again. *Foreign Affairs, 99*(2), 64-76.

Braet, A. C. (1992). Ethos, pathos and logos in Aristotle's Rhetoric: A re-examination. *Argumentation, 6*(3), 307-320.

Brooks, S. G., & Wohlforth, W. C. (2016). *America abroad: The United States' global role in the 21st century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brzezinski, Z. (1997). *The grand chessboard: American primacy and its geostrategic imperatives*. New York: Basic Books.

Brzezinski, Z. (2010). *Out of control: Global turmoil on the eve of the 21st century*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Chaudhuri, R. B. (2026). Geopolitical transformations in the 21st Century: An evolutionary perspective. *Journal of Law and Legal Research Development*, 01-05.

Chohan, U. W. (2024). *Modern economic warfare and its implications*. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4894995

Coe, R. M. (1990). Defining rhetoric—and us. *Journal of Advanced Composition*, 39-52.

Cowen, D., & Smith, N. (2009). After geopolitics? From the geopolitical social to geo-economics. *Antipode, 41*(1), 22–48.

Denisenko, I. F. (2025). The evolution of the global order: Between geopolitical myth and multipolar reality. *ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОЕ И МУНИЦИПАЛЬНОЕ УПРАВЛЕНИЕ. УЧЕНЫЕ ЗАПИСКИ*, 175-181.

Flint, C. (2021). *Introduction to geopolitics*. London: Routledge.

Førland, T. E. (1991). Economic Warfare and Strategic Goods: A Conceptual Framework for Analysing COCOM. *Journal of Peace Research, 28*(2), 191-204.

Goldsmith, J. L., & Posner, E. A. (2002). Moral and legal rhetoric in international relations: A rational choice perspective. *The Journal of Legal Studies, 31*(S1), S115-S139.

Hagan, C. B. (1942). Geopolitics. *The Journal of Politics, 4*(4), 478-490.

Hayes, J. (2017). Reclaiming constructivism: Identity and the practice of the study of international relations. *PS: Political Science & Politics, 50*(1), 89-92.

Hellmann, G. (2009). Pragmatism and international relations. *International Studies Review, 11*(3), 638-662.

Ikenberry, G. J. (2018). The end of liberal international order? *International Affairs, 94*(1), 7-23.

Ikenberry, G. J. (2020). *A world safe for democracy: Liberal internationalism and the crises of global order*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Kim, D. J. (2019). The perils of geoeconomics. *The Washington Quarterly, 42*(1), 153-170.

Kissinger, H. (2015). *World order*. New York: Penguin Books.

Kowert, P. A. (2016). Toward a constructivist theory of foreign policy. In V. Kubálková (Ed.), *Foreign policy in a constructed world* (pp. 266-287). New York: Routledge.

Lonsdale, D. J. (1999). Information power: Strategy, geopolitics, and the fifth dimension. *The Journal of Strategic Studies, 22*(2-3), 137-157.

McNally, J. R. (1970). Toward a definition of rhetoric. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 71-81.

Mamadouh, V., & Müller, M. (2023). Political geography and geopolitics. In D. Mishkova & B. Trencsényi (Eds.), *European regions and boundaries: A conceptual history* (pp. 258-279). New York: Berghahn Books.

Richards, D. L. (2012). "Rhetoric and reality" revisited. *Journal of Human Rights, 11*(3), 337-343.

Scholvin, S., & Wigell, M. (2018a). Power politics by economic means: Geo-economics as an analytical approach and foreign policy practice. *Comparative Strategy, 37*(1), 73-84, 10.1080/01495933.2018.1419729

Scholvin, S., & Wigell, M. (2018b). Geo-economic power politics: An introduction. In M. Wigell, S. Scholvin & M. Aaltola (Eds.), *Geo-economics and power politics in the 21st century* (pp. 1-13). London: Routledge.

Shidore, S. (2025). The United States and the global south in a post-unipolar world. *CEBRI-Revista: Brazilian Journal of International Affairs*, (14), 122-132.

Simons, G. (2022). Obstructive foreign policy and orthodoxy of knowledge as mechanisms of communication management in international relations. In Управление коммуникациями (pp. 297-303).

Simons, G. (2024a). BRICS and the geo-economic aspects of engineering a new global order. *TPQ, 22*(4).

Simons, G. (2024b). Propaganda and psychological warfare aspects in the strategic communication of the 21st century: European Union's place in the global order. In A. V. Laskin & K. Freberg (Eds.), *Public relations and strategic communication in 2050* (pp. 223-233). New York: Routledge.

Simons, G. (2024c). Ideology versus pragmatism in a transforming global order: Motivations and effects. *Journal of Governance, Security & Development, 4*(2).

Simons, G., & Chifu, I. (2025). Realist and constructivist interpretations and representations of the Second Nagorno-Karabakh War: As an event and as a process. *Journalism and Media, 6(*1), 21.

Simons, G., & Hossain, A. (2025). Decoding the rhetoric of Trump 2.0 foreign policy and the high-stakes geopolitical game. In K. Zakic & D. Trailovic (Eds.), *Recalibrating the global compass: China and shared future in a fragmented world* (pp. 119-136). Belgrade: Institute of International Politics and Economics.

Trump, D. J. [@realDonaldTrump]. (2025a, January 31). *The idea that the BRICS Countries are trying to move away from the Dollar, while we stand by and watch, is OVER*. Truth Social. https://truthsocial.com/@realDonaldTrump/posts/113920366067218393

Trump, D. J. [@realDonaldTrump]. (2025b, May 26). *Our Nation is staging one of the greatest and fastest comebacks in history*. Truth Social. https://truthsocial.com/@realDonaldTrump/posts/114574087342675789

Trump, D. J. [@realDonaldTrump]. (2025c, July 07). *Any Country aligning themselves with the Anti-American policies of BRICS, will be charged an ADDITIONAL 10% Tariff. There will be no exceptions to this policy*. Thank you for your attention to this matter! Truth Social. https://truthsocial.com/@realDonaldTrump/posts/114809574296066307

Trump, D. J. [@realDonaldTrump]. (2025d, July 14). *The United States of America has been ripped off on TRADE (and MILITARY!), by friend and foe, alike, for DECADES*. Truth Social. https://truthsocial.com/@realDonaldTrump/posts/114851420581462592

Voci, D. (2022). Logos, ethos, pathos, sustainabilitos? About the role of media companies in reaching sustainable development. *Sustainability, 14*(5), 2591.

Wróbel, S. (2015). Logos, ethos, pathos. *Classical rhetoric revisited. Polish Sociological Review, 191*(3), 401-421.